



From Conflict to Coexistence: Media Narratives and Digital Platforms in Reconciliation Efforts

¹**Kabita Devi Phurailatpam**, *Research Scholar, Dhanamanjuri University, Manipur*

kabita3435@gmail.com

²**Dr. Naorem Jibolata Devi**, *Assistant Professor, Dhanamanjuri University, Manipur*

Abstract: The landscape of global stability is experiencing a transformation comparable in magnitude to the introduction of the printing press or radio. Whereas 20th-century conflicts were primarily characterized by the movement of physical forces, contemporary conflict dynamics are increasingly shaped by the flow of information and control over digital narratives. This shift has given rise to a “post-digital” environment, wherein the distinctions between online antagonism and acts of physical violence have become blurred within integrated operations. Traditionally, media such as radio and print functioned as central platforms for public discourse and, in certain instances, the incitement of violence, operating largely within a centralized and hierarchical framework. In contrast, the advent of digital technologies—including social media, artificial intelligence (AI), and encrypted communications—has decentralized narrative formation, enabling both grassroots peacebuilders and malign actors to influence societal structures in real time. This paper examines the existing literature on mediated narratives and digital communication in the context of reconciliation initiatives. Narrative framing refers to the manner in which media structure and present information to their audiences.

Keywords: *Conflict, Media Narratives, Digital Platform, Reconciliation*

1. Introduction

The outlook of global stability is currently undergoing a change as intense as the invention of the printing press or radio. While 20th century conflict was mainly defined by the physical movement, the existing conflict dynamics are increasingly guided by the flow of data and the mastery of digital narratives. This evolution has introduced a “post digital” reality, a

state in which the difference between online taunting and physical violence has disintegrated into single operations. Historically, traditional media such as radio and print served as the main medium for public discussion and, occasionally, the incitement of violence. However, this medium operated under a centralized, top down framework. In contrast, the integration of digital technologies such as social media, artificial intelligence (AI) and encrypted messaging has democratized the ability to shape narratives, allowing both grassroots peace builders and malicious actors to influence the social structure in real time. This paper reviews literature on mediated narratives and digital communication in reconciliation efforts. Narrative framing refers to how media organize and present information to audiences. Frames influence interpretation by highlighting specific themes, actors, or causal explanations (Entman, 1993). In conflict settings, media may frame events in terms of security threats, moral binaries, or us-versus-them dynamics—intensifying division. Peace journalism advocates a shift toward conflict-sensitive framing that emphasizes root causes, contextual factors, and human impacts (Lynch & McGoldrick, 2005).

Digital platforms—social media, messaging apps, blogs—facilitate participatory communication. They support decentralized production and dissemination of narratives beyond traditional gatekeeping. However, algorithmic logics that prioritize engagement can amplify sensational or polarized content, inadvertently fueling division (Bakshy et al., 2015). Platforms thus mediate not just content but the social structures of interaction.

Reconciliation entails restoring relationships after violence and division, involving truth-telling, acknowledgment, and mutual recognition. Communication is central to reconciliation: shaping collective memory, facilitating intergroup dialogue, and constructing narratives of shared identity (Kelman, 2008).

Conflict has ever been a recurring decimal in history of mankind. More often than not, this is as a result of competition for scarce resources in human society. Conflicts between indigenous communities have existed for a very long time but it may be exactly difficult to pinpoint when the crises actually started. However, from a historical point of view, scholars like Ikezue and Ezeah (2017) refer to the fact that conflicts resulting from cattle grazing have existed for as long as the practice of agriculture. Empirical evidence by Oduma-Aboh (2018) has shown that an attempt to resolve one conflict, another conflict often surface and as such persistence of conflicts in Nigeria indicate that the orthodox methods designed to manage or, and resolve conflicts has not been fully effective (Yar'Adua et al., 2023). It is safe to argue that resource ownership and utilization have directly and indirectly defined the dimensions of most conflicts involving man since time immemorial. Of all resources, however, land has remained an overwhelming source of conflicts among various user groups as well as individuals at

