JOURNAL OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE
ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 4, No. 2 / June, 2026
https://www.jopd.com.ng

LIBRARIES AS CONDITIONAL PEACE INFRASTRUCTURES: A CRITICAL INTEGRATIVE REVIEW OF INFORMATION DISORDER IN CONFLICT-AFFECTED AND POLARISED SETTINGS

Patrick Ogbonnaya Okoro, PhD* • Paul Andrew Gwaza, PhD* • Imran Usman Sani, PhD*
*Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Abuja, Nigeria
Corresponding author: pat_okoro@yahoo.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.57233/jopd.v4i2.23

Abstract
Information disorder poses a significant challenge to peacebuilding in conflict-affected and polarised settings, where access to credible information, institutional trust and opportunities for constructive cross-group engagement may be limited. This paper examines how libraries can contribute to addressing information disorder without reducing peacebuilding to fact-checking or assuming that libraries are inherently neutral or trusted institutions. The study employed a critical integrative review methodology, drawing on 41 analytical publications across library and information science, misinformation intervention research, peace and conflict studies, and African library practice. The literature was examined for intervention mechanisms, reported outcomes, institutional conditions and ethical risks. The synthesis identified four interconnected dimensions through which libraries may strengthen information resilience and support peacebuilding: informational resilience, interpretive resilience, relational resilience and institutional resilience. However, the evidence base remains fragmented. Library research rarely evaluates behavioural or peace-related outcomes, while misinformation intervention studies seldom examine libraries, violent conflict or the development of sustained institutional trust. The paper therefore conceptualises libraries as conditional peace infrastructures whose contribution depends on contextual, institutional and ethical conditions. It proposes an evidence-based framework linking library practices to proximal outcomes while emphasising safeguards for low-trust, multilingual and politically sensitive environments. The framework is intended as an analytical foundation for future participatory validation and adaptation in conflict-affected settings.
Keywords: Conflict-affected settings; Information disorder; Information literacy; Libraries; Peace infrastructures

Introduction

False or misleading information is not new, but its consequences become sharper where social relations are already strained. In conflict-affected settings, a fabricated message can do more than confuse an audience. It can deepen fear, mark a community as dangerous, obstruct humanitarian access or make retaliation appear justified. For this reason, conflict-related information disorder should be understood not only as an accuracy problem but also as a social and institutional risk. Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) distinguish misinformation, disinformation and malinformation, while Tandoc et al. (2018) show why the loose label "fake news" conceals different forms, intentions and consequences. Ulbricht and Rizk (2024) extend the analysis to armed conflict by tracing physical, psychological, economic, social and societal harms associated with harmful information.

Libraries appear well placed to respond. They provide access to documentary resources, employ staff trained in information evaluation and, in many communities, offer one of the

few public spaces where people can enter without declaring a political or religious position. Research on libraries as public-sphere institutions also links them to civic participation, knowledge exchange and encounters among people who may not otherwise meet (Appleton & Hall, 2023; Audunson et al., 2019; Widdersheim & Koizumi, 2016). Yet these qualities should not be romanticised. A library may be trusted by one group and viewed as an arm of government by another. Its collections can reproduce exclusions, its staff may lack security or specialist training, and an event presented as dialogue can expose participants to surveillance or harm. Trust, neutrality and safety are therefore empirical conditions to be built and assessed, not qualities that follow automatically from the word "library".

Library scholarship has already addressed misinformation. Reviews describe responses ranging from source-evaluation instruction and curated guides to reference services and public programming (Batchelor, 2017; De Paor & Heravi, 2020; Revez & Corujo, 2021). Critical information-literacy research has also moved beyond mechanical checklists by asking who is recognised as an authority, how platforms and institutions shape visibility, and whose interests are served by prevailing information systems (Faix & Fyn, 2020; Tewell, 2015). The problem is that these conversations remain only partly connected to research on violent conflict, harmful rumours, intergroup relations and infrastructures for peace.

A second limitation concerns evidence. Professional accounts often describe what libraries should do, or what librarians believe they do, but provide little evidence of changed behaviour. Revez and Corujo (2021) found a field dominated by higher-education instruction and thin evaluation. Saunders (2023) similarly reported that misinformation was widely addressed among surveyed academic librarians, yet direct assessment of learners' identification or evaluation performance remained uncommon. Experimental research offers stronger evidence that accuracy prompts, prebunking and corrective messages can improve discernment, but the average effects are often modest and context-sensitive (Ali & Qazi, 2023; Guess et al., 2020; Pennycook & Rand, 2022). These studies seldom test library delivery, sustained community relationships or conditions of active conflict.

