

# Justice on Screen: The Provision of Resolution to Public Disputes and its Alignment with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16

John Andrey G. Baylon, Regine Santos Balmaceda

Camarines Norte State College, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90900074>

Received: 21 August 2025; Accepted: 26 August 2025; Published: 29 September 2025

## ABSTRACT

The avenue of justice in the form of a media-driven dispute resolution program has grown in popularity. Previous studies have explored the influence of media on public perception; however, few studies have critically investigated how these programs deliver resolutions that align with international principles for accountability, inclusivity, and justice. This study aimed to examine how the media-driven dispute resolution programs, specifically the “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” program, provide resolutions to public disputes and assess whether these resolutions align with selected principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16—Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. The study utilized a qualitative approach, particularly discourse analysis. Thematic analysis was used to analyze ten episodes that were examined and selected based on the criteria. The Dual Concern Model by Pruitt and Rubin (2004) was utilized to analyze the conflict management styles, such as forcing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, and integrating styles. Strong adherence to ethical considerations and integration of the criteria of trustworthiness by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were strictly followed. The analysis revealed that the “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” program predominantly employed an accommodating, compromising, and integrating style in addressing and managing disputes. However, instances of forcing style or lack of consideration were also observed. The study found that “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” provided resolution between the disputing parties, both conforming and violating the selected SDG 16 principles. The findings suggest that with the provision of a resolution to public disputes, the program must strengthen ethical standards and consistently align with the principles of SDG 16. This study emphasizes the dual role of media as both a tool for empowerment and a potential threat to sustainable, human rights-based justice.

**Keywords—** Conflict Management Styles, Dual Concern Model, Media-Driven Dispute Resolution, Public Dispute, Sustainable Development Goal 16

## INTRODUCTION

Justice has extended its avenue from formal and traditional procedures to the emergence of an informal and alternative space for disputes to be addressed through media-driven dispute resolution programs. Globally, similar programs such as Judge Judy, Hot Bench, Divorce Court, and The People’s Court have drawn millions of viewers (Ranker, 2024).

However, scholars raise concerns about these programs. Critics argue that such programs risk prioritizing entertainment over justice. Gauri and Brinks (2008) warned that informal justice neglects accountability and due process.

In the local setting, “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” has gained massive public engagement. With over 28.5 million subscribers and billions of views (Social Blade, 2024). While it appeals to public emotions and highlights social issues, it often uses public humiliation rather than legal processes to resolve disputes. Redulla, et al. (2022) note that parties often turn to the program due to a lack of access to formal justice but suffer from media exposure and short-term solutions. The program’s popularity reflects deeper problems in the Philippine justice system (Valenzuela, 2016). Issues like slow processes, financial burdens, and public distrust have driven people to seek help from the media instead of the courts (Philippine Ombudsman, 2013). Golub (2010) emphasized the need for legal empowerment to make the justice system more accessible and effective.

Still, media programs can blur truth and legality. Kitzinger (2000) warned that they often cater to public sentiment rather than legal facts. “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” may pressure accused parties into public trials, ignoring due process.

This study examined how “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” resolves disputes and whether it aligns with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, which emphasizes access to justice, human rights, and the rule of law. As media-driven dispute resolution increasingly shapes public perceptions, it becomes crucial to assess the implications of such programs. While media can empower, it also poses risks, creating distrust in legal institutions if misused (Boothe-Perry, 2014).

By analyzing the discourse in the program, this study reveals how disputes are addressed and managed, the power dynamics involved, and whether the approach upholds human rights standards outlined in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16.

## METHODOLOGY

The study used a qualitative approach, specifically discourse analysis, to examine how language is used to manage disputes in the “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” program. The main data in the study was sourced from Pedro Tanggol on Justice’s official YouTube channel. Ten episodes were selected based on the set criteria, such as the highest view counts, published between August 1, 2024, and October 1, 2024, featured different types of public disputes and resolutions, and good video quality.

The data were gathered from the Pedro Tanggol on Justice’s official YouTube channel. Chosen episodes were transcribed to provide an in-depth analysis of the discourses and communication. Pseudonyms were strictly observed to protect the privacy of the involved individuals in each selected episode.

Thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns in qualitative data. Additionally, a mixture of inductive and deductive coding approaches was also applied in the analysis, using pre-developed codes based on existing theories (Bingham & Witkowsky, 2022), to identify the conflict management styles utilized in the episodes.

The study followed Judd, et al. (1991) to ensure ethical research practices and principles were observed. The five trustworthiness principles from Lincoln and Guba (1985) were integrated into the study. Credibility was ensured through a clear alignment of the study’s framework, objectives, and methodology. Additionally, triangulation with expert input. Dependability was maintained through consistent methods, use of QDA Miner Lite, and the provision of an audit trail. Confirmability was achieved by grounding findings in data, using actual verbatim, and corroboration. Transferability was supported by providing detailed descriptions of each selected episode. Reflexivity was practiced through reflective journaling to manage biases and assumptions during the research.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings and discusses their relevance to the research goals and existing literature. Results are grouped by key themes identified from the data, followed by detailed analysis.

