

Youth Consciousness in the Virtual Environment: A Socio-Philosophical Model of the “Invisible Shield” Against Manipulation

Sherzodjon Qurbonov 

Abstract. *This article develops a socio-philosophical model for protecting young people’s cognitive and moral agency in digitally mediated environments. It asks how manipulation differs from ordinary influence and which capacities allow a user to benefit from online communication without surrendering independent judgment. The study uses a structured conceptual synthesis of fifteen works published between 1970 and 2025 on critical pedagogy, information disorder, digital literacy, cognitive security, online reasoning, and platform power. Sources were compared across four analytical dimensions: control of attention, assessment of credibility, regulation of affect, and value-guided action. The findings show that exposure to persuasive content is not itself manipulation. Manipulative risk becomes substantial when influence is opaque, exploits cognitive or emotional vulnerability, narrows reflective choice, and serves goals the user cannot adequately recognize or contest. On this basis, the article proposes an “Invisible Shield” model comprising epistemic orientation, critical verification, affective self-regulation, and value-guided agency. The model rejects both unrestricted technological optimism and blanket prohibition. It instead treats spiritual immunity as a teachable set of reflective practices supported by education, families, cultural institutions, responsible media, and transparent platform design. The article concludes with operational indicators that can guide future empirical assessment among youth.*

Keywords: *virtual environment, youth consciousness, manipulation, spiritual immunity, cognitive sovereignty, critical thinking, media and information literacy, digital agency*

Institute of Socio-Spiritual Research under the Republican Center for Spirituality and Enlightenment, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: sherzodjonnurbonov@gmail.com

Received: 25 May 2026; Accepted: 31 August 2026; Published online: 30 September 2026

© The Author(s) 2026. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Virtual mühitdə gənclərin şüuru: manipulyasiyaya qarşı “görünməz qalxan”ın sosial-fəlsəfi modeli

Sherzodjon Qurbonov 

Xülasə. *Məqalədə rəqəmsal vasitələrlə formalaşan mühitdə gənclərin idraki və mənəvi subyektivliyinin qorunmasına dair sosial-fəlsəfi model işlənib hazırlanır. Tədqiqat adi təsirlə manipulyasiya arasındakı fərqi nədən ibarət olduğunu və istifadəçinin müstəqil mühakiməsini itirmədən onlayn ünsiyyətin imkanlarından yararlanmasına hansı bacarıqların kömək etdiyini araşdırır. 1970–2025-ci illərdə tənqidi pedaqogika, informasiya pozuntusu, rəqəmsal savadlılıq, kognitiv təhlükəsizlik, onlayn mənbələrin qiymətləndirilməsi və platforma hakimiyyəti haqqında nəşr edilmiş on beş əsərin*

strukturlaşdırılmış konseptual sintezindən istifadə olunmuşdur. Mənbələr diqqətin idarə edilməsi, etibarlılığın qiymətləndirilməsi, emosiyaların tənzimlənməsi və dəyərlərə əsaslanan fəaliyyət istiqamətləri üzrə müqayisə edilmişdir. Nəticələr göstərir ki, inandırıcı məzmunla qarşılaşmaq öz-özünüdə manipulyasiya deyil. Təsir qeyri-şəffaf olduqda, koqnitiv və ya emosional zəiflikdən istifadə etdikdə, düşünülmüş seçimi məhdudlaşdırdıqda və istifadəçinin tanıya və mübahisələndirə bilmədiyi məqsədlərə xidmət etdikdə risk yüksəlir. Bu əsasda epistemik istiqamətlənmə, tənqidi yoxlama, emosional özünü-tənzimləmə və dəyərlərə əsaslanan subyektivlikdən ibarət “Görünməz qalxan” modeli təklif olunur. Model həm kor texnoloji nikbinliyi, həm də ümumi qadağanı rədd edir və mənavi immuniteti təhsil və sosial institutlar tərəfindən dəstəklənən öyrədilə bilən reflektiv təcrübələr sistemi kimi izah edir.

