

**Digital Literacies
practices in the
English language
classroom:
filter bubbles**

ABSTRACT

Globalization is an ongoing phenomenon that affects the world. From the third globalization, digital technology is being developed (KALANTZIS; COPE, 2006). One of them, the internet, is to be highlighted due to its increasing use. In this context, filter bubbles, that is, the personalization of content based on users' previous access, emerged. They prevent users from seeing different perspectives by only showing what they already believe in and like, but living with difference is crucial in this diverse world; schools are one of the institutions responsible for teaching that. Therefore, this paper aims to discuss the work with digital literacies in English classes through the analysis of a lesson plan about filter bubbles. The bibliography underlying this study includes works of authors such as Lankshear and Knobel (2006), Santaella (2018), and Selwyn (2014). This is a qualitative research based on action research (BURNS, 2015; PAIVA, 2019). Finally, I conclude that training students to deal with particular social practices online does not meet the goals of the digital literacies' theory; instead, teachers should encourage them to reflect and distrust, so they can do it in any context. Also, the lesson plan manages to work on how students can be affected by filter bubbles both in online and offline environments, but it fails at highlighting the danger of being surrounded only by people who share your ideas.

KEYWORDS: Digital literacies. English class. Filter bubbles.

¹ Aluna do mestrado em Letras na Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR); e-mail: nayara-mandarino@hotmail.com

1. TO SET THE TONE

Globalization is a continuous phenomenon that unequally takes place in societies all over the world. Consequently, it affects work relations, forms of entertainment, meaning-making processes, and ways of teaching and learning. Kalantzis and Cope (2006) discuss the great changes the world has been going through, which they divide into three. The first globalization is marked by the emergence of the first languages and human nomadism. There were differences concerning communication; the peoples dealt with them by developing interlanguages, hence, by negotiating meanings. Later, in the second globalization, writing systems emerged, but they were restricted to small social groups. The textual modality got its supremacy established with the help of modern imperialism and nationalism. Still about this period, homogenization was one of its aims; in schools, for instance, students would sit, experience one type of teaching, and take the same tests. Differences, therefore, were ignored. This starts to change in the third globalization, when new means of communication, especially the internet, are developed and contribute to highlight differences. This is the phase where meanings are highly multimodal, and the production of content is decentralized, that is, anybody can create texts and post them online. In this context, it becomes crucial to prepare students to deal with this reality and to think critically about it.

The English language has a big role in this process because of its use by different people all over the world, considering its hegemonic position. As a *Lingua Franca*, it is utilized by varied groups of people who do not share the same native language, who negotiate meanings and act on the language, so it can serve their needs and goals within certain contexts (CANAGARAJAH, 2007).

Considering language as discourse - which is embedded with unequal power relations and ideologies - demands that we deal with it critically, and that we recognize that it is a social construction through which we understand the world (JORDÃO, 2007). Digital technologies are increasingly part of students' realities. The virtual and the 'real' are so intertwined that it has become impossible to clearly identify the boundaries between one and the other, as they can no longer be separated (LÉVY, 2009; SANTAELLA, 2013). In this sense, considering the role of schools in preparing critical citizens, digital technologies should be addressed from a critical perspective, so students can use them critically in and outside school.

This paper, therefore, aims to discuss the work with digital literacies in English classes through the analysis of a lesson plan about filter bubbles. The latter are responsible for personalizing our access to technology by filtering research results based on our previous activity online (SANTAELLA, 2018). The bibliography underlying this study includes works of authors such as Lankshear and Knobel (2006), Santaella (2018), and Selwyn (2014). This is a qualitative research based on action research (PHAKITI; PALTRIDGE, 2015; BURNS, 2015; PAIVA, 2019).

First, I discuss filter bubbles, explaining how they work and some of their possible consequences. Then, I talk about the definition of digital literacies, focusing on the educational context. Finally, I analyze a lesson plan of which I was the author, highlighting how the above-mentioned theory can be incorporated into the English classroom.

2. FILTER BUBBLES

Santaella (2013) discusses the changes digital technologies have been propelling. The author explains that there are four eras. The first one is called microcomputer and it starts in 1980 when the desktop started to be used. The next era World Wide Web (WWW) begins in the 2000s. In the Web 1.0, users were consumers of content that was produced by a small group of companies to millions of people. There was a clear division between producers and consumers. However, it started to be dissolved with the Web 2.0, when social media (e.g., Orkut and Facebook) networks emerged. Henceforth, users become producers as well, making what Jenkins (2009) calls ‘participatory culture’ possible. Consequently, the power relations between producers and consumers is affected, and the former tries to deal with it by creating content that requires more participation, for example, or by including what users create. Jenkins (2009) explains that technological changes take place very fast, and most of us are not ready to keep up with it. He also clarifies that it is not possible to ignore technology because it changes, among other things, how we communicate and interact with media.