Table I Subjects’ Demographics

Episode Number	Topic/Case Featured	Subject(Pseu-donym)	Position	Gender
1	Finan-cial Conflict	Marie	Complainant	Female
		John	Accused	Male
		Ben	Attorney/Communicator	Male
		Rona	Assistant/Communicator	Female

2	Cheating Issue	Boy Nicole & Alex Ben Rona	Complainant Accused  Attorney/Communicator Assistant/Communicator	Male Female & Male Male Female
3	Family Dispute	Lena & Jerome Noli Pedro	Complainant  Accused Communicator	Female & Male Male Male
4	Relation-ship Issue	Lukas Maya Pedro	Complainant Accused Communicator	Male Female Male
5	Cheating Issue	Brent Lovely Pedro	Complainant Accused Communicator	Male Female Male
6	Family Dispute	Jay-ar Sarina Pedro	Complainant Accused Communicator	Male Female Male
7	Family Dispute	Mia Edward Pedro	Complainant Accused Communicator	Female Male Male
8	Family Dispute	Ruel & Kris-tine Rey & Cyn-thia Pedro	Complainant Accused Communicator	Male & Female Male & Female Male
9	Relation-ship Issue	Leo Mona Ben Rona	Complainant Accused Attorney/Communicator Assistant/Communicator	Male Female Male Female
10	Group Conflict	Bia, Ryan, et al. Fred Pedro Rona	Complainant Accused Communicator Assistant/Communicator	Female & Male Male Male Female

Table I summarizes the demographics of program staff and participants featured in the selected episodes. All involved individuals were assigned pseudonyms to protect their identities.

Resolution Provided by Pedro Tanggol on Justice Between Parties Involved and Its Alignment to the Selected Principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 – Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

The thematic analysis identified one key theme: (1) Procedural Settlement of the Dispute Between Parties Involved. The theme is further broken down into one subtheme (a) Negotiating and Mediating Dynamics, which highlights recurring patterns observed during the coding process.

Additionally, the result of the analysis of the Resolution Provided by Pedro Tanggol on Justice Between Parties Involved were then assessed whether it conforms to or violates to the Selected Principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 – Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, along with 16.2 End Abuse, exploitation, trafficking, and all forms of violence against and torture of children; 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all; 16.6 Develop effective, accountable, and transparent institutions at all levels; 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making at all levels; 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements; 16.B Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.

Table II Theme 1 – Procedural Settlement Of The Dispute Between Parties Involved

Sub-theme	Code	Conflict Management Style	Case	SDG 16 Conformed	SDG 16 Violated
Nego-tiating and Media-ting Dynamics	Finding a Co-mmon Ground	Com-promising Style <sup>c</sup>	4	16.3; 16.6; 16.7 <sup>c</sup>	
	Sho-wing Acco-mmoda-tion	Acco-mmodatinnng Style <sup>a</sup>	8	16.2; 16.3; 16.6; 16.7; 16.10; 16.B <sup>a</sup>	
	Sho-wing Collab-oration	Problem-solving/ Integrating Style <sup>d</sup>	3	16.2; 16.6; 16.7; 16.B <sup>b</sup>	
	Lack of Con-side-ration	Forcing Style <sup>b</sup>	6		16.2; 16.3; 16.6; 16.7; 16.10; 16.B <sup>a</sup>

Table II presents the identified key theme and recurring patterns during the coding process, as well as the

alignment with the SDG 16 principles, whether it conforms to or violates them. Hence, the following sections provide detailed discussions.

### **Theme: Procedural Settlement of the Dispute Between the Parties Involved**

From the study's analysis, anchored with how Pedro Tanggol provides resolution with the parties involved and assesses whether it conforms to or violates SDG principles, one key theme has emerged: Procedural Settlement of the Dispute Between the Parties Involved. It is a process or procedure wherein the disputed parties' issues or misunderstandings are facilitated through open discussion and transparent dialogue by the communicator to reach an agreement between the disputed parties (needs and interests) and/or propose a potential resolution from the communicator.

Moreover, the resolution provided by "Pedro Tanggol on Justice" between the parties involved is assessed whether it conforms to or violates the principles of justice for all as outlined in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, along with: 16.2 End Abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children; 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all; 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels; 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels; 16.10 Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, under national legislation and international agreements; and 16.B Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development. From the identified theme, a recurring pattern or subtheme emerged: (a) Negotiating and Mediating Dynamics.

### **Negotiating and Mediating Dynamics**

From the key theme, a recurring pattern was identified: Negotiating and Mediating Dynamics. This refers to facilitating dialogue and exchanging perspectives to address and manage the dispute. The communicator seeks to understand the concerns and needs of the disputed parties, address and manage the issue by employing conflict management styles and propose a possible resolution. The provided resolution was assessed to determine whether it conforms to or violates any of the six (6) selected principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16.

## **FINDING A COMMON GROUND**

In finding a common ground, the communicator facilitates discussion and seeks to understand the concerns and interests of the disputing parties. The communicator tries to accept and balance both concerns and formulate a solution where both parties' needs and interests are considered. This approach is not commonly employed in the selected cases.