The African evidence is especially limited. Ayoung et al. (2023) found that academic librarians in Ghana recognised fake news but did not always grasp its complexity and needed stronger training and curricular collaboration. In conflict-affected South-East Nigeria, Eze et al. (2016) documented inadequate peace and conflict collections, weak programming and serious infrastructure constraints. Earlier Nigerian scholarship proposed timely information, public education and access to conflict-resolution resources as library contributions to peace, but did not establish causal effects (Echezona, 2007). This leaves both a practical and conceptual gap: how might libraries contribute to information resilience in conflict-prone societies, through which mechanisms, and under what safeguards?

This paper answers that question through a critical integrative review. It asks how library responses are conceptualised; what interventions and outcomes have been studied; which mechanisms could reduce information-related conflict risks; what institutional and ethical conditions matter; and where the most consequential gaps remain. Its central argument is that libraries can function as peace infrastructures when four capacities work together: informational resilience, interpretive resilience, relational resilience and institutional resilience. The contribution is deliberately conditional. Libraries do not produce peace simply by distributing accurate content. Their value lies in combining credible documentation, critical pedagogy, trusted mediation and inclusive civic space, while recognising the political risks of each function.

Methodology

The study employed a critical integrative review methodology because the topic spans empirical experiments, qualitative library studies, conceptual scholarship and policy frameworks that cannot be meaningfully reduced to a single effect estimate. Integrative reviews allow different forms of evidence to be compared, while critical review supports the examination of assumptions, contradictions and research gaps (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2016; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005).

Searches were conducted between June and 13 August 2026 using Google Scholar, Crossref records and publisher platforms. Search terms combined library-related concepts with misinformation terms and peace-related terms, while citation chaining from major reviews and highly relevant studies was used to identify additional sources. The review covered publications from 2007 to August 2026.

Sources were included if they examined library responses to misinformation, library-relevant misinformation interventions, libraries as civic or relational institutions, information harms in conflict, or evidence from Nigeria, Africa or comparable conflict-affected settings. Sources without a clear connection to library practice, information behaviour or conflict risk were excluded.

Forty-one publications formed the analytical corpus, while three methodological sources guided the review design. Each source was assessed for setting, method, population, intervention or concept, reported outcome, limitation and relevance to conflict-sensitive library practice. The synthesis compared patterns across studies and identified four recurring capacities: informational, interpretive, relational and institutional resilience. Contradictory findings, contextual limitations and potential risks were retained. The resulting framework is therefore an evidence-informed analytical model rather than a validated causal instrument.

Conceptual Foundations

Information disorder is used here as an umbrella term, not as a diagnosis that makes every disputed claim equivalent. Misinformation refers to false or misleading content shared without an intention to cause harm; disinformation involves deliberate deception; and malinformation involves genuine information used in a harmful way, often by removing context or violating privacy (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). The distinction matters operationally. A mistaken community alert may call for clarification, an organised influence campaign may require coordinated verification and documentation, and the circulation of a survivor's identity may require protection rather than further publicity. Conflict sensitivity begins by identifying the type of information problem, the people exposed to it and the harms that may follow.

Information literacy is equally broader than the ability to judge whether a website looks credible. Checklist approaches can help with routine evaluation, but they may imply that users fail because they lack individual skill. Critical information literacy redirects attention to power, authority and the political economy of information (Tewell, 2015). Faix and Fyn (2020) show how questions about framing, authority and information creation can be used in misinformation teaching. Jones-Jang et al. (2021) found that information literacy was more consistently associated with identifying fabricated news than narrower literacy measures, although the observational design does not establish that instruction caused this difference. Machete and Turpin (2020) likewise conclude that critical thinking is relevant but note uneven concepts and intervention evidence. Together, this work suggests that useful

instruction must combine verification techniques with reflection on identity, emotion, platform incentives and unequal authority.

