

The Kids Aren't Alright: They're Being Out-Read by the Internet

Corrine H Hurt

Correspondence: Corrine H Hurt, Department of Teacher Education, University of Southern Indiana, USA.

Received: May 20, 2025

Accepted: August 20, 2025

Online Published: February 2, 2026

doi:10.11114/jets.v14i2.7707

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v14i2.7707>

Abstract

This meta-analysis explores the urgent need for critical media literacy (CML) in K-12 education at a time when digital environments are engineered to manipulate, polarize, and overwhelm. Grounded in critical theory and postmodernism, the paper synthesizes recent literature to expose the shortcomings of current media literacy approaches—namely their emotional avoidance, structural silence, and lack of ideological critique. Drawing on works by Jason Stanley and others, the author argues that students are not just consuming content—they're being consumed by it. This paper offers actionable recommendations for educators and curriculum designers working to resist disinformation, clickbait culture, and the commodification of truth.

Keywords: critical media literacy, misinformation, clickbait, K-12 curriculum

1. Introduction

Let's be honest: Students today are immersed in a media landscape where truth feels optional... and many are starting to notice.

In classrooms across the country, we're asking students to stay objective while their screens deliver algorithmic outrage and monetized misinformation. We're teaching fact-checking, while politicians run ads that deliberately provoke fear and tribalism. As Jason Stanley reminds us, propaganda doesn't always lie—it just tells you what you already feel, using language you don't realize is weaponized.

We don't need more neutral literacy. We need critical literacy that challenges systems of power. This paper argues that media literacy today must do more than detect misinformation. It must empower students to understand how media shapes belief, reinforces power, and distorts democratic discourse. Grounded in a meta-analysis of recent peer-reviewed research and informed by Critical Theory and Postmodernism, this paper identifies four key challenges and offers a roadmap for resistance.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study operates through two intersecting lenses: Critical Theory, which insists that all education is political and asks who benefits from a given narrative and which ideologies are rendered invisible by claims of neutrality; and Postmodernism, which resists universal narratives, treats language as a tool of power, and asserts that "truth" is always constructed.

Together, they frame media literacy not as curriculum content, but as a democratic imperative—teaching students not just how to identify information, but how to identify and interrogate the power behind it.

3. Literature Review: Teaching in the Age of Clickbait

We are no longer preparing students to read the news. We are preparing them to survive it.

In the digital age, information is abundant, emotional, and weaponized. Truth isn't just distorted. It's engineered. Headlines are designed not to inform but to provoke, optimized for engagement over accuracy. And in this attention economy, disinformation has a competitive edge. As Jason Stanley (2015) argues in *How Propaganda Works*, propaganda succeeds not by telling outright lies but by manipulating context, inflaming emotion, and appealing to deeply held identities. Education, then, is not neutral territory, it is a battleground for epistemological control.

This brief but pertinent literature review synthesizes recent research on critical media literacy (CML) in K-12 classrooms, analyzing it through the dual lens of Critical Theory and Postmodernism. The review is organized around four major themes: (1) ideological language and emotional manipulation, (2) teacher knowledge and fear, (3) curriculum silencing and surveillance, and (4) critical literacy as democratic action.

3.1 The Weaponization of Language in Digital Media

Platforms like YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram have become the default epistemological engines for young people—not just places to consume media, but places to form belief. And yet these platforms operate without the institutional safeguards of traditional journalism (Notley et al., 2023). Students are no longer passive recipients of media. They are subjects in a digital ecosystem that prioritizes emotional virality over nuance, and identity reinforcement over intellectual challenge.

This environment doesn't just reflect today's reality. It manufactures it.

Beaver and Stanley (2023) argue that emotionally charged media isn't incidental—it's *technological ideology*. Clickbait doesn't simply sensationalize; it polarizes. Headlines like “*What They're Not Telling You*” or “*The Truth About Your Child's School*” use a moral binary—someone is lying, something is hidden, and you, the reader, are under attack. This is not the language of inquiry. It is the language of urgency, grievance, and suspicion. This type of rhetoric activates what Stanley calls *the friend-enemy distinction* from fascist discourse: truth becomes tribal. You're either with “the people” or you're part of the problem. Words become weapons, framing opponents as threats rather than participants in a shared democratic dialogue.