The third era Santaella (2013) addresses is the Semantic Web, from 2010 to 2020. In this one, searches are based on concepts and the content becomes highly personalized; depending on what users (dis)like and on what they access, a profile is created, and the Web results are filtered to fit it. The author highlights that this is used especially for commercial purposes.

The name ‘filter bubble’ was used for the first time by Eli Pariser in 2010. He discusses the issue further in his book “The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you” (PARISER, 2011). This phenomenon is possible due to algorithms that surveil users’ clicks to filter results. Users, then, get to see only what is within their interests, creating a bubble in which they see reality only from their own perspectives and those of like-minded people. The author exemplifies his definition by showing that, when he asked two friends to look up the same thing on Google, they got different results which were based on the kind of websites they would normally access. By staying inside a bubble, we do not see what is beyond it, and this is the danger of filter bubbles.

Santaella (2018, p. 98, my translation) states that

search engines and social media promote ideological segregation because users end up being exposed, nearly exclusively, to unilateral visions within the wider political spectrum. When too entrenched due to its endless repetition, the one-sidedness of a viewpoint generates fixed beliefs, dampened by inflexible habits of thinking that shelter the formation of blind sects to everything that is outside the surrounding bubble.

Users get in contact only with content that corresponds to their own ideologies and become unable to see different perspectives. The internet, initially, provides people with the opportunity to talk to others from any place in the world and to expand their circle of social contacts, being forced, therefore, to see the differences that were ignored or unknown for so long. Filter bubbles restrict these circles again, and people continue interacting with more of the same. Santaella (2018) defends that one's beliefs are reinforced, which makes him/her more vulnerable to manipulation. She emphasizes that people have to be exposed to a kind of educational process that makes them question their own ideologies. Hence, the abilities required to use digital technology go beyond technical ones, it involves being able to reflect. The concept of digital literacies is in accordance with this argument. I will address this theory in the following topic.

3. DEFINING DIGITAL LITERACIES

Santaella (2013) discusses how the concept of ubiquity – that is, being able to connect with online practices anytime, anywhere – permeates and has had implications on diverse spheres. Some of them include the reconfiguration of time and space, modification on how people read and learn. With regard to education, the author explains the different means to learn which emerged due to communication technology. The processes go from the use of textbooks to m-learning (m stands for mobile); all of each are structured and share some similarities with the organization of learning in a face-to-face class. She also proposes the emergence of ubiquitous learning. Not only can it happen anytime and anywhere, it is also characterized for being chaotic and spontaneous, different from the above-mentioned processes. She states that “as technology evolved it became more personalized, user-centered, mobile, network-based, ubiquitous, and durable, learning became equally individualized, learner-centered, situated, collaborative, and ubiquitous” (SANTAELLA, 2013, p. 292-293, my translation).

Therefore, there have been impacts on how people learn and deal with information; something that calls for rethinking traditional schooling. However, even though digital technologies have changed profoundly people's lives and interactions, “the educational model inherited from the past, based on the legitimated authority of knowledge to be transmitted and acquired, has remained relatively intact” (SANTAELLA, 2020, p. 7). In this sense, simply implementing technological devices in school does not necessarily mean that practices will be changed; teachers need to be prepared to work with them and be willing to rethink their own practices.

Digital technologies can be used for different purposes. When it comes to the educational context, many people believe that such devices alone are responsible for changing the learning process for better. However, Selwyn (2014) argues that what really matters and can make a difference in the classroom is **how** technology is used. The author defends that educational

technology is ideologically driven, that is, there are distinct interests and purposes surrounding the development and use of technology, which is why it can (and should) be questioned and distrusted. There are interest struggles and power relations where some people get more benefits than others.

‘educational technology’ is deceptively neat shorthand for a diverse array of socio-technical devices, activities and practices. Above and beyond the multitude of technological devices and artefacts themselves, ‘educational technology’ refers to a wide-ranging field of activities and practices – that is, what is done with these technologies in the name of education. Perhaps less obviously, ‘educational technology’ also refers to a commercial field of technology development, production and marketing, as well as a thriving field of academic study and scholarship (SELWYN, 2014, p. 6).

Therefore, educational technology depends on how teachers use it to meet learning goals. Despite being a teaching tool, it is also a product with commercial ends. The author (2014, p. 10) defends that “educational technology needs to be understood both as process and as discourse” because it is a continuing matter which involves social practices and power struggles, and it is embedded in a cultural and historical context. The skeptical look towards technology is not to be taken as discrediting its potential, but to see it as it really is; only then can it be truly explored.

Awareness of the ideologies that permeate the use of technology – our own use included – is one of the principles discussed within the digital literacies theory, which also draws attention to the need for questioning and deconstructing.