The idea of peace infrastructure provides the institutional bridge. Infrastructures for peace are networks of structures, resources, relationships and skills that support conflict prevention, management and transformation across levels of society (van Tongeren et al., 2012). Applying the term to libraries does not mean assigning them the work of mediators, journalists or security agencies. It means asking whether routine library capacities, documentation, access, instruction, referral, convening and preservation, can be organised so that communities are less vulnerable to escalatory information and better able to handle disagreement without violence.

Public-sphere research clarifies why the library may matter as more than a content provider. Widdersheim and Koizumi (2016) conceptualise the public library as a discourse arena with spatial, communicative and institutional dimensions. Audunson et al. (2019) describe public libraries as infrastructure for a sustainable public sphere, while Appleton and Hall's (2023) longitudinal focus-group study shows that knowledge can emerge through person-to-person interaction in library spaces. Larsen (2018) connects libraries, archives and museums to public communication, identity and civic participation. Hansson's (2017) analysis of professional values adds an ethical layer by showing how librarianship's public commitments are documented and regulated within the profession. Most of this work was conducted in stable settings, so its mechanisms cannot simply be transferred to conflict zones. It does, however, show why access, encounter, ethics and institutional design should be studied together.

Social-capital research adds a relational mechanism but also a warning. Interviews with library staff suggest that everyday relationships can build trust, reduce isolation and connect patrons to wider resources (Johnson, 2012). Vårheim's (2014) study of immigrant programmes found increased trust in libraries, librarians and fellow participants, although the evidence did not demonstrate a rapid shift to broad generalised trust. Mehra and Srinivasan's (2007) library-community convergence framework places community action and participatory engagement at the centre of library work. Such relationships may support bridging ties across groups, but cohesive in-groups can also circulate rumours efficiently. The peacebuilding question, therefore, is not whether libraries create "social capital" in the abstract, but whether they foster accountable, cross-cutting relationships without putting participants at risk.

Findings from the Integrative Review

The literature converged around relevant assets but diverged sharply in the strength of evidence. Library studies established professional roles, instructional approaches and civic possibilities. Misinformation research tested discrete cognitive and communicative interventions. Conflict scholarship clarified the stakes of harmful information. Very few studies combined these levels. Four findings followed from reading them together.

First, most library responses remain informational and instructional. They include research guides, workshops, source-comparison exercises, reference support and collaboration with teaching staff (Batchelor, 2017; De Paor & Heravi, 2020; Revez & Corujo, 2021). These activities are useful because access and evaluation are necessary parts of resilience. Yet evidence of outcomes remains limited. Saunders (2022) found faculty concern about misinformation but uneven teaching approaches and limited collaboration with librarians. Saunders (2023) found widespread reported engagement among academic librarians but little

direct assessment of whether learners could identify or evaluate questionable content. The literature consequently tells us more about activity than about behavioural change, durability or conflict prevention.

Second, research outside librarianship shows that information interventions can work, but not uniformly. A brief digital media-literacy intervention improved discernment in the United States and India, with variation across settings (Guess et al., 2020). In Pakistan, personalised feedback improved the identification of false content more than generic educational material, while some effects raised concerns about judging true content (Ali & Qazi, 2023). Accuracy prompts can improve the quality of sharing choices across samples, although effects are generally small and do not remove motivated reasoning (Pennycook & Rand, 2022). These findings favour short, concrete and context-tested activities over broad exhortations to "think critically".

Third, prebunking and correction offer practical design principles. Inoculation studies show that explaining manipulation techniques before exposure can increase resistance to misleading arguments (Cook et al., 2017; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; van der Linden et al., 2017). Short videos have also improved recognition of common techniques and sharing decisions at scale (Roozenbeek et al., 2022). Meta-analyses indicate that corrections generally improve belief accuracy, especially when they provide a clear factual alternative and engage the audience, although outcomes vary by message, prior belief and context (Chan et al., 2017; Walter & Murphy, 2018; Walter et al., 2020). Social-media experiments further show that correction source and placement matter (Bode & Vraga, 2018), and news-literacy messages can strengthen expert corrections on Twitter (Vraga et al., 2022). Practical guidance therefore recommends a factual replacement, an explanation of the misleading technique and careful avoidance of unnecessary repetition (Lewandowsky et al., 2020).