Açar sözlər: *virtual mühit, gənclərin şüuru, manipulyasiya, mənavi immunitet, koqnitiv suverenlik, tənqidi düşüncə, media və informasiya savadlılığı, rəqəmsal subyektivlik*

Respublika Mənaviyyat və Maarifləndirmə Mərkəzi nəzdində Sosial-Mənavi Tədqiqatlar İnstitutu, Daşkənd, Özbəkistan

E-poçt: sherzodjonnurbonov@gmail.com

Daxil oldu: 25 May 2026; Qəbul edildi: 31 Avqust 2026; Onlayn dərc edildi: 30 Sentyabr 2026

© Müəllif(lər) 2026. Bu açıq girişli məqalə Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 Beynəlxalq Lisenziyasının (CC BY-NC 4.0) şərtlərinə uyğun olaraq yayımlanmışdır.

Introduction

The virtual environment has become part of the infrastructure through which young people learn, communicate, construct identity, and evaluate social reality. Its significance therefore cannot be reduced to the amount of time spent online. Digital platforms organize visibility: they rank messages, repeat selected themes, recommend content, and translate attention into measurable engagement. These functions can enlarge access to knowledge and participation, but they also create asymmetries between users and the systems that select what users encounter. The central philosophical problem is not whether the internet is inherently beneficial or harmful. It is whether a person remains capable of understanding, questioning, and revising the judgments formed within an environment whose selection mechanisms are only partly visible.

Existing discussions often collapse three different phenomena into one: influence, persuasion, and manipulation. Influence is unavoidable in social life because language, education, culture, and interpersonal relations shape judgment. Persuasion presents reasons or appeals that a recipient may examine and reject. Manipulation is more specific. It uses concealed or structurally unequal means to steer perception or action while weakening the recipient's capacity for reflective choice. This distinction matters because an indiscriminate language of “threat” can justify blanket restriction, while an indiscriminate language of “freedom” can ignore engineered vulnerability. A defensible approach must protect agency without treating young people as passive objects.

Research on online misinformation demonstrates that users frequently encounter difficulty when judging the credibility of digital sources, and that intuitive or familiarity-based processing can increase susceptibility to false claims (Breakstone et al., 2021; Pennycook & Rand, 2021). Research on digital environments further shows that individual responsibility alone is insufficient because interface design, data extraction, algorithmic ranking, and commercial incentives structure the field in which decisions occur (Kozyreva et al., 2020; Zuboff, 2019). Within the Central Asian scholarly context, information-psychological security has likewise been examined as a relationship among individual, social, and institutional protection rather than as a purely technical problem (Biyimbetov,

2021). Qurbonov and Abduvafoyeva (2025) connect these processes to the transformation of youth spirituality, while Qurbonov (2025) emphasizes communicative education and value-based identity. The concept of spiritual immunity is useful only if it is made analytically precise. Used vaguely, it can become a slogan that labels unfamiliar information as harmful. Used carefully, it can describe a person's capacity to encounter competing messages without losing the ability to evaluate evidence, regulate immediate reactions, recognize ethical consequences, and act according to considered values. In this article, spiritual immunity does not mean cultural isolation, ideological conformity, or rejection of technology. It refers to a layered form of cognitive and moral resilience that preserves agency under conditions of informational pressure.

The study addresses two questions. First, through which mechanisms can digitally mediated influence become manipulative? Second, which capacities should an "invisible shield" contain if it is to protect cognitive sovereignty without undermining openness, learning, and dialogue? The objective is to reconstruct a transparent conceptual model that connects philosophical principles with observable educational practices. The article's contribution is the four-capacity Invisible Shield model and a threshold test that distinguishes ordinary exposure from agency-reducing manipulation.