Afrilyasanti et al. (2023) find that students increasingly assess the credibility of information not through evidence but affect: how it makes them feel. A headline that stirs fear, outrage, or righteousness is more likely to be believed than one that is measured or complex. In this way, intensity becomes a proxy for truth. Volume, not veracity, drives trust. Moreover, the repetition of certain phrases, “woke indoctrination,” “parental rights,” “coastal elites”—acts as ideological shorthand. These aren't neutral descriptors; they're emotionally loaded symbols, used to trigger a sense of identity-based victimhood or superiority. Students absorb this language before they understand its architecture.

Without formal instruction in rhetorical analysis, students are left defenseless against this kind of linguistic manipulation. They need to learn how to deconstruct metaphors, recognize appeals to emotion and identity, and map how narratives are framed for political or commercial ends. What's more, many of these same tactics have crept into even “respectable” media. Headlines in major outlets increasingly rely on indignation bait. Language that is designed to provoke a click, not foster understanding. The media environment does not reward reflection. It rewards reaction. Thus, teaching students to “identify reliable sources” is no longer enough. Critical media literacy must train students to decode *why* a piece of content is emotionally resonant, *how* language is being weaponized, and *who* benefits from the framing.

3.2 Teacher Confusion and Misinformation Fatigue

Teachers aren't just trying to cover the curriculum anymore. They are trying to keep their heads above water in a flood of headlines, hashtags, and half-truths. Every day, students walk into classrooms carrying narratives shaped by TikTok algorithms, YouTube influencers, and politicized news cycles. And the adults in the room? They're often just as overwhelmed. Secondary educators frequently lack formal training in media literacy, despite mounting pressure to address misinformation (Oktay and Bayraktar, 2024). Many are left to improvise, defaulting to fact-checking exercises or news bias charts: tools that, while helpful, do little to confront the ideological and emotional undercurrents of modern disinformation.

In the U.S., the problem is compounded by a climate of fear and political interference. Social studies teachers walking a tightrope between curriculum standards and the moral imperative to teach civic truth (Wilson, 2022). Many fear professional consequences for bringing “controversial” topics into the classroom, even when those topics are central to students lived experiences and national discourse. This pressure doesn't just silence teachers, it distorts the very function of education. Stanley (2018) refers to this as “*the harmony of ideological silence*”—a false sense of peace achieved by removing discomfort, flattening complexity, and avoiding confrontation with power. In effect, the classroom becomes a stage for neutrality theater, where controversial truths are avoided in favor of consensus, no matter how shallow.

But neutrality in the face of propaganda is complicity. The refusal to name and analyze power in media education doesn't maintain civic harmony, it erodes democratic capacity (Ashbridge et al., 2022; Cone, 2004). When we ask teachers to stay neutral while students are bombarded with ideological messaging, we deny both groups the tools they need to navigate a post-truth society.

3.3 Surveillance, Silencing, and the Politics of Curriculum

We're asking teachers to be brave in a system designed to make them afraid.

Today's classrooms don't just reflect cultural conflict. They host it. And increasingly, teachers are navigating a political minefield where even mentioning systemic racism, gender identity, or media bias can trigger anonymous reporting, public outrage, or job loss. “In multiple U.S. states, including Florida, policies now enable students and parents to report “divisive content” to government bodies—under Florida's House Bill 7 (the Stop W.O.K.E. Act) this is considered discrimination if it ‘espouses, promotes, advances, inculcates, or compels’ individuals to believe certain concepts related to race or gender (Florida HB 7, 2022). This isn't just censorship, it's a quiet normalization of surveillance culture in public education.

Ashbridge et al. (2022) call this the “*conceptual paradox*” of modern schooling: schools preach the values of democratic citizenship yet gut the very tools students need to practice it. Critical literacy becomes suspect. Dissonance is reframed as dysfunction. And rather than asking *why* young people are turning to YouTube for truth, policymakers reinforce scripted curricula that avoid ideological nuance like the plague. Mendes and Amar (2024) argue this climate not only undermines teacher autonomy, it rewires the purpose of education itself. When educators are forced to pre-approve every lesson against political optics, what’s left is the performance of teaching, not its substance. It’s the illusion of rigor in a classroom where discomfort is taboo, complexity is a threat, and truth is only welcome if it’s tidy.