Fourth, conflict changes both the mechanism and the risk. Rohman and Ang's (2019) study of Ambon, Indonesia, shows how diverse friendship networks, crowdsourced verification, civic identity and intergroup contact helped residents challenge false information during civil conflict. This is not a library intervention, but it demonstrates why resilient information environments are relational. People often judge a threatening claim through trusted social ties before consulting an institutional source. Libraries may help by supporting diverse verification networks and structured dialogue, but a poorly designed programme could amplify a rumour, expose a participant or be interpreted as partisan intervention.

African studies underline the importance of capacity and context. Ayoung et al. (2023) identified gaps in librarians' understanding and preparedness in Ghanaian academic libraries. Eze et al. (2016) found limited collections, programming and infrastructure in Nigerian libraries serving conflict-affected communities. Echezona (2007) provided an early Nigerian argument for timely information, public education and conflict-resolution resources. These studies support the relevance of libraries but do not establish that particular services reduce misinformation or violence. They also point to constraints, which include funding, connectivity, staff preparation, language and institutional independence, that much experimental research assumes away.

Across the corpus, no study validated an integrated library model linking information access, critical interpretation, cross-group relationships and organisational safeguards to peace-related outcomes. This is the central gap. The next section develops this model based on the mechanisms that received the strongest, albeit still incomplete, support.

Libraries as Peace Infrastructures: An Evidence-Based Framework

The framework treats the library as a layered information-and-relational infrastructure. Each dimension tackles a specific vulnerability, but none is sufficient on its own. Informational resilience concerns access to credible, contextualised and timely material. Interpretive resilience concerns the capacity to recognise manipulation and examine authority, emotion and identity. Relational resilience concerns the social pathways through which claims are checked and disagreements handled. Institutional resilience pertains to the legitimacy, competence, and safety measures that enable the other functions to withstand challenges.

Table 1: An Evidence-based Framework for Libraries as Peace Infrastructures

Dimension	Central mechanism	Illustrative practices	Proximal outcomes	Safeguards
Informational resilience	Reliable access, verification and context	Curated local sources; multilingual guides; reference and verification clinics; documented uncertainty	Better access, source tracing and claim comparison	Transparent selection; privacy; avoid amplifying harmful content
Interpretive resilience	Understanding authority, manipulation, emotion and identity	Critical information literacy; prebunking; lateral reading; image and quotation tracing	Improved discernment and calibrated confidence	Context-test materials; avoid indiscriminate distrust or partisan framing
Relational resilience	Diverse pathways for checking claims and handling disagreement	Moderated dialogue; cross-group learning; confidential rumour referral; journalist-community partnerships	Broader verification networks, procedural trust and safer uncertainty	Voluntary participation; trained facilitation; protection and referral protocols
Institutional resilience	Capacity and legitimacy that sustain the other functions	Staff development; partnerships; language capacity; safety plans; documentation and evaluation	Consistent response, accountable impartiality and organisational learning	Political independence; role clarity; conflict-of-interest and security review

Source: Authors' synthesis of the reviewed literature (Audunson et al., 2019; Revez & Corujo, 2021; Rohman & Ang, 2019; van Tongeren et al., 2012; Widdersheim & Koizumi, 2016).

Note. Outcomes are proximal and should not be interpreted as proof of reduced violence.

Framework Interpretation

Informational resilience begins with the documentary environment. Libraries can preserve local news, official notices, verified community updates and contextual material that makes isolated claims easier to evaluate. They can maintain multilingual directories of trusted

sources and referral pathways for high-risk questions. Curation should be transparent: users need to know why a source is included, what remains uncertain and when information was updated. A list labelled "trusted sources" without criteria may simply relocate authority from one opaque institution to another.

Interpretive resilience turns instruction from a one-off checklist into a repertoire. Learners can compare claims across sources, trace an image or quotation, identify emotional manipulation, distinguish evidence from assertion and practise pausing before sharing. Prebunking evidence suggests that teaching common techniques such as impersonation, false dilemmas, scapegoating and decontextualization can be more transferable than memorising approved websites (Cook et al., 2017; Roozenbeek et al., 2022). Critical information literacy adds questions of power: whose account is visible, who is treated as authoritative, which languages are excluded and what interests shape circulation (Tewell, 2015). In a conflict setting, these questions must be facilitated carefully so that critical reflection does not become an invitation to indiscriminate distrust.