Materials and Methods

The study employs a structured conceptual synthesis rather than an empirical survey or experiment. Its corpus consists of fifteen works published between 1970 and 2025. The corpus was purposively assembled to represent five complementary domains: critical pedagogy and reflective emancipation; critical-thinking methodology; media and information literacy; psychological research on misinformation and online reasoning; and socio-philosophical analyses of platform power, information security, and youth spirituality. Foundational works were retained when they supplied concepts still required by the analysis, while recent peer-reviewed studies and institutional guidance were selected to address contemporary digital conditions.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. First, each source was coded for the object of concern: information quality, attention, emotion, identity, socialization, or institutional power. Second, the mechanism of vulnerability was identified, including repetition, source opacity, urgency, social endorsement, personalization, and affective activation. Third, proposed responses were classified as restrictive, corrective, educational, or design-based. Fourth, the responses were evaluated against an agency criterion: whether they increase a young person's ability to understand an influence, test its claims, regulate reaction, and make a revisable choice. This criterion draws on Freire's distinction between passive adaptation and critical participation (Freire, 1970), Paul and Elder's account of disciplined judgment (Paul & Elder, 2002), and contemporary work on cognitive tools for digital citizens (Kozyreva et al., 2020).

Concepts were compared through a matrix with four analytical dimensions: epistemic orientation, critical verification, affective self-regulation, and value-guided agency. A proposed protective measure was included in the final model only when it met three conditions: it was not dependent on a complete ban on access; it could be translated into a teachable or institutionally supportable practice; and it preserved the user's capacity to revise conclusions in the light of better evidence. Lateral reading, for example, satisfies these conditions because it redirects attention from the appearance of a single page to independent information about the source (Wineburg & McGrew, 2019).

The synthesis is interpretive and does not claim statistical representativeness. No human participants were recruited, no personal data were processed, and no new dataset was created. The model is therefore assessed by conceptual coherence, correspondence with the selected literature, explanatory

usefulness, and falsifiability through future empirical research. Direct quotations from uncertain secondary reproductions were avoided; arguments are paraphrased and attributed in author-date form.

Results

The first result is a four-part threshold for identifying manipulation. Digitally mediated influence becomes manipulative when four conditions converge: the operation is materially opaque to the user; it exploits a predictable cognitive or emotional vulnerability; it narrows the time, information, or alternatives available for reflection; and it advances an objective that the user cannot adequately recognize or contest. None of these conditions alone is sufficient. Personalization can improve relevance, emotional communication can be legitimate, and simplified interfaces can reduce cognitive burden. The decisive question is whether the configuration systematically bypasses reflective agency. This threshold corrects two symmetrical errors. The first error treats every persuasive message as manipulation and therefore mistakes protection for prohibition. The second treats every click as an autonomous preference and therefore ignores how options are framed and ranked. Floridi (2014) describes the digital transformation as a change in the informational environment in which human action occurs, while Zuboff (2019) highlights the economic power derived from predicting and shaping behavior. Read together, these perspectives indicate that agency must be evaluated relationally: not only by asking whether a choice occurred, but also by examining whether the conditions of choice were intelligible and contestable.

The second result concerns the mechanisms through which vulnerability is produced. The literature converges on four mechanisms. Attention capture prioritizes salience, novelty, or repetition over importance. Credibility substitution encourages users to rely on visual polish, familiarity, popularity, or identity cues instead of checking expertise and evidence. Affective acceleration converts surprise, fear, admiration, or indignation into immediate sharing before verification. Agency displacement turns a recommendation into a default path, gradually weakening deliberate selection. Pennycook and Rand (2021) show that susceptibility to false information cannot be explained only by partisan motivation; inadequate attention to accuracy is also important. Kozyreva et al. (2023) therefore add “critical ignoring” to critical thinking: digital competence includes the disciplined decision not to allocate attention to low-value or manipulative material.

The third result is the Invisible Shield model. The metaphor denotes neither a technical firewall nor an impermeable moral boundary. It describes four interdependent human capacities. Epistemic orientation is the ability to identify what kind of claim is being made, who benefits from its acceptance, and what evidence would be relevant. Critical verification is the ability to leave the initial post, investigate the source, compare independent accounts, and distinguish primary evidence from commentary. Affective self-regulation is the ability to recognize when emotional activation is compressing judgment and to create a deliberate pause before reacting or sharing. Value-guided agency is the ability to connect digital action with responsibility, dignity, truthfulness, and the foreseeable effects on other people.