In the first case, Ben expressed his opinion and proposed,

*Let me propose to you a midway ground solution muna 'no before, sabi ko nga lagi drastic action kung pwede iwasan, 'wag nating gawin. So, ito offer ko sayo sir, schedule of payments. 1 million in two receivable dates. (Let me suggest a middle-ground solution first. As I always say, if we can avoid drastic action, then let's not do it. So here's what I'm offering you, sir — a payment schedule: 1 million in two installments. Ep.1, 30m:06s, p.15)*

The phrase "midway ground solution" by Ben is a direct reflection of the compromising style wherein both parties' interests and needs were mutually discussed and equally considered. Ben tries to seek alternative measures and suggests a plan, ensuring that both sides benefit while making reasonable adjustments.

Furthermore, Ben and Rona guide the discussion by listening to both sides and offering options. Ben says, "If ever the negotiations do fall through, if she's still willing sir, I mean sabi mo naman may depensa ka, we will allow you to present your defense." (If the negotiations don't work out and she's still willing, sir — since you said you have a defense — we'll let you present it). showing fairness and readiness to pursue legal steps if needed. His statement, "We will try to exercise every opportunity that we can get para makuha niyo po yung buong amount." (We will try to use every opportunity we can to help you recover the full amount. Ep.1, 30m:06s,

p.17-19). Highlights his willingness to prioritize compromise but still ensure justice, aligning with SDG 16.3 on promoting the rule of law and equal access to justice. Rona also supports a fair resolution by involving key stakeholders,

*Madam, ganito na lang po bibigyan po namin kayo ng chance na makapag-usap po ni sir John. Ah sasamahan na lang din po siguro tayo ng reporter po ni senator Pedro para magkaroon po kayo ng agreement, makapag-usap po kayo, and of course um kakausapin din po natin si attorney Garry patungkol po dito, (Ma'am, here's what we'll do — we'll give you a chance to talk with Sir John. The reporter from Senator Pedro's office will probably join us so you can come to an agreement and have a proper conversation. And of course, we'll also talk to Attorney Garry about this matter Ep.1, 30m:06s, p.17-19).*

reflecting SDG 16.7, which promotes inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making. In the second case, Pedro expressed his opinion about the issue and said, *Bakit natin siya pilitin pag gawin ng isang bagay na ayaw niya? Baka yun pang ikakasakit niya kasi pinipilit natin. Who knows baka ayaw niya mag-exercise o maglakad-lakad dahil masama pakiramdam niya, meron siyang nararamdaman tapos pilitin mo maglakad-lakad baka may mangyaring disgrasya, sa palagay niyo sir? (Why should we force her to do something she doesn't want to? It might even make her feel worse because we're pressuring her. Who knows — maybe she doesn't want to exercise or take a walk because she's not feeling well, maybe she's in pain. Then if you force her to walk, something bad might happen. What do you think, sir? Ep.3, 20m:22s, p.40)*

Pedro considers the other party's well-being and avoids imposing strict actions that could lead to harmful consequences, promoting mutual understanding and respecting the personal autonomy of the parties involved. Pedro makes sure that the other party has representation through him. This aligns with the principles of SDG 16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making. One of the key aspects of this principle is the representation of marginalized groups, which includes women, minorities, and disadvantaged communities that should be represented.

In case three, Pedro expresses a cautionary statement that aligns with a compromising tone by offering a solution or awareness rather than assigning full blame to the parties involved.

Pedro speaks on behalf of women, warning against the risks of sharing nude pictures: *"Sa mga kababaihan na nanonood, wag na wag Kayongo magpapadala ng mga nude pictures kaninoman dahil pwede gamitin sa inyo yan later on."* (To all the women watching, never ever send nude pictures to anyone because they could use those against you later on). He raises awareness about digital privacy and the consequences of careless actions, aligning with SDG 16.7 by representing women in inclusive decision-making and SDG 16.10 by promoting digital privacy. His statement, *"All these pictures, all the accounts that you posted using her name, using her account to post all these pictures, I would like you to delete it Sir because the table can turn against you,"* (Sir, I want you to delete all the pictures and all the accounts you created using her name or her account to post those pictures, because this could turn against you Ep.5, 19m:52s, p.74&79). urges the other party to act responsible. Both suggestions show a compromise, avoiding escalation and being accountable, reflecting the SDG 16.6 on accountability and transparent resolution.

### Showing Accommodation

In showing accommodation, the communicator opens an opportunity to call for a dialogue between the disputed parties. Addressing the issue and managing the dispute. The communicator shows the accommodating style by prioritizing the needs and interests of the parties involved in pursuit of considering a need for harmony and sensitivity for them. Furthermore, the alignment of resolution provided by "Pedro Tanggol on Justice" between the parties involved to the selected principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 is assessed to determine whether it conforms or violates.

In the first case, Pedro accommodated the interests of the involved parties and stated,

*Darating po kami diyan sa inyong tanggapan at mag-usap-usap yung magkakapatid at pag-usapan itong ginagawang pang aapi kay nanay. Itong sama ng loob ni nanay. Kung ano po yung magiging desisyon ni nanay*

*yun po ang susundin natin.* (We will come to your office so the siblings can talk and discuss what's being done to mistreat our mother — the hurt she's feeling. Whatever decision she makes, that's what we will follow. Ep.3, 20m:22s, p.51)

Pedro focuses on Lena's emotional well-being by encouraging open dialogue between parties and relevant stakeholders. His approach supports SDG 16 principles. First, it aligns with SDG 16.B by promoting fair, non-discriminatory decisions and addressing concerns of age-based oppression, as seen in his remark about the mother being mistreated. Second, it reflects SDG 16.7 by ensuring vulnerable voices, like the elderly, are heard. Lastly, it supports SDG 16.6 by holding parties accountable and involving local government in resolving the dispute.