Relational resilience recognises that information moves through relationships. Libraries can convene small, moderated encounters around shared local problems; host verification clinics with journalists and community organisations; and create channels through which rumours can be checked without publicly stigmatising the person who asks. Public-library research supports the value of interaction and accessible civic space (Appleton & Hall, 2023; Johnson, 2012). Conflict evidence from Ambon suggests that cross-cutting ties and civic identification can help communities resist divisive information (Rohman & Ang, 2019). Still, dialogue is not inherently benign. Participation should be voluntary, facilitators trained, ground rules explicit and referral arrangements available where disclosure creates risk.

Institutional resilience makes these practices credible. It includes staff preparation, language capacity, partnerships, documentation standards, political independence, safety protocols and evaluation. Libraries cannot verify every claim or manage every threat. They need relationships with credible media, researchers, civil-society groups, peace institutions, community leaders and, where appropriate, public agencies. Roles must be explicit so that a library does not become an informal intelligence channel or a vehicle for official messaging. Institutional resilience also depends on learning from failures by monitoring participant engagement, noting who refrains from participation, assessing whether corrections extend beyond workshops, and identifying any groups that perceive the service as biased or unsafe.

The dimensions are mutually dependent. Accurate information without interpretive capacity may be ignored. Critical skills without credible local sources may leave users skeptical yet stranded. Dialogue without reliable evidence may reproduce rumours. Strong programmes without institutional safeguards may collapse when staff change or political pressure rises. Therefore, the framework shifts focus from isolated activities to the overall quality of the system that connects documents, people and organisations.

Discussion of Findings

The review supports a cautious redefinition of library peacebuilding. Much earlier writing treats information provision as the main pathway: if citizens receive accurate and balanced information, conflict should become easier to prevent or resolve (Echezona, 2007; Eze et al., 2016). That claim is normatively attractive but incomplete. People do not receive information outside identity, memory, fear and social pressure. The experimental literature shows that even well-designed interventions have heterogeneous and often modest effects. The public-sphere literature shows that libraries also matter through interaction, civic learning and

institutional presence. Bringing these fields together makes the library's contribution less direct but more plausible: it can strengthen the conditions under which communities verify claims, interpret uncertainty and remain in relationship during disagreement.

This account differs from a library-as-neutral-referee model. Neutrality can protect access and provide room for disagreement, but it can also disguise choices about collections, speakers, language and institutional partners. Buschman (2019) argues that misinformation must be connected to democracy and the political role of libraries, not treated solely as a deficit in individual literacy. Hansson (2017) shows that professional values also depend on documented ethical commitments and forms of self-regulation. In conflict-prone contexts, the answer is neither partisan advocacy nor silence. It is accountable impartiality: transparent standards applied consistently, openness about uncertainty, protection for plural expression and refusal to facilitate incitement or targeted harm.

Trust requires the same caution. The literature often lists trust as an existing library asset, yet trust is unevenly distributed and can be damaged by association with political authority. Vårheim (2014) and Johnson (2012) suggest that trust develops through repeated, helpful interactions rather than institutional branding alone. Sullivan (2019a) sees library trust as a potential resource for responding to social-media misinformation, while Sullivan (2019b) warns that conventional fake-news responses can oversimplify the problem. For peace-infrastructure work, trust should be measured among different groups, not assumed from general reputation surveys. A service trusted only by already advantaged users may exacerbate rather than alleviate informational inequality.

The framework also clarifies how library practice differs from platform interventions. Accuracy prompts, correction labels and inoculation videos operate at the point of exposure or sharing. Libraries can use these techniques, but their comparative advantage may lie in continuity: they can preserve local context, explain uncertainty, provide confidential help, link online and offline information, and maintain relationships after a viral claim has faded. Mehra and Srinivasan (2007) show how community engagement can reposition libraries from passive service points to partners in collective action. That role is valuable only when communities participate in defining problems and evaluating responses.

The implication for Nigeria is not that every library should establish a large anti-disinformation unit. Capacity evidence suggests adopting a phased approach. A public or academic library might begin with staff training, a multilingual source and referral map, a small verification clinic, and one partnership with a credible local organisation. Services can then expand as legitimacy and competence grow. The Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution and university peace centres could support conflict-sensitivity training and evaluation, while libraries contribute documentary expertise and public access. Such partnerships should preserve professional independence and avoid turning libraries into publicity channels.