varying thresholds (Oduma-Aboh, 2018). Conflicts involving lands have not only heightened the level of insecurity, but have also demonstrated high potential to exacerbate food crisis in Nigeria and other affected countries due to loss of lives, animals, crops and valuable properties (Mojaye & Aondover, 2022). For instance, the invasion of Agatu in Benue state in north central zone of Nigeria is another killing by the nomadic herdsmen. They rendered some villages in Benue State a gaping wound, spewing forth a river of human blood. No immediate reasons were offered for the attacks. Neither has anybody been able to give the precise number of people killed; but reports say more than a hundred people were killed by the herdsmen. The account of Paul Ede, who coordinated the coalition of civil society groups that visited the National Assembly in Abuja Nigeria to protest the latest killings in Agatu Local Government Area of Benue State, claimed that 400 persons lost their lives in that orgy of violence. The invaders in Agatu reportedly crossed over from Logo and Doma in nearby Nasarawa State and sacked seven villages, namely Okokolo, Aila, Adagbo Akwu, Omikuidi, Ocholonya and Odugbeho. Similarly, in Nimbo in Uzo-Uwani community of Enugu state, it was alleged that no sooner than the law enforcement agents left than the herdsmen struck and ravaged the villages without any challenge whatsoever from the law enforcement agencies. It could be recalled that no fewer than 500 persons were brutally murdered and many wounded in three villages in Jos South and Barakin Ladi local

government areas of Plateau State in north central geo political zone of Nigeria, among other incidents of indigenous community conflicts (Adedogun, 2006).

Cultural Theory of Conflict and Media Conflict Resolution

The Cultural Theory of Conflict serves the study goal. This paper used the cultural theory of conflict as its theoretical justification to explain vividly the supposed role of the mass media in a conflict situation. This theory identifies social difference, particularly cultural, as the main factor that creates a social identity and social exclusion thereby creating “we” against “them” feeling which nurtures animosity, hatred, and contemptuous relationship among people of divergent cultures leading to conflict, how the competing interest of groups tie conflict directly into the social, economic and political organizations of society as well as the nature and strength of social networks within and between community groups (Ademola, 2005). The culturally-induced conflict that this relationship cultivates is a result of the creation of the enemy image which is learned from the early stage of growth to adulthood and is passed on from generation to generation. An example is seen in the case of Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda. The theory believes that different forms of identities in various societies exist; however, the one that has ethnic origin is the most dangerous identity and the one that most explains violent

conflicts. Psycho-cultural theory of conflict argues that conflict is avoidable when tolerance and understanding among people of different races, cultures, languages, and historic are established. The theory however becomes relevant as it addresses the feeling which nurtures animosity, hatred, and contemptuous relationship among people of divergent cultures leading to conflict. In this context, there is a nexus between the theory and the study because of the violent extremism in Nigeria and the traumatic condition such conflicts create among indigenous community. The assumption of the theory becomes imperative through which this study is borne out of the realization that in a mix where “indigenous community” meet, most especially as a result of social and geographical contacts, a culture shock is produced. Thus, the politicization or poor mediation of these community members could produce shocks that can explode into social conflict with devastating consequences.

The Media and Conflict Reporting

The media, according to Wilson (2009) have an important role to play in promoting an honest and pluralistic political debate and in providing accurate and timely information about the issues, policies, and strategies that will reduce tension, create the conditions for equitable development and reduce the level of ignorance and fear that contribute to misunderstanding and hostility in society. The MacBride Commission (1980) viewed the roles of media in times of conflict as significant in informing the public of the necessary facts however unpleasant or distributing they might be. According to Uchenya (2003) the information the media provides becomes a vital factor for evolving and fully enlightening the masses to be fully responsive to the dynamics of society. Uchem (2003) stated that responsible and useful communication can heal conflict. Aliagan (2006) also observed that there cannot be peace and understanding among members of the community unless they have better and truer information about one another, which is the idea behind conflict reporting. Conflict reporting is the art and practice of gathering, compiling, and disseminating information about the conflict through the mass media. It involves reporting and writing on events and situations of conflict or impending conflict and its magnitude and consequences. Conflict reporting has also been called peace journalism or conflict resolution journalism (Anaeto as cited in Wilson, 2009). Conflict reporting in the media makes for the introduction, interpretation, or clarification of issues in a conflict situation to which many have given little or no attention at all. Orhewere (2004) states that the media in conflict reporting puts the reader to task to think, brainstorm, dialogue, agree and disagree, accuse, and counter-accuse to bring a lasting solution to the conflict. The role of the media in conflict reporting is basically for conflict solutions. It is to bring about peace. It seeks to bring the parties in the conflict to a peaceful common plane. Conflict reporting assists