The four capacities are complementary rather than interchangeable. Information literacy without affective regulation may fail at the precise moment when a message produces anger or fear. Moral commitment without source evaluation may spread false information for a sincerely held purpose. Skepticism without value-guided agency may become cynical disbelief in every source. Technical safety without reflective participation may produce compliance rather than autonomy. Spiritual immunity is therefore strongest when all four capacities operate as a cycle: orient, verify, regulate, and act.

The fourth result is an institutional principle. The shield cannot be assigned exclusively to the individual because digital choices occur within educational, familial, cultural, media, and technological environments. UNESCO (2021) treats media and information literacy as a civic and educational competence, while Rheingold (2012) emphasizes attention, participation, collaboration, and network awareness as practical digital literacies. The synthesis indicates that institutions should not attempt to decide every conclusion for the learner. Their responsibility is to create repeated opportunities for transparent source comparison, reason-giving, emotional reflection, and accountable participation.

Table 1
The Invisible Shield model and its operational indicators

Capacity	Core question	Observable practice
Epistemic orientation	What is being claimed, by whom, and for what purpose?	Identifies claim type, source, intended audience, and relevant evidence.
Critical verification	What independent evidence supports or challenges the claim?	Uses lateral reading, checks provenance, date, context, and corroboration.
Affective self-regulation	Is an emotional reaction replacing considered judgment?	Names the emotion, pauses, delays sharing, and re-evaluates after activation falls.
Value-guided agency	What responsible action follows from the verified information?	Explains a choice, considers consequences, corrects errors, and respects others' agency.

The fifth result is a pedagogical sequence derived from the model. Instruction should begin with authentic but low-stakes examples, because abstract warnings rarely transfer to actual feeds. Learners first describe what made a post attractive or credible. They then investigate the source through lateral reading, compare the claim with independent evidence, identify the emotional trigger, and justify a decision to share, reject, annotate, or suspend judgment. Feedback must assess the reasoning process rather than reward agreement with a predetermined opinion. Research on civic online reasoning supports the need for explicit practice because many students struggle to evaluate online sources despite extensive digital exposure (Breakstone et al., 2021). Digital familiarity is not equivalent to epistemic competence.

The resulting model also clarifies the meaning of cognitive sovereignty. Sovereignty does not imply complete independence from social influence, which is impossible. It means retaining a practical right and capacity to inspect the reasons for a judgment, resist concealed steering, and revise one's position. Critical pedagogy contributes the principle that education should transform the learner from an object of communication into a participant capable of questioning the conditions of communication (Freire, 1970). Paul and Elder (2002) add standards such as clarity, accuracy, relevance, and logical consistency. The Invisible Shield translates these standards into the temporal conditions of digital life, where verification must often compete with speed, repetition, and emotional intensity.

Finally, the model produces a testable prediction: interventions that teach only factual correction will be less durable than interventions combining verification, affective pause, and accountable action. The Debunking Handbook similarly stresses that correction must be clear, evidence-based, and attentive to how misinformation is cognitively processed (Lewandowsky et al., 2020). The proposed

model extends this insight from correcting isolated claims to preserving the broader capacities through which a person evaluates future claims.

Discussion

The findings support a move from defensive rhetoric to capability-based protection. A purely prohibitive model assumes that safety can be produced by removing harmful content before it reaches the user. This assumption is unrealistic in an open and rapidly changing information environment, and it can leave young people less prepared when restriction is absent. A purely individual model is equally inadequate because it asks users to resist systems designed to capture attention while leaving institutional incentives untouched. The Invisible Shield model distributes responsibility: individuals develop reflective capacities, educators build practice, families support dialogue, media institutions improve provenance and correction, and platforms make recommendation and advertising processes more intelligible.

This distribution of responsibility is consistent with Kozyreva et al. (2020), who distinguish individual cognitive tools from system-level reforms. Boosting user competence and improving the choice architecture should not be treated as substitutes. Transparent labeling is weak if users do not know how to interpret it; critical-thinking instruction is weakened when platform design continually rewards impulsive engagement. The conceptual implication is that cognitive sovereignty is an ecological achievement produced through the interaction of personal capacities and institutional conditions.