The framework's principal theoretical contribution is to connect documentary and relational work. Library research sometimes separates information provision from community engagement; misinformation research often separates cognition from institutions; peacebuilding research can overlook documentary systems. The four dimensions show that these are parts of one infrastructure. A correction becomes more credible when embedded in trusted relationships. Dialogue becomes safer when participants can consult well-described evidence. Institutional legitimacy grows when curation and facilitation are transparent. This is the paper's synthesis rather than a finding attributable to any single study.

Implications for Policy, Practice and Research

Policy should recognise information resilience as a legitimate library function while avoiding unfunded mandates. National and state library policies can include conflict-sensitive information literacy, multilingual access, preservation of local public information and referral partnerships. Funding should cover staff development, connectivity, secure recordkeeping and evaluation, not only public-facing events. Professional associations can develop protocols for handling dangerous rumours, doxxing, requests involving imminent harm and political pressure. The distinction among misinformation, disinformation and malinformation should guide responses because education, correction and protection are not interchangeable.

Practice should begin with context mapping. Before designing a programme, a library needs to know which information channels different groups use, which languages carry public discussion, which institutions are trusted, what rumours have caused harm and who may face risk by participating. Programmes can then combine brief skills activities with local examples, a factual alternative and opportunities for guided practice. Corrections should avoid humiliating users or repeating inflammatory content more than necessary. Where direct public correction would heighten danger, a confidential reference service or referral may be safer.

Evaluation should go beyond merely measuring attendance and satisfaction. Proximal measures can assess source tracing, claim comparison, confidence calibrated to accuracy, willingness to pause before sharing, knowledge of referral channels and exposure to diverse sources. Relational measures can examine whether participants develop cross-group contacts, perceive procedures as fair and feel safe expressing uncertainty. Institutional measures can assess staff competence, response time, language coverage, partnership quality and incidents of political interference. Longer-term research may explore whether these changes persist and whether communities become less susceptible to escalatory narratives. Claims about reduced violence would require careful longitudinal or comparative designs and should not be inferred from improved quiz scores.

Future research should prioritise conflict-affected and multilingual settings. Comparative case studies could examine how public, academic and special libraries build legitimacy under different governance conditions. Participatory studies should involve librarians, journalists, peace practitioners, youth, women's groups, displaced people and minority-language communities in defining both harm and success. Where feasible, quasi-experimental or stepped implementation designs could compare alternative instructional approaches without withholding essential services. Qualitative follow-up is equally important because a statistically improved discernment score may coexist with fear, stigma or declining institutional trust.

Research reporting should describe interventions well enough to be reproduced: duration, facilitator, language, materials, recruitment, safeguarding, political context and assessment instrument. It should also report null effects and unintended consequences. Ali and Qazi (2023) demonstrate why this matters: an intervention can improve recognition of false content while producing trade-offs in judgments of true information. Therefore, evidence should underpin calibrated trust rather than blanket scepticism.

Limitations

This review has four limitations. First, it is integrative rather than systematic. Search and appraisal procedures are reported transparently, but the review cannot claim exhaustive coverage. Second, the evidence is heterogeneous. Experimental effects, professional

perceptions and conceptual arguments answer different questions and were not treated as interchangeable. Third, English-language and readily accessible publications were more visible, which may underrepresent locally published African and non-English work. Fourth, the framework is derived from literature rather than validated through fieldwork. Its four dimensions should therefore be tested and adapted through participatory validation involving librarians, peacebuilding practitioners and members of conflict-affected communities. Initial testing could combine expert review and stakeholder workshops with pilot implementation in selected libraries, followed by surveys, interviews and focus groups to assess the framework's relevance, clarity, feasibility, perceived safety and contextual suitability. Findings from this process could then be used to refine the dimensions, indicators and safeguards before the framework is applied more broadly as an assessment standard.

Conclusion

Libraries have credible but conditional potential to strengthen responses to conflict-related information disorder. The strongest evidence does not support a simple claim that access to accurate information produces peace. It supports a more demanding proposition: communities are better placed to resist harmful information when they can reach credible sources, understand manipulation, check claims through diverse relationships and rely on institutions with transparent rules and adequate safeguards.

The proposed framework brings these requirements together as informational, interpretive, relational and institutional resilience. It also places limits around the argument. Libraries are not automatically neutral, uniformly trusted or equipped to manage conflict. Their contribution depends on local legitimacy, staff capacity, language inclusion, political independence, physical and digital safety, and partnerships that preserve professional boundaries.