In the second case, Pedro takes a facilitating role wherein the involved parties have a safe space for dialogue and reconciliation. Pedro focuses on planning out the proposed resolution between the disputed parties with relevant stakeholders to discuss and address the issue. This reflects a commitment to collaborate and understand the dispute between the parties involved, rather than impose confrontation. Furthermore, Pedro accommodates the involved parties' needs, "*We're going to accompany you to Bataan to see her and then we're going to settle your problem, uh with the barangay?*" (We're going to go with you to Bataan to see her, and then we'll settle your issue with the barangay Ep. 5, 19m:52s, p.78) aligning with the principle of SDG 16.7, ensuring responsive, inclusive, and representative decision-making between parties involved, wherein both parties encourages to have a civic participation in decision-making and empowers the local officials to take charge of mediating the disputed parties and considers their needs and interests to reach mutual agreement.

In the third case, Pedro ensures that the involved parties' well-being, needs, and interests are accommodated. Pedro emphasizes child protection by saying, "*Huwag mo pakita yung bata sa camera.*" (Don't show the child on camera) prioritizing the child's privacy and aligning with SDG 16.10 on protecting fundamental freedoms. He also takes an inclusive approach by involving professionals, "*Kukuha ako ng marriage counselor, kasama yung barangay, social worker.*" (I will get a marriage counselor, along with the barangay and a social worker). showing concern for all parties, especially the child. By agreeing to follow expert recommendations, "*kung anong resulta, rekomendasyon nung ah marriage counselor, rekomendasyon ng DSWD, social worker ng barangay ninyo yun ang susundin ko.*" (Whatever the result or recommendation of the marriage counselor, the DSWD, and your barangay's social worker — that's what I will follow Ep.6, 21m:47s, p.96). He avoids personal bias and ensures a fair resolution. This supports SDG 16.2, which calls for ending abuse and promoting proper care for children.

In the fourth case, Ben and Rona balanced the legal support with accommodation, ensuring that both parties had the opportunity to communicate and address the conflict. Ben offers an opportunity for the parties involved to have the guidance of the professionals in discussing the issue and to further express their interests and needs, "*Para mailahad po natin do'n kung ano po yung mga gusto niyong mangyari.*" (So that you can express what you want to happen Ep.9. 27m:49s, p.140). Further, Rona expresses her stand,

*Susuportahan po namin si Sir dahil of course magaganda naman po mga ebidensya niya. Isinama na po natin si Sir JM at aminado din po kayo; at kung desidido po si Sir Leo na sampahan kayo Ma'am and Sir JM, tutulungan po namin siya* (We will support Sir because, of course, his evidence is solid. We've already involved Sir JM, and you also admitted it. And if Sir Leo is determined to file a case against you, Ma'am, and Sir JM, we will help him. Ep.9. 27m:49s, p.140)

Rona fosters a transparent and accountable remarks about the issue, aligning with the principle of SDG 16.6 – Develop effective, accountable, and transparent institutions at all levels, which implements mechanism to hold individuals accountable for their misbehavior.

### Showing Collaboration

In showing collaboration, the communicator employs the problem-solving or integrating style, which showcases the communicator's effective use of the situation to reach an agreement where both parties' needs, ideas, and interests are considered and valued to formulate better solutions. However, this approach is the least employed

by the program in the selected episodes. Thus, the alignment of resolution provided by “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” between parties involved to the selected principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 is assessed to determine whether it conforms or violates.

In the second case, Pedro’s statement, “*hindi niyo sila palalayasin at wala kayong ipapirma kung anong mga dokumento na ayaw naman nilang pirmahan*” (You won’t force them to leave, and you won’t make them sign any documents they don’t want to sign). promotes fairness and voluntary agreement, protecting individual rights in conflict resolution. This conforms to the principle of SDG 16.7, which supports inclusive and responsive decision-making. He also encourages collaboration through, “*Sir, makipag-coordinate kayo sa mga taga-barangay social worker at paki-monitor po itong pamilya ni Ma’am Mia kung anumang ayuda ang pwedeng maibigay o tulong.*” (Sir, please coordinate with the barangay social workers and monitor Ma’am Mia’s family for any assistance or support that can be given), “*Especialy, para safety ng mga bata.*” (Especially for the safety of the children Ep.7, 18m:03s, p.107-108). showing an effort to involve proper authorities and social workers. This approach prioritizes the safety and welfare of vulnerable individuals, especially children, and aligns with SDG 16.2, which aims to end abuse, exploitation, and violence against children.

### Expressing Lack of Consideration

In expressing a lack of consideration, the communicator facilitates an open discussion between the disputing parties, addressing and managing their conflict. In these cases, the communicator employs an authoritative, aggressive, and confrontational approach, imposing a solution with a lack of consideration for the interests and needs of the involved parties to achieve their own goal. The resolutions provided by “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” are evaluated to determine whether they align with or violate the selected principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16.