citizens to rebuild their society and reduce tension or at least not exacerbate existing divisions (Aondover et al, 2023) According to Pate (2002) conflict reporting tries to depolarize conflict by showing the black and white of all sides and de-escalating by highlighting peace and conflict resolutions as much as violence. Peace journalism seeks to minimize the rift between opposed parties by not repeating facts that demonize one side and set the stage for conflict. In conflict reporting, journalists need to work independently and make a decision on everything from the headline, to the people interview and the selection of images, quotes, and the language used, to the basic decision of what stories are covered and why (Park & Deshapriya, 2008). Wilson (2009) adds that in covering conflict stories, journalists should add an „S“ for a solution and a „C“ for common ground to the additional „five W“s and H formula (who, what, when, where, why, and how). This is simply corroborating the idea that the ultimate goal of conflict reporting is conflict resolution. Pate (2013) summarizes the common professional errors that are found in media reports thus: Promoting prejudicial stereotypes about groups and individuals through selective reporting; Reporting intergroup conflicts out of their fundamental sociological, economic, political, and other contents; Making generalized statements not supported by concrete facts and figures. Similarly, attributing statements by individuals to collectives; Publishing rumors as facts; Publishing unfair and discriminating advert; Using inflammatory language in news reporting; The use of inflammatory, misleading and sensational headlines to attract sales. Also, demonizing certain ethnic religious or political groups in an already divided and tense society; Un-objective and biased reporting against some groups, individuals, or communities; Inappropriate use of language in reporting conflict; Using unrepresentative pictures; Unethical editorial conduct of allowing letters to editors and opinion pages to be used as platforms for making inflammatory statements against people or groups; Exposing sources of information to harm and Exposing victims of violent attacks to further attack. Globally, journalism practice is guided by some operational guidelines of objectivity, balance, fairness, and neutrality which, according to (Shoemaker & Reese, 2009) form the fulcrum of the international principles of journalism and are deemed binding on the practicing journalists and the institutions that employ them. The principle of objectivity behooves journalists (editors and reporters) to give a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of an event in a context that gives them meaning. These they achieve by “selecting, writing, editing, positioning, scheduling, repeating and otherwise massaging information to become news” (Shoemaker & Reese, 2009). Journalists daily receive a large volume of information from different sources out of which they select the newsworthy ones for publication, which is what is being referred to as the gatekeeping function of the media. The principle of objectivity demands that journalists employ appropriate news judgment and value to determine the amount of time

(television and radio) and space (newspaper and magazine) allotted to conflicting sides of a news report. It also determines the degree of the importance attached to a story in the newspapers and news broadcast, which in the opinion of Isola (2010) is a function of understanding and experience. “Balance,” “fairness” and “neutrality” are other problematic aspects of objectivity. These, according to Isola (2010) presuppose open and free access to media space and time by every participant involved in the news. It is, however, noteworthy that due to time and space constraints not everyone could enjoy this privilege but only those who can pay for it. This is where Oso (2017) notes that the commercialization and the privatisation of mass media have come to clash with media objectivity. Notwithstanding, it has been observed from the foregoing that objectivity runs through every aspect of the news reporting process.

In achieving a higher level of objectivity, journalists are encouraged to always present conflicting possibilities, supporting evidence, judicious use of quotations, structuring information in appropriate sequences, and above all humility (Nwanne in Wilson, 2007). However, Pate and Dauda (2015) examine the challenges of Nigerian journalists. It can be understood that many of them work to beat very strict deadlines. They are handicapped by a weak resource base, poor infrastructural facilities, the absence of basic working tools, and inadequate security cover, among others. Consequently, they are forced to depend on unreliable or incomplete sources of information without conducting proper, deeper, and contextually relevant journalist investigations. Similarly, some of the journalists, even where they appear complement, are often subdued by the attitude and policies of their individual media houses to the detriment of their professional honour (Ezeonyejiaku et al., 2021). Thus, it is important also to address media owners for their understanding of this issue. Closely linked to the above also is the survival instinct pervading most media organisations. In their desire to sell copies and attract viewers and listeners, they violate journalistic ethics through “colorful, unique and unexpected” stories, which may have negative consequences on society.

Media Narratives in Conflict and Post-Conflict Contexts

Historically, newspapers, radio, and television have played influential roles during conflict. In situations like the Balkans in the 1990s or Rwanda in 1994, media rhetoric contributed to polarization and violence (Keenan, 2009). Post-conflict, public broadcasters and national newspapers can be sites for truth commissions, victim testimonies, and peace discourse—yet they may also reproduce elite narratives that marginalize minority experience.

Peace journalism proposes reporting that avoids reifying conflict binaries and instead foregrounds systemic grievances and peace efforts. Research has shown that even subtle shifts in metaphor, sourcing, and emphasis can alter public perceptions (Doyle & MacDonald, 2007).

However, structural pressures (news values, market competition, editorial norms) often constrain implementation.