This is how propaganda creeps in... not through bold declarations of ideology, but through the slow erosion of critical inquiry. Propaganda becomes institutionalized not just through what is said, but through what is no longer safe to say (Cone, 2004). In this sanitized version of civic education, patriotism is praised, but power is never questioned.

And here’s the kicker: all of this is done in the name of “unity.” But enforced harmony is not democracy—it’s control. When dissent is labeled divisive and inquiry is cast as inflammatory, students are not being prepared for democratic life. They’re being trained to perform agreement.

3.4 Critical Media Literacy as Democratic Praxis

Media literacy shouldn’t just help students navigate information. It should help them navigate *power*.

When Critical Media Literacy (CML) is done well, it doesn’t just teach students to spot fake news - it helps them interrogate *how* truth is constructed, *who* benefits from distortion, and *what* ideologies are embedded in the content they consume. This is the difference between checking a source and checking a system. And that’s where most media literacy programs fall short.

CML must be rooted in a transformative pedagogy—one that views media not as neutral content but as political text (Robertson & Scheidler-Benns, 2016). Students should be taught to ask: Whose voice is amplified? Whose story is being told? Who is missing? This aligns with critical theory’s goal of exposing the ideologies beneath the surface and disrupting the appearance of neutrality that sustains power structures.

This also reflects a postmodern orientation. If truth is always mediated, through language, symbols, institutions, then teaching media literacy means teaching students to read the codes. Nash (2024) highlights a curriculum in which students not only analyzed viral videos for ideological bias but created counternarratives that reframed public discourse from their own communities. In that moment, students weren’t just learning. They were becoming authors of civic *reality*.

Fabbro and Gabbi (2024) found similar results when students examined conspiracy theories through the lens of storytelling, not belief. They didn’t just debunk, they demystified. And in doing so, students gained what Stanley (2018) calls “epistemic humility”: the understanding that knowledge is always situated, always contested, and always open to critique.

This is CML as democratic praxis. Not content consumption. Not digital hygiene. But the cultivation of students as active participants in shaping the political, cultural, and emotional terrain they inhabit. To be clear: this doesn’t mean replacing media with ideology. It means naming the ideologies that are already there. Because if schools won’t give students the tools to question dominant narratives, someone else—an algorithm, an influencer, a political grifter—will give them a ready-made answer.

CML isn’t a supplement to civic education. It *is* civic education. And in an era of weaponized narratives, it may be democracy’s best line of defense.

4. Findings and Implications

What’s becoming clear across the literature is this: students aren’t just misinformed. They’re out-messaged, out-marketed, out-read, and often outmatched by the platforms and algorithms shaping their worldview. CML must evolve from a checklist of scrutiny skills into a political education, one that prepares students not only to decode media, but to challenge the systems that produce it.

4.1 Even “Reputable” News Isn’t Immune to Clickbait

Clickbait is no longer confined to fringe blogs or conspiracy-oriented YouTube channels. It’s embedded in mainstream journalism, wrapped in institutional credibility. Headlines like “America’s Schools Are Failing” or “What They Won’t Tell You About COVID” deploy emotionally manipulative framing, even when the underlying reporting is sound (Notley et al., 2023). These are not just editorial strategies—they are ideological signals. Propaganda doesn’t rely on falsity; it relies on affective resonance (Beaver & Stanley, 2023). Framing, not fact, is the dominant tool of influence. If students are trained to trust a source purely because it’s familiar or “reputable,” they are left vulnerable to the soft power of emotional suggestion.

Implication: Media literacy must include headline analysis, tone deconstruction, and emotional framing as standard practice, especially when evaluating “mainstream” sources.