In the first case, Pedro uses an aggressive and dominant tone in handling disputes. His statement, “*Ang nagsasabi ng illegal gambling pulis para mangutong.*” (The ones calling it illegal gambling are the police, just so they can extort money) showcases distrust toward law enforcement and generalizes their integrity. He uses threats like, “*Sir kung sa loob ng bahay at sila’y nagto-tong-its at nagfo-forty-one at ang pustahan lamang ay piso-piso, sabihin mo sa akin yung pulis na manghuhuli sa kanya babak-bakan ko dito.*” (Sir, if they’re just playing tong-its and forty-one inside the house and only betting one peso each, tell me which police officer would arrest them — I’ll take them on right here). Implying some forms of illegal gambling are tolerable. Phrases like “*Patanggal ko pa*” (I’ll even have them removed) and “*Sipain ko pa yung pulis na yon,*” (I’ll even kick that police officer) show threats and physical intimidation, undermining institutional trust and violating SDG 16.6, which promotes accountable and transparent institutions. Furthermore, his harsh language, such as “*Mahiya-hiya naman kayo sa balat niyo, especially kung kayo may mga pamilyadong tao na ‘di ba?’*” (You should be ashamed of yourselves — especially if you have families, right?) and “*Mga anak na balasubas,*” (Disrespectful children Ep.3, 20m:22s, p.41,45,46, &47) reveals a judgmental attitude, disregarding the other party’s dignity. These reflect power imbalance, selective law enforcement, and discrimination, violating SDG 16.B’s call for fair and inclusive resolution processes.

In the second case, Pedro tried to address the evidence from Lukas and said,

Ma’am, tingnan nyo po ha may conversation sa chat si Res aka Tony o Tony aka Res kay Mister nyo. Ito po yun oh, “muntik na akong mapikot ng babaeng yan, sabi po ni Tony. Tapos sabi, Huh? Sabi niya pinsan nya daw naghahatid sa kanya, so sinasabi niyo pinsan niyo itong si mister. Dati pa akong nagdududa, kase never nya ako pinakilala sa kahit sino, Ayun po. Na-gets nyo po, ma’am? di ko alam na may asawa’t anak pala yan. Ma’am, maliwanag sa chat na kayo po’y nagsisinungaling kay Tony. (Ma’am, please take a look — there’s a chat conversation between Res, also known as Tony, and your husband. Here it is: ‘That woman almost trapped me into marriage,’ Tony said. Then your husband replied, ‘Huh? She said it was her cousin who was driving her.’ So you told him your husband was just your cousin. ‘I’ve had doubts for a while, because she never introduced me to anyone.’ There it is. Do you get it now, Ma’am? ‘I didn’t know she had a husband and child.’ Ma’am, it’s clear from the chat that you were lying to Tony. (Ep.4, 23m:34s, p.64)

Pedro discloses the evidence from Lukas without Maya’s consent on-air. Hence, this violates the right to privacy



of Maya in the dispute and does not conform to SDG 16.10 principle, which is to protect the fundamental freedom of the involved party.

In the same case, Pedro asserted his belief and proposed a resolution to the involved party. Pedro shows dominance by imposing decisions without considering the other party's views. Statements like "*Hindi karapat-dapat na ikaw ay magiging nanay nitong bata*" (You don't deserve to be the mother of this child) and "*Tama lang na dito kay mister muna ang baby. Hindi ka nagbabago*" (It's only right that the baby stays with the father for now. You haven't changed) appear judgmental and may undermine a mother's parental rights. He dismisses the mother's side and suggests resolutions without legal consultation, relying on personal judgment. This violates the principles of SDG 16.6 and SDG 16.B, which seek to promote fairness and non-discrimination. Moreover, his statement, "*Hinaan ko lang boses. Gusto mo alam mo bang address tapos pahuli natin silang dalawa.*" (I'll just lower my voice. Do you want to know the address so we can have the two of them arrested? Ep.4, 23m:34s, p.83&84) Implies a secretive and informal law enforcement approach, violating SDG 16.3's call for due process and equal justice for all.

In the third case, Pedro addressed the proposed resolution to the parties involved in an authoritarian and aggressive approach. Pedro reiterates his resolution to the involved party in a dominating conversation, considering mostly the complainant's needs and interests rather than both parties. "*Tatrabahuhin po namin kayo dalawa kayong magkasama lalo pa kung kayo po'y nasa kama makukulong ka sir*" (We'll go after both of you, especially if you're caught together in bed — you'll go to jail, sir) and, "*Hoy! Sino bang pinagmamalaki mong NBI?! Dalahin mo sa harap ko tadyakan ko kung yun ang pinagmamalaki mo at kinukonsinti ka, walang biro,*" (Hey! Who are you bragging about from the NBI? Bring that person in front of me and I'll kick them if they're the one covering for you — I'm not joking Ep.6, 21m:47s, p.89&90) both statements reflect the use of threats, legal and physical, which assert dominance and control over the conversation. This highlights the violation to the principles of SDG 16.3 and SDG 16.6 wherein Pedro must adhere to developing an effective, accountable, and transparent institution.