The model also sets limits on the language of spiritual immunity. First, disagreement is not evidence of manipulation. A person may reach an unpopular or mistaken conclusion through sincere reasoning. Second, cultural difference is not inherently harmful. Shielding becomes intellectually destructive when it prevents exposure to alternative interpretations. Third, emotional communication is not necessarily irrational; moral understanding often depends on empathy and affect. The relevant danger is not emotion itself but the engineered compression of reflection. Fourth, national or communal values cannot replace evidence when a factual claim is evaluated. Values guide responsible use of knowledge; they do not determine whether a verifiable statement is true.

These limits make the concept non-confessional and analytically usable. Spiritual immunity can be defined through public capacities—truth-seeking, responsibility, dignity, reflection, and meaningful choice—without requiring adherence to a particular doctrine. In this form, the concept complements media and information literacy rather than competing with it. UNESCO's framework emphasizes access, evaluation, creation, and participation (UNESCO, 2021). The present model adds an explicit bridge between epistemic competence and moral agency: a well-verified message can still be used irresponsibly, while a benevolent intention can still distribute an unverified claim.

The local literature strengthens this bridge. Biyimbetov (2021) interprets information-psychological security through the relations among persons, social groups, and institutions. Qurbonov and Abduvafoyeva (2025) emphasize the influence of digital information processes on youth spirituality. The present synthesis narrows these broad concerns into mechanisms and capacities. Its value lies not in declaring the digital environment dangerous, but in specifying when an influence becomes agency-reducing and which observable practices may interrupt that transition.

The model can be applied in educational and cultural settings through scenario-based assessment. A learner may be presented with a viral claim and asked to document four steps: identify the source and purpose, open independent sources, record the initial emotional response, and justify a final action. Performance can be assessed with a rubric rather than a binary correct/incorrect score. Wineburg and

McGrew (2019) show why this matters: expert fact-checkers often evaluate credibility by leaving a page and examining what other sources say about it. Instruction that focuses only on close reading within the original page may reward precisely the visual and rhetorical features that manipulation exploits.

There is also a temporal dimension. Manipulation frequently benefits from immediacy, whereas responsible judgment requires time. A short epistemic pause is therefore not passivity; it is an active reorganization of attention. Critical ignoring adds a second temporal practice: refusing to spend scarce attention on content whose source or purpose makes it unworthy of deeper engagement (Kozyreva et al., 2023). Together, lateral reading and critical ignoring counter opposite failures—remaining trapped inside a deceptive source and wasting cognitive resources on strategically distracting material.

The strongest version of the “invisible shield” is thus not invisibility in the sense of secrecy. It is invisibility because the protection resides in habits of judgment that travel with the person across platforms. These habits should nevertheless be made visible during learning: students need language for explaining how they checked a source, why they delayed a reaction, and which values shaped their action. A capacity that cannot be demonstrated or assessed risks remaining rhetorical.

Practical Implications

Educational institutions should integrate source evaluation into ordinary subject teaching rather than isolate it in a single digital-safety lecture. History classes can compare provenance and context; language classes can analyze framing and rhetorical omission; science classes can distinguish peer-reviewed evidence from testimonial claims. The same four-step routine—orient, verify, regulate, act—can be adapted across disciplines. This approach avoids presenting media literacy as a technical accessory and treats it as part of disciplined thinking.

Families and youth organizations should replace one-directional warnings with guided discussion. Asking “What made this convincing?” or “What evidence would change your mind?” develops metacognition more effectively than simply labeling a source as forbidden. Cultural institutions and responsible media can support the process by publishing transparent corrections, explaining editorial decisions, and distinguishing reporting from commentary. Platforms should make sponsorship, provenance, recommendation criteria, and complaint procedures comprehensible to ordinary users. Assessment should focus on demonstrated processes. Four indicators are especially useful: whether the learner can name the claim and source; whether independent corroboration is sought; whether emotional activation is recognized and managed; and whether the eventual action is justified in relation to consequences. Longitudinal assessment is preferable because a single correct response may reflect luck or prior familiarity. The objective is stable agency across unfamiliar cases.