4.2 Technocratic Approaches Are Insufficient

Many current media literacy programs remain stuck in the mode of detection: how to fact-check, how to identify “fake news,”

how to trace sources. While these are useful skills, they treat media as neutral data rather than as ideological text (Robertson & Scheidler-Benns, 2016). As a result, students may spot bias without ever understanding how that bias serves systems of power. What's missing is interrogation: of the economic models that incentivize outrage, the racial and gendered dynamics of media representation, and the algorithmic forces that dictate what students see before they even ask.

Implication: CML must expand to include analysis of emotional appeals, digital economies, platform governance, and cultural narrative structures, not just content veracity.

4.3 Neutrality Is a Mask for Ideological Control

Silence has always been a form of speech. Yet in many classrooms, silence around race, gender, politics, or history is treated as objectivity. This is what Ashbridge et al. (2022) and Stanley (2018) warn against: a political harmony that disguises structural injustice. In the name of *balance*, students are given both sides of an argument without being taught how those sides were constructed.

This creates an illusion of neutrality—what Cone (2004) called “institutionalized propaganda.” And it has consequences. Students risk becoming fluent in false equivalency, trained to weigh oppression and opinion on equal terms.

Implication: Educators must reframe “controversial” content not as risk, but as necessary terrain for civic inquiry. Silence around systems of power only reinforces them.

4.4 Teachers Are Key, but Underequipped and Undervalued

Teachers are eager to engage this work, but are often asked to do so without the institutional support, training, or curricular freedom required. Fear of parental pushback or administrative scrutiny leads to avoidance (Oktay & Bayraktar, 2024; Wilson, 2022). Worse still, recent laws encourage students to report teachers for engaging in “divisive concepts,” turning classrooms into surveillance spaces. Without protection and pedagogical development, teachers remain the most overburdened and under-defended line of defense against disinformation.

Implication: Professional development must address ideological literacy, emotional labor, and resistance to censorship. CML should not be an elective. It should be a pillar of teacher preparation and civic education.

5. Recommendations for Practice and Policy

If digital media is where identity, ideology, and emotion converge, then media literacy must evolve beyond detection and into democratic critique. Below are targeted, concrete strategies grounded in findings, and structured to be classroom-ready, research-aligned, and politically aware.

5.1 Teach Emotion as a Literacy Skill

- Break down how emotional triggers (fear, outrage, nostalgia) are used to bypass logic.
- Use viral headlines, TikToks, and influencer content to teach the emotional architecture of persuasion..
- Apply Jason Stanley’s propaganda tactics—scapegoating, manufactured crisis, moral panic—to real-world examples.

5.2 Make Headline Deconstruction a Daily Habit

- Have students compare headlines on the same issue from left, center, and right-leaning sources.
- Ask: *Who* is being blamed? What *emotion* is this triggering? Which rhetorical devices are carrying the emotional weight?
- Annotate headlines to identify tone, omission, and charged language.

5.3 Teach the Algorithms Behind the Content

- Introduce how recommendation engines (YouTube, TikTok, Instagram) shape epistemological perception.
- Explore how outrage and polarization are rewarded by engagement metrics.
- Use media diaries or screen time tracking to connect attention to content exposure.

5.4 Go Beyond Fact-Checking. Teach Rhetorical Literacy

- Break down media messages using ethos, pathos, and logos.
- Ask students: *Who* benefits from this message? *What* story is being told?
- Teach students to critically identify ideological framing—what’s **emphasized**, what’s *erased*, and **why**.

5.5 Create a Culture of Productive Dissonance

- Normalize disagreement and discomfort as part of democratic learning.

- Use debate protocols to explore polarizing media content without devolving into polarizing narratives.
- Let students analyze media representations of their own identities—race, gender, region, religion.

5.6 Ground PD in Power, Not Just Platforms

- Professional development should equip educators to recognize ideological framing, not just technical platforms.
- Offer training on media framing, historical propaganda, and navigating censorship.
- Create interdisciplinary PD that links social studies, ELA, science, and digital tools.

5.7 Embed Media Literacy Across All Subjects

- English: Analyze metaphors, tone, and framing in viral posts or ads.
- Science: Examine how climate science or public health gets distorted online.
- Math: Deconstruct how graphs and data visualizations are used (or misused) to persuade.