In the fourth case, Pedro considered the interests and needs of the involved parties, proposing a solution. Pedro focuses on the complainant's concerns while imposing judgment on the accused, saying, "*Sir, magpa-rehabilitate ka siguro muna Sir.*" (Sir, maybe you should go into rehab first.) "*Kaya lang nalulong ka ata sa droga. Ito na ngayon ang nagresulta.*" (It seems you got hooked on drugs — and this is the result now) and "*Ayan! Mister Edward naitimbre ka na sa PDEA, good luck!*" (There! Mister Edward, you've been reported to the PDEA — good luck!) These remarks reflect an authoritarian style, showing little consideration for the accused's perspective or dignity. Such comments can be seen as stigmatizing and may violate SDG 16.10. Additionally, by publicly announcing, "*Meron pong mga video, kumpleto recados*" (There are videos — everything is complete and well-documented Ep.7, 18m:03s, p.102,103&106) instead of submitting evidence properly, Pedro risks violating the accused's right to privacy and fair treatment.

In the fifth case, Pedro showcased an aggressive approach to the involved parties. Pedro uses a forcing style through threats and intimidation. Statements like "*Alam mo sir kung nandito ka lang baka binatukan na kita*" (You know what, sir? If you were here, I might've already hit you on the head) reflects physical intimidation. While assertions, such as "*Pag lumitaw sa lie detector test na ikaw nagsinungaling ikukulong kita sa senado,*" (If the lie detector test shows that you lied, I'll have you jailed in the Senate), "*Pag ikaw natyempo at pacheekin ka namin natyempo ng mga pulis may hawak-hawak na marriage certificate itong si Sir na magkasiping kayo, kulong ka agad,*" (If you get caught and the police check on you — and Sir is holding a marriage certificate while you're caught in bed together — you'll go straight to jail), and "*Hindi! Hindi sayo! Nasa amin yon. Pag lumabas na sinungaling ikukulong ka namin.*" (No! Not yours! That belongs to us. If it turns out you're lying, we'll have you jailed Ep.8, 16m:07s, p.115,116, &118) show legal threats used to control and dominate the other party, without regard for their perspective. These statements mirror the multiple violations of SDG 16 principles, such as SDG 16.6 to develop effective, accountable, and transparent institutions, SDG 16.7, which ensures a responsive, inclusive, and representative decision-making, and SDG 16.3, which protects individuals from discrimination and abuse of power. Furthermore, Pedro's involvement of a child on-air may also breach SDG 16.2 by exposing minors to harm.

A notable limitation in the dispute resolution process presented in "Pedro Tanggol on Justice" is the absence of

direct input from disputants regarding their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the judgment or settlement. This omission stems from the authoritarian and unilateral communication style employed by the host, who dominates the interaction and rarely provides disputants the opportunity to articulate their views, feelings, or concerns about the proposed outcomes. Instead of fostering dialogue, Pedro frequently interrupts or overrides disputants' responses, imposing his preferred resolutions without negotiation or consent.

This tendency is evident in episodes where Pedro imposes decisions without seeking the other party's perspective. For instance, when resolving a custody dispute, Pedro asserted, "*Hindi karapat-dapat na ikaw ay magiging nanay nitong bata*" (You don't deserve to be the mother of this child) and "*Tama lang na dito kay mister muna ang baby. Hindi ka nagbabago*" (It's only right that the baby stays with the father for now. You haven't changed. Ep.4, p.64, 83–84). These statements reflect a judgmental stance that excludes the mother's voice from the decision-making process. Similarly, when an accused party attempted to explain their side, Pedro ended the exchange with threats such as, "*Hoy! Sino bang pinagmamalaki mong NBI?! Dalahin mo sa harap ko tadyakan ko kung yun ang pinagmamalaki mo at kinukonsinti ka, walang biro*" (Hey! Who are you bragging about from the NBI? Bring that person in front of me and I'll kick them if they're the one covering for you — I'm not joking. Ep.6, p.89–90), further reinforcing his unilateral control of the process.

From a conflict management perspective, these instances negate the essential ADR principle of party autonomy, which emphasizes voluntary participation and informed agreement. The failure to solicit disputants' voices not only undermines procedural fairness but also violates SDG 16.7, which calls for responsive, inclusive, and participatory decision-making processes. Consequently, this lack of consideration reinforces the critique that the program operates under a paradigm of performative justice rather than genuine conflict resolution, further distancing it from established ADR norms and best practices.

The analysis of ten episodes of "Pedro Tanggol on Justice" revealed significant insights into how media-driven dispute resolution interacts with the principles of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16—Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. Findings indicate that the program frequently employs an accommodating style, prioritizing harmony and emotional appeasement over rigorous adherence to due process. Compromising strategies also surfaced in instances where mediators sought middle-ground solutions, whereas integrating or collaborative approaches, which require deeper engagement and joint problem-solving, were rarely observed. Conversely, episodes marked by forcing or competing behaviors—manifested through threats, dominance, and unilateral decision-making—reflect authoritarian tendencies that undermine inclusivity and transparency. A central theme, Procedural Settlement of Disputes Between Parties Involved, underscores the program's attempt to facilitate dialogue through Negotiating and Mediating Dynamics. However, this process reveals a dual pattern: while the program demonstrates alignment with SDG 16 principles such as inclusive decision-making (SDG 16.7), child protection (SDG 16.2), and accountability mechanisms (SDG 16.6) in certain cases, it simultaneously violates fundamental freedoms (SDG 16.10) and principles of equal access to justice (SDG 16.3) through privacy breaches, authoritarian interventions, and lack of procedural safeguards.