For Nigeria and similar contexts, a modest yet impactful initial step involves training staff, mapping local information landscapes, curating transparent multilingual resources, establishing safe verification and referral services, and assessing how these interventions affect different groups. For Nigeria and similar contexts, a modest yet impactful initial step involves training staff, mapping local information landscapes, curating transparent multilingual resources, establishing safe verification and referral services, and assessing how these interventions affect different groups.

References

Ali, A., & Qazi, I. A. (2023). Countering misinformation on social media through educational interventions: Evidence from a randomized experiment in Pakistan. *Journal of Development Economics, 163*, Article 103108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2023.103108

Appleton, L., & Hall, H. (2023). The public library as public sphere: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Documentation, 79*(1), 112–126. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2022-0031

Audunson, R., Aabø, S., Blomgren, R., Evjen, S., Jochumsen, H., Larsen, H., Rasmussen, C. H., Vårheim, A., Johnston, J., & Koizumi, M. (2019). Public libraries as an infrastructure for a sustainable public sphere: A comprehensive review of research. *Journal of Documentation, 75*(4), 773–790. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-10-2018-0157

Ayoung, D. A., Baada, F. N.-A., & Bugre, C. (2023). Curbing fake news: A qualitative study of the readiness of academic librarians in Ghana. *The International Information & Library Review, 55*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2022.2046438

Batchelor, O. (2017). Getting out the truth: The role of libraries in the fight against fake news. *Reference Services Review, 45*(2), 143–148. https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-03-2017-0006

Bode, L., & Vraga, E. K. (2018). See something, say something: Correction of global health misinformation on social media. *Health Communication, 33*(9), 1131–1140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2017.1331312

Buschman, J. (2019). Good news, bad news, and fake news: Going beyond political literacy to democracy and libraries. *Journal of Documentation, 75*(1), 213–228. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-05-2018-0074

Chan, M.-P. S., Jones, C. R., Hall Jamieson, K., & Albarracín, D. (2017). Debunking: A meta-analysis of the psychological efficacy of messages countering misinformation. *Psychological Science, 28*(11), 1531–1546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617714579

Cook, J., Lewandowsky, S., & Ecker, U. K. H. (2017). Neutralizing misinformation through inoculation: Exposing misleading argumentation techniques reduces their influence. *PLOS ONE, 12*(5), e0175799. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175799

De Paor, S., & Heravi, B. (2020). Information literacy and fake news: How the field of librarianship can help combat the epidemic of fake news. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 46*(5), Article 102218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102218

Echezona, R. I. (2007). The role of libraries in information dissemination for conflict resolution, peace promotion and reconciliation. *African Journal of Library, Archives and Information Science, 17*(2), 143–151.

Eze, J. U., Ibegbulam, I. J., & Umunnakwe, G. (2016). The use of information, awareness and communication in conflict resolution: Role of libraries in South-East Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science, 8*(4), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.5897/IJLIS2015.0579

Faix, A., & Fyn, A. (2020). Framing fake news: Misinformation and the ACRL Framework. *portal: Libraries and the Academy, 20*(3), 495–508. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2020.0027

Guess, A. M., Lerner, M., Lyons, B., Montgomery, J. M., Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., & Sircar, N. (2020). A digital media literacy intervention increases discernment between mainstream and false news in the United States and India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(27), 15536–15545. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1920498117

Hansson, J. (2017). Professional value and ethical self-regulation in the development of modern librarianship: The documentality of library ethics. *Journal of Documentation, 73*(6), 1261–1280. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2017-0022

Johnson, C. A. (2012). How do public libraries create social capital? An analysis of interactions between library staff and patrons. *Library & Information Science Research, 34*(1), 52–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2011.07.009

Jones-Jang, S. M., Mortensen, T., & Liu, J. (2021). Does media literacy help identification of fake news? Information literacy helps, but other literacies don't. *American Behavioral Scientist, 65*(2), 371–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764219869406

Larsen, H. (2018). Archives, libraries and museums in the Nordic model of the public sphere. *Journal of Documentation, 74*(1), 187–194. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-12-2016-0148

Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Ecker, U. K. H., Albarracín, D., Amazeen, M. A., Kendeou, P., Lombardi, D., Newman, E. J., Pennycook, G., Porter, E., Rand, D. G., Rapp, D. N., Reifler, J., Roozenbeek, J., Schmid, P., Seifert, C. M., Sinatra, G. M., Swire-Thompson, B., van der Linden, S., … Zaragoza, M. S. (2020). *The debunking handbook 2020*. Databrary. https://doi.org/10.17910/b7.1182