5.8 Reframe “Truth” as Civic Action

- Encourage students to ask: Who decides what’s *true*? Whose stories are missing?
- Create assignments where students produce counter-media or community narratives.
- Treat media literacy as civic literacy: not merely a technical proficiency, but a democratic survival skill.

6. Conclusion

We are not just teaching students to spot fake news—we’re teaching them to survive in a world where outrage is monetized, confusion is weaponized, and “truth” is a branded product sold to the highest bidder.

Clickbait is not just a nuisance—it’s a pedagogy of distraction. It trains students to react rather than reflect. To share before verifying. To feel rather than question. In this climate, neutrality is a myth. Silence is complicity. And education that doesn’t interrogate language, power, and ideology becomes an accomplice to the very disinformation it claims to resist.

What we need now is Critical Media Literacy that fights back:

- Literacy that centers discomfort as a tool of inquiry.
- Literacy that teaches students to trace power through platforms, algorithms, and headlines.
- Literacy that refuses to sanitize civic discourse in pursuit of false neutrality.

If we teach students to read between the lines—if we help them see that language is never neutral—we’re not just preparing them for the world as it is.

We’re empowering them to shape the world as it should be.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the University of Southern Indiana for providing research funding to support the open-access publication of this article. Appreciation is also extended for institutional support that made the dissemination of this work possible.

Authors contributions

The author was solely responsible for the study design, literature synthesis and analysis, manuscript drafting, and revision. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the University of Southern Indiana through internal graduate research funding to cover the open-access publication fee.

Competing interests

The author declares no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Redfame Publishing.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- Afrilyasanti, R., Indriyani, L., & Widiati, U. (2023). Factual vs. fake news: Teachers' lens on critical media literacy education in EFL classes. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(1), 42-55. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.13693>
- Ashbridge, L., Burnard, P., & Colley, H. (2022). Democratic citizenship, critical literacy and educational policy in England: A conceptual paradox. *Policy Futures in Education*, 20(5), 590-605. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103221075935>
- Beaver, D., & Stanley, J. (2023). *The politics of language*. Princeton University Press.
- Cone, S. (2004). Democratic morality and the Freedom Academy Debate: A conflict about institutionalizing propaganda in America, 1954-1968. *American Journalism*, 21(4), 13-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08821127.2004.10677608>
- Fabbro, F., & Gabbi, M. (2024). Addressing conspiracy theories through media and data literacy education: An exploratory case study. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*, 9(1), 33-45. <https://doi.org/10.13187/ijmil.2024.1.33>
- Florida House of Representatives. (2022). House Bill 7: Stop the Wrongs to Our Kids and Employees Act (Stop W.O.K.E. Act). Florida Legislature. <https://www.flsenate.gov/Session/Bill/2022/7>
- Mendes, K., & Amar, S. (2024). Media and information literacy (MIL) and emerging methodologies in early childhood education and primary school. *Journal of Children and Media*, 18(1), 19-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2024.11022334>
- Nash, L. (2024). Critical inquiry in (and about) media environments: Examining an asset-based digital literacy curriculum. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 16(1), 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2024-16-1-4>
- Notley, T., Dezuanni, M., & Zhong, H. F. (2023). Using YouTube to seek answers and make decisions: Implications for Australian adult media and information literacy. *Media International Australia*, 188(1), 100-117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X231188001>
- Oktay, S., & Bayraktar, H. (2024). The place of media literacy course in TRNC secondary education institutions and the use of technology in the course. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 14(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijemst.2745>
- Robertson, L., & Scheidler-Benns, J. (2016). Critical media literacy as a transformative pedagogy. *The International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 7(2), 165-186. <https://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/licej/published-papers/volume-7-2016/Critical-Media-Literacy-as-a-Transformative-Pedagogy.pdf>
- Stanley, J. (2015). *How propaganda works*. Princeton University Press.
- Stanley, J. (2018). *How fascism works: The politics of us and them*. Random House.
- Stanley, J. (2024). *Erasing history: How fascists rewrite the past to control the future*. Yale University Press.
- Wilson, C. (2022). Education and democracy: A phenomenological perspective of contemporary social studies curriculum in the United States. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 4(1), 24-39. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2022.3>