Media organizations embedded in political or economic interests may frame reconciliation selectively. Ownership concentration and advertising incentives can skew coverage toward conflict escalation or cynical “both-sides” false equivalence instead of nuanced peace reporting.

Digital Platforms as Spaces of Conflict and Reconciliation

Digital platforms have democratized voice but also facilitated the spread of harmful narratives. Hashtags and viral content can mobilize groups rapidly, yet echo chambers and filter bubbles can entrench existing biases. Algorithms driven by engagement metrics often elevate emotionally charged content—frequently divisive messages.

Despite risks, digital platforms have enabled innovative reconciliation efforts. Examples include:

- **Cross-Community Dialogue Spaces:** Online forums and groups designed for intergroup discussion.
- **Storytelling Projects:** Platforms where individuals share personal narratives of loss, resilience, or reconciliation, fostering empathy.
- **Counter-Narrative Campaigns:** Initiatives that challenge hate speech and promote alternative framings, often driven by civil society and grassroots actors.

Digital reconciliation efforts face hurdles: harassment and trolling discourage participation, digital divides limit access for marginalized groups, and platform governance often lacks mechanisms to protect vulnerable users. Moreover, state actors may deploy surveillance or censorship under the pretext of security, suppressing dissent and reconciliation discourse.

Interplay Between Traditional and Digital Media

Contemporary media ecologies are hybrid: traditional outlets and digital platforms interact. Journalists increasingly use social media for sourcing and dissemination. At times, online narratives feed into mainstream coverage and vice versa. This interplay can either magnify reconciliation efforts or entrench misinformation. Scholars have documented instances where online campaigns influenced policy or public sentiment toward reconciliation—for example, digital memorialization projects that were later referenced in traditional news, or conflict de-escalation hashtags that gained institutional attention.

Ethical Reporting and Platform Design

Media practitioners must balance freedom of expression with harm mitigation. Ethical guidelines for conflict reporting emphasize contextualization, accuracy, and dignified representation of victims. Platforms, too, have ethical responsibilities: designing algorithms that do not prioritize sensationalism at the expense of social cohesion; providing tools for community moderation; and transparent content governance.

Policy responses to online harms—such as content moderation laws—must navigate the tension between regulation and protecting civil liberties. Overbroad regulation can stifle legitimate reconciliation dialogue, while lax governance allows harmful narratives to proliferate.

2. Discussion

The existing body of literature presents a multifaceted understanding of the role of media in situations of social and political conflict. Rather than functioning in a purely constructive or destructive manner, media narratives often operate within a spectrum where they can either intensify tensions or facilitate processes of dialogue and reconciliation. In many cases, the

framing of events, the language used in reporting, and the selection of voices represented in news coverage can significantly shape public perceptions of conflict. Narratives that emphasize blame, division, or sensationalism may amplify mistrust and hostility among communities, whereas reporting that highlights shared experiences, human suffering, and possibilities for cooperation can contribute to empathy and understanding. As a result, the media environment becomes a critical arena where meanings of conflict and peace are continuously negotiated.

Although traditional forms of media such as newspapers, radio, and television continue to hold considerable influence in shaping public opinion, their role has evolved in response to the rapid expansion of digital communication technologies. Contemporary information ecosystems are increasingly characterized by the interaction between established media institutions and decentralized digital platforms. Social media networks, online forums, and user-generated content platforms have transformed audiences from passive consumers of information into active participants in the creation and dissemination of narratives. This shift has broadened the range of perspectives that can enter public discourse, allowing marginalized voices and grassroots movements to share their stories more easily than before. In this sense, digital spaces have contributed to a more democratized form of communication in which the production of narratives is no longer monopolized by professional media organizations.

However, the same features that enable greater participation also create new challenges. The decentralized and often unregulated nature of digital platforms can lead to the rapid circulation of misinformation, emotionally charged content, and polarizing narratives. Algorithm-driven content recommendation systems may reinforce existing beliefs by exposing users primarily to viewpoints that align with their own perspectives. This process can create echo chambers that deepen ideological divisions and reduce opportunities for constructive dialogue across different communities. Consequently, digital environments have become spaces where both constructive engagement and heightened polarization coexist.

In light of these dynamics, scholars and practitioners increasingly emphasize the need for comprehensive and integrative approaches to reconciliation in media-saturated societies. Ethical and responsible journalism remains a cornerstone of such efforts, requiring reporters and media institutions to prioritize accuracy, fairness, and contextual sensitivity when covering conflicts. At the same time, digital platform companies must assume greater responsibility for the governance of online spaces by implementing transparent moderation policies, reducing the spread of harmful content, and promoting trustworthy sources of

information. Strengthening digital literacy among users is equally important, as it enables individuals to critically assess information, recognize manipulation or bias, and engage more thoughtfully in online discussions.