Machete, P., & Turpin, M. (2020). The use of critical thinking to identify fake news: A systematic literature review. In M. Hattingh, M. Matthee, H. Smuts, I. Pappas, Y. K. Dwivedi, & M. Mäntymäki (Eds.), *Responsible design, implementation and use of information and communication technology* (pp. 235–246). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45002-1_20

Mehra, B., & Srinivasan, R. (2007). The library-community convergence framework for community action: Libraries as catalysts of social change. *Libri, 57*(3), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1515/LIBR.2007.123

Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2022). Accuracy prompts are a replicable and generalizable approach for reducing the spread of misinformation. *Nature Communications, 13*, Article 2333. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30073-5

Revez, J., & Corujo, L. (2021). Librarians against fake news: A systematic literature review of library practices (January 2018–September 2020). *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 47*(2), Article 102304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102304

Rohman, A., & Ang, P.-H. (2019). Truth, not fear: Countering false information in a conflict. *International Journal of Communication, 13*, 4586–4601. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/10912

Roozenbeek, J., & van der Linden, S. (2019). Fake news game confers psychological resistance against online misinformation. *Palgrave Communications, 5*, Article 65. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0279-9

Roozenbeek, J., van der Linden, S., Goldberg, B., Rathje, S., & Lewandowsky, S. (2022). Psychological inoculation improves resilience against misinformation on social media. *Science Advances, 8*(34), eabo6254. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abo6254

Saunders, L. (2022). Faculty perspectives on mis- and disinformation across disciplines. *College & Research Libraries, 83*(2), 221–245. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.83.2.221

Saunders, L. (2023). Librarian perspectives on misinformation: A follow-up and comparative study. *College & Research Libraries, 84*(4), 478–494. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.84.4.478

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Sullivan, M. C. (2019a). Leveraging library trust to combat misinformation on social media. *Library & Information Science Research, 41*(1), 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2019.02.004

Sullivan, M. C. (2019b). Libraries and fake news: What's the problem? What's the plan? *Communications in Information Literacy, 13*(1), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2019.13.1.7

Tandoc, E. C., Jr., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2018). Defining "fake news": A typology of scholarly definitions. *Digital Journalism, 6*(2), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143

Tewell, E. (2015). A decade of critical information literacy: A review of the literature. *Communications in Information Literacy, 9*(1), 24–43. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2015.9.1.174

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing integrative literature reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606

Ulbricht, B., & Rizk, J. (2024). How harmful information on social media impacts people affected by armed conflict: A typology of harms. *International Review of the Red Cross, 106*(926), 823–862. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383124000572

van der Linden, S., Leiserowitz, A., Rosenthal, S., & Maibach, E. (2017). Inoculating the public against misinformation about climate change. *Global Challenges, 1*(2), Article 1600008. https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201600008

van Tongeren, P., Ojielo, M. O., Brand-Jacobsen, K., McCandless, E., & Tschirgi, N. (2012). The evolving landscape of infrastructures for peace. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development, 7*(3), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2013.774793

Vårheim, A. (2014). Trust in libraries and trust in most people: Social capital creation in the public library. *The Library Quarterly, 84*(3), 258–277. https://doi.org/10.1086/676487

Vraga, E. K., Bode, L., & Tully, M. (2022). Creating news literacy messages to enhance expert corrections of misinformation on Twitter. *Communication Research, 49*(2), 245–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650219898094

Walter, N., Cohen, J., Holbert, R. L., & Morag, Y. (2020). Fact-checking: A meta-analysis of what works and for whom. *Political Communication, 37*(3), 350–375. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2019.1668894

Walter, N., & Murphy, S. T. (2018). How to unring the bell: A meta-analytic approach to correction of misinformation. *Communication Monographs, 85*(3), 423–441. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2018.1467564

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making*. Council of Europe. https://rm.coe.int/information-disorder-report/1680764666

Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52*(5), 546–553. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x

Widdersheim, M. M., & Koizumi, M. (2016). Conceptual modelling of the public sphere in public libraries. *Journal of Documentation, 72*(3), 591–610. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-06-2015-0079