Limitations

This study has four limitations. First, it is a conceptual synthesis and does not measure the prevalence of manipulation or the effectiveness of the proposed model. Second, the corpus is selective rather than exhaustive and is weighted toward English-language research alongside a limited Central Asian literature. Third, concepts such as spirituality, autonomy, and manipulation remain culturally sensitive; their operational indicators require validation in specific linguistic and educational contexts. Fourth, platform architectures evolve rapidly, so the mechanisms identified here should be periodically re-examined. The model should therefore be treated as a falsifiable framework for research, not as a completed intervention proven to produce behavioral change.

Future Research

Future studies should develop and validate an age-sensitive scale for the four capacities and test whether they predict resistance to misleading content beyond general academic achievement. Experimental work could compare factual correction alone with a combined intervention involving lateral reading, affective pause, and value-based justification. Qualitative interviews could examine how young people interpret “spiritual immunity” and whether the term supports agency or is experienced as external control. Research should also compare urban and rural contexts, different language environments, and varying levels of access without assuming that exposure or vulnerability is uniform. Finally, platform-level variables—recommendation transparency, advertising disclosure, friction before resharing, and correction visibility—should be studied together with educational interventions.

Conclusion

The virtual environment expands learning, communication, and self-expression, but it also reorganizes the conditions under which judgment is formed. The relevant philosophical challenge is therefore not to choose between technological enthusiasm and technological fear. It is to preserve the young person’s ability to understand influence, test claims, regulate reaction, and act responsibly within an environment shaped by opaque selection and unequal informational power.

The article defines manipulation through a four-part threshold—opacity, exploitation of vulnerability, restriction of reflection, and an insufficiently contestable objective—and proposes the Invisible Shield model of epistemic orientation, critical verification, affective self-regulation, and value-guided agency. The shield is not a ban, a doctrine, or a guarantee of correct belief. It is a transferable set of practices that protects the conditions of meaningful choice. Its effectiveness depends on a shared ecology of responsibility involving education, families, cultural institutions, media, and platform design. The next task is empirical: the model must be operationalized, tested, criticized, and revised in collaboration with the young people whose agency it seeks to strengthen.

Declarations

Conflict of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding: The study received no external funding.

Ethics and data availability: The study is based on published literature, involved no human participants, and generated no new dataset.

Use of generative AI: Generative AI was used for language editing and structural organization. The author is responsible for verifying the argument, sources, and final text.

References

- Biyimbetov, J. K. (2021). Philosophical analysis of the problem of information psychological security. *Adam Alemi*, 88(2), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.48010/2021.2/1999-5849.01>
- Breakstone, J., Smith, M., Wineburg, S., Rapaport, A., Carle, J., Garland, M., & Saavedra, A. (2021). Students’ civic online reasoning: A national portrait. *Educational Researcher*, 50(8), 505–515. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211017495>
- Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

- Kozyreva, A., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2020). Citizens versus the Internet: Confronting digital challenges with cognitive tools. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 21(3), 103–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100620946707>
- Kozyreva, A., Wineburg, S., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2023). Critical ignoring as a core competence for digital citizens. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 32(1), 81–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221121570>
- 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*. <https://doi.org/10.17910/b7.1182>
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking: Tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2021). The psychology of fake news. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(5), 388–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.02.007>
- Qurbonov, S. S. (2025). A communicative approach in the moral education system to foster loyalty to national and cultural values. *Oriental Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9), 209–217. <https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojss-05-09-26>
- Qurbonov, S. S., & Abduvafoyeva, N. S. (2025). The influence of information and ideological processes on the spirituality of youth. *Oriental Journal of History, Politics and Law*, 5(11), 300–306. <https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojhpl-05-11-38>
- Rheingold, H. (2012). *Net smart: How to thrive online*. MIT Press.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Media and information literate citizens: Think critically, click wisely!*
- Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record*, 121(11), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912101102>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.