Applying the Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI) further contextualizes these findings. The dominance of accommodating (low assertiveness, high cooperativeness) and compromising (moderate assertiveness and cooperativeness) modes illustrates the program's preference for quick, publicly visible settlements over integrative solutions. For example, Pedro's remark, "*Kung ano po yung magiging desisyon ni nanay yun po ang susundin natin*" (Whatever decision she makes, that's what we will follow, Ep.3, p.51), reflects an accommodating approach, whereas Ben's proposal, "Let me propose to you a midway ground solution... schedule of payments. 1 million in two receivable dates" (Ep.1, p.15), typifies compromise. In contrast, collaborative strategies—requiring high assertiveness and cooperativeness—were largely absent, demonstrating the program's structural bias toward expediency over inclusivity. Meanwhile, episodes featuring statements such as "*Sipain ko pa yung pulis na yon*" (I'll even kick that police officer, Ep.3, p.47) exemplify competing behaviors, characterized by high assertiveness and low cooperativeness, which contravene SDG 16's emphasis on impartiality and accountability. The absence of avoidance or strategic withdrawal, which could serve as de-escalation strategies, underscores the show's entertainment-driven design, which amplifies rather than diffuses conflict for audience engagement.

Both the Dual Concern Model and TKI classify conflict styles along similar dimensions—concern for self-versus concern for others (Dual Concern) and assertiveness versus cooperativeness (TKI)—and converge on five key strategies: avoiding, accommodating, compromising, competing, and collaborating (Pruitt & Rubin, 2004; Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). The recurring patterns in the data—dominance of accommodating and compromising, sporadic forcing, and minimal collaboration—reflect high cooperativeness and low assertiveness, punctuated by authoritarian spikes. This alignment demonstrates the utility of these models in diagnosing not only the strategies employed but also the structural limitations imposed by media logic on collaborative, interest-based resolution.

Similar to “Raffy Tulfo in Action” (Redulla et al., 2022), the show offers fast, personality-driven “justice” that bypasses legal procedure. Unlike collaborative models of dispute resolution (Chou & Yeh, 2007), Pedro Tanggol promotes unilateral judgment and public shaming, which contrasts with the foundational principles of ADR, such as confidentiality, neutrality, voluntariness, and mutual consent. As the ADR mechanisms are designed to foster collaborative problem-solving which establishes harmonious relationships and ensures equal participation in decision-making, the program operates on a logic of media virality rather than ethical justice, echoing the commodification of justice noted by Boothe-Perry (2022). While some platforms empower citizens (Silva et al., 2024), this program exploits personal conflict for viewer engagement. These convergences position “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” within a broader global trend: the trade-off between speed and visibility versus deliberation and rights protection.

Bacuño’s (2020) insights about how communication is fostering symbolic authority and recognition in the academe likewise apply to Pedro’s mediation style—highlighting that, as a non-neutral force, communication plays a crucial role in shaping meaning and establishing credibility. In academia, these practices reinforce intellectual authority, but in Pedro’s case, they distort justice into displays of dominance and public shaming, creating a stark contrast.

Theoretically, these findings confirm and extend the Dual Concern Model and TKI. Both frameworks assume that collaborative, integrative strategies are optimal for durable and equitable conflict resolution. Yet the structural logic of televised formats discourages such approaches by incentivizing performative immediacy over relational depth—revealing a practical constraint that neither model fully anticipates. This suggests a theoretical refinement: while both models presuppose voluntariness and neutrality, mediated disputes operate under asymmetrical power dynamics shaped by production imperatives and audience metrics.

For practice, these findings underscore the ethical obligation of media producers to move beyond performative settlements toward hybrid models that combine Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) safeguards—confidential intake, informed consent, and structured follow-up—with the accessibility that makes such programs attractive (Redulla et al., 2022). For pedagogy, integrating these cases into communication, journalism, and legal curricula can equip future practitioners with diagnostic tools to critically analyze mediated justice and design interventions that reconcile speed with fairness (Kohm, 2006; Lorenzo-Dus, 2008). For policy, urgent regulatory measures are needed: content guidelines mandating privacy protections, transparent disclosure of settlement limits, and independent oversight for cases involving minors—all essential to realigning media dispute practices with the democratic values enshrined in SDG 16.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that “Pedro Tanggol on Justice” reshapes the public’s understanding of justice by turning legal mediation into performance. This practice results in mixed alignment with the principles of SDG 16 where inclusivity and protection were evident in some cases, but undermining the transparency, due process, and fundamental freedoms in others. The show does not empower citizens; it exploits their conflicts for entertainment. As a result, it distorts civic understanding of justice and weakens public trust in formal institutions.