Furthermore, meaningful reconciliation efforts should encourage participatory dialogue that connects both online and offline interactions. Initiatives such as community forums, collaborative storytelling projects, and cross-cultural dialogue programs can help bridge the gap between digital conversations and real-world relationships. By creating spaces where individuals from diverse backgrounds can share experiences and perspectives, these initiatives contribute to building mutual understanding and trust. Ultimately, the literature suggests that addressing the challenges of contemporary media environments requires coordinated efforts that combine ethical media practices, accountable platform governance, informed audiences, and inclusive communication strategies capable of linking digital engagement with community-based peacebuilding.

3. Conclusion

In contemporary societies shaped by rapid communication technologies, media narratives and digital platforms possess a powerful capacity to shape public perceptions, social relationships, and political realities. Their influence is particularly significant in contexts marked by conflict, division, or historical grievances. Media spaces—ranging from traditional journalism to social media networks—can either intensify polarization or contribute to

dialogue, understanding, and reconciliation. Importantly, the direction of this influence is not fixed or automatic. Instead, it is shaped by the choices, ethical commitments, and institutional frameworks that guide the actions of journalists, platform designers, policymakers, civil society organizations, and everyday users. Recognizing this dynamic nature of media influence is essential for understanding how communication systems can either perpetuate conflict or foster pathways toward coexistence.

Responsible journalism plays a crucial role in this process. When journalists adopt ethical reporting practices—such as fact-checking, balanced representation, and sensitivity to the historical and cultural contexts of conflict—they can contribute to narratives that promote empathy and mutual understanding rather than hostility. Similarly, digital platform designers and technology companies hold significant responsibility in shaping the information environment. Their decisions regarding algorithms, content moderation policies, and community guidelines influence which narratives gain visibility and which voices are amplified or marginalized. Thoughtful platform governance can reduce the spread of

misinformation, hate speech, and inflammatory content that often escalates tensions in divided societies.

At the same time, civil society organizations, educators, and community leaders can utilize media spaces to encourage dialogue across social and cultural boundaries. Initiatives such as digital storytelling, peace journalism, online dialogue forums, and collaborative media projects can create opportunities for individuals from different communities to share experiences and perspectives. These initiatives help humanize opposing groups, challenge stereotypes, and build trust—an essential component of sustainable peacebuilding. In this way, media platforms can become arenas for constructive engagement rather than sites of antagonism.

However, the risks associated with media environments cannot be overlooked. Digital platforms can also facilitate the rapid spread of misinformation, propaganda, and emotionally charged narratives that deepen social divisions. Echo chambers and algorithm-driven content personalization may reinforce existing biases, making it difficult for individuals to encounter diverse perspectives. For this reason, a balanced approach is necessary—one that acknowledges both the transformative potential and the inherent vulnerabilities of modern communication systems. Media literacy among users is equally important, enabling individuals to critically evaluate the information they consume and share.

Looking ahead, further academic inquiry is essential to better understand how media can effectively contribute to reconciliation processes. Future research should examine practical intervention strategies that leverage media for peace building, including collaborative

journalism initiatives, digital dialogue platforms, and community-based communication programs. Additionally, scholars and policymakers should explore innovative models of platform governance that prioritize transparency, accountability, and ethical responsibility. Longitudinal studies are also needed to assess the long-term impact of media-mediated reconciliation efforts, as the effects of narrative change and social engagement often unfold gradually over time.

Ultimately, the role of media in shaping conflict and coexistence is profound but contingent. When guided by ethical practices, inclusive design, and active civic participation, media platforms can help transform narratives of division into opportunities for dialogue and understanding. Harnessing this potential requires sustained collaboration among media professionals, technology developers, policymakers, researchers, and communities themselves. Through such collective efforts, media can move beyond being mere channels of

information and instead become meaningful instruments for fostering reconciliation, resilience, and peaceful coexistence in increasingly interconnected societies.

References

- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). *Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook*. Science.
- Doyle, D., & MacDonald, M. (2007). *Covering Conflict: A Handbook for Journalists*. BBC Academy.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). *Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm*. Journal of Communication.
- Kelman, H. C. (2008). *Reconciliation from a Social-Psychological Perspective*. In Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence.
- Lynch, J., & McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace Journalism*. Hawthorn Press.