What “Pedro Tanggol in Justice” reveals is more than media spectacle, it’s a mirror of the collective impatience with broken systems: the pursuit of quick, visible resolutions at the expense of procedural and institutional

credibility. But when justice is reduced to performance, people risk forgetting what real accountability looks like. If not careful, the drama will replace the duty, and the truth will be whatever draws the loudest applause. Balancing speed with fairness is no longer optional, it is imperative for sustaining public trust and safeguarding democratic ideals in the age of mediated justice.

This study focused only on the aired content and did not cover production practices or post-show outcomes. The following are the study's recommendations. Media practitioners should adopt hybrid models integrating Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) safeguards, such as confidentiality, neutrality, and informed consent mechanisms. Future research should investigate how participants and hosts interact off-camera, specifically in terms of consent, emotional harm, and legal consequences. Researchers should also compare these shows with formal mediation programs to reveal deeper institutional gaps. Policy makers and regulators must assess how such programs shape legal understanding and public trust. Clearer content standards and stronger accountability systems are needed to protect participants and uphold democratic justice.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to take this precious moment to send their sincere gratitude to all individuals who supported, encouraged, and believed in them.

## REFERENCES

1. Bacuño, M.D. (2020). Knowledge Sharing as Communication via James W. Carey's Communication as Culture. *Recoletos Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 8(1), 31-42. <https://doi.org/10.32871/rmrj2008.01.03>
2. Bingham, A.J., & Witkowsky, P. (2022). Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Qualitative Data Analysis. In C. Vanover, P. Mihas, & J. Saldaña (Eds.), *Analyzing and interpreting qualitative data: After the interview* (pp. 133-146). SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://www.andreajbingham.com/resources-tips-and-tricks/deductive-and-inductive-approaches-to-qualitative-analysis>
3. Boothe-Perry, N. (2014). Friends of Justice: Does Social Media Impact the Public Perception of the Justice System? 35 *Pace L. Rev.* 72 (2014). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/plr/vol35/iss1/3>
4. Chou, H.W., & Yeh, Y.-J. (2007). Conflict, Conflict Management, and Performance in ERP Teams. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 35(8), 1035–1048. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2007.35.8.1035>
5. Gauri, V., & Brinks, D. (2008). *Courting Social Justice: Judicial Enforcement of Social and Economic Rights in the Developing World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511511240>
6. Golub, S. (Ed.). (2010). *Legal empowerment: Practitioners' perspectives* (T. McInerney, Series Ed.). International Development Law Organization. [https://www.idlo.int/sites/default/files/pdfs/publications/Legal\\_Empowerment\\_Practitioners\\_Perspectives\\_Book.pdf](https://www.idlo.int/sites/default/files/pdfs/publications/Legal_Empowerment_Practitioners_Perspectives_Book.pdf)
7. Judd, C., Smith, E. and Kidder, L. (1991) *Research Methods in Social Relations*. 6th Edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
8. Kitzinger, J. (2000). Media templates: Patterns of association in the public discourse of new social problems. In R. C. Bell & B. M. Zelizer (Eds.), *Media studies: Key issues and debates* (pp. 134–149). Routledge.
9. Kohm, S. A. (2006). The people's law versus Judge Judy justice: Two models of law in American reality-based courtroom TV. *Law & Society Review*, 40(1), 115–140.
10. Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, 289-331. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(85\)90062-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8)
11. Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2008). Real disorder in the court: An investigation of conflict talk in U.S. television courtroom shows. *Media, Culture & Society*, 30(4), 573–591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443708088613>

12. Philippine Ombudsman (2013). A Survey of Private Legal Practitioners to Monitor Access to Justice by the Disadvantaged. Retrieved from. [https://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/UNDP4/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/PLP\\_Final.pdf](https://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/UNDP4/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/PLP_Final.pdf)
13. Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. (2004). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Higher Education
14. Redulla, J., Vargas, D., & Estigoy, M.A. (2022). Perspectives of Lawyers/Legal Experts and Heavy Viewers on Rocky Tungol in Action. Retrieved from. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363201132\\_Perspectives\\_of\\_LawyersLegal\\_Experts\\_and\\_Heavy\\_Viewers\\_on\\_Raffy\\_Tulfo\\_in\\_Action](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363201132_Perspectives_of_LawyersLegal_Experts_and_Heavy_Viewers_on_Raffy_Tulfo_in_Action)
15. Silva, R. M. L., Cárdenas Gasca, A. M., Fisher, J. A., Principe Cruz, E., Jauregui, C., Lueck, A., Liu, F., Monroy-Hernández, A., & Lukoff, K. (2024). With or Without Permission: Site-Specific Augmented Reality for Social Justice. In *Extended Abstracts of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '24)*, May 11–16, 2024, Honolulu, HI, USA. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3636283>
16. Social Blade (2024). Rocky Tungol in Action's YouTube Stats. Retrieved from. <https://socialblade.com/youtube/c/raffytulfoinaction>
17. Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1976). Thomas–Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. *Group & Organization Studies*, 1(4), 249–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117600100214>
18. Valenzuela, R.P. (2016). *Glimmers of Hope: A Report on the Philippine Criminal Justice System*. Retrieved from. <https://international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/irrc-903-8.pdf>