Lankshear and Knobel (2006) explain two main types of definition of digital literacy. The first one refers to typical conceptual definitions which understand the theory as a set of abilities that includes understanding, evaluating, and using information presented in online contexts through monomodal or multimodal texts. Thus, it goes beyond technical skills. On the other hand, the second type of definition involves attempts to establish standardized operationalizations that a digitally literate individual can perform. The goal is to list the abilities that define what digital literacy is. The authors, then, highlight common features in mainstream definitions of the theory. First, they put information as the center of the concept; they base the theory on an idea of what is true and what is not; and they believe digital literacy is a set of abilities one can have and use to access online environments. Lankshear and Knobel (2006) criticize these ideas. They argue that the theory cannot be restricted to interacting with information, it goes beyond that, it involves social practices and interactions. The idea of ‘truthiness’ is also problematic because credibility and power are entirely interrelated. Finally, digital literacy is not something one can possess, it is an ongoing process immersed in a social context:

we should think of «digital literacy» not as something unitary, and certainly not as some finite «competency» or «skill» – or even as a set of competencies or skills. Rather, it means we should think of «digital literacy» as shorthand for the myriad social practices and conceptions of engaging in meaning making mediated by texts that are produced, received, distributed, exchanged etc., via digital codification. Digital literacy is really digital literacies (LANKSHEAR; KNOBEL, 2006, p. 13).

Considering that digital literacies is in the plural, the social practices are included in the theory, and they cannot be limited to a thing someone can master. There are different social practices, therefore, literacies.

According to Bezerra (2017), the word literacy, however, was initially used as a synonym of alphabetization. Starting in the 80's some authors begin to question and amplify this definition. In the 90's, based on the argument that the 'old' literacies could no longer be considered enough to prepare people to act in a changing world, the New London Group coin the concept multiliteracies, which “suggests a pedagogy for active citizenship, centered on learners as agents in their own knowledge processes, capable of contributing their own as well as negotiating the differences between one community and the next.” (COPE; KALANTZIS, 2009, p. 172). The 2000's, as per Bezerra (2017), are marked by studies (such as LANKSHEAR; KNOBEL, 2007) which defend that meaning and language cannot be considered apart from social practices. Digital literacies refer to the variety of practices which can take place in digital environments.

Digital literacies are not limited to technical abilities, but, in order to get involved with social practices online, one needs these skills. For instance, to record a video using a cellphone, a person must know where to click and to which direction to point the camera. Nonetheless, the opposite is not true. A person with technical abilities cannot be considered literate; reflecting on the social practices and their implications is necessary - this is a complex ongoing process. Then, who gets to be considered digitally literate?

One of the implications of acknowledging the plural form of the theory's name is that it is impossible to measure or define all the social practices included within the concept of digital literacies, for different and ever-changing contexts and needs culminate in diverse social practices that equally go through transformations. Consequently, no person can be digitally literate in every single social practice.

In this sense, educating students to be critical and digitally literate is not training them to deal with every single context; it consists of providing them with the basis to question, reflect, and deconstruct ideas regardless of the social practice with which they will get involved.

4. METHODOLOGY

This paper follows a qualitative approach, which, as per Phakiti and Paltridge (2015, p. 25) “in applied linguistics typically seeks to make sense of language, language learning or use in context, or a social phenomenon as it occurs in natural settings such as social and classroom settings.” In this case, I focus on language learning, analyzing an English class plan in light of digital literacies. According to the qualitative approach, one does not seek to find general rules but address phenomena specifically, understanding that they are bound to context. Therefore, I emphasize that I do not intend to suggest the use of this class plan as a ‘recipe’ which can be applied in every classroom. What I do here is analyze the class planning process, considering the conflicts that emerged on the way, given the goal of preparing classes which converse with the digital literacies theory.

Here I study my own process of class planning, aiming to problematize and change my teaching practices, as well as to contribute to other teachers’ reflections on their practice. In this sense, I am the participant and researcher of the action, engaging in action research (BURNS, 2015; PAIVA, 2019). Action research, according to Burns (2015, p. 188), “involves a self-reflective, systematic and critical approach to enquiry by participants who are at the same time members of the research community.”

This research, therefore, falls under the umbrella of action research, given that I am conducting an enquiry of my own practice as a teacher with the aim of not only improving it but also of sharing the findings with other teachers to provoke reflections (BURNS, 2015; PAIVA, 2019). Data was gathered through field notes, document collection (that is, all documents elaborated to be used in the class – lesson plan and slides presentation), and teaching logs (FREEMAN, 1998).

I highlight, finally, that the focus of this paper lies on the class planning process not on the actual development of classes in a school, given that the latter did not happen – as the planning took place in a supervised teaching practicum discipline I took as an undergraduate student of *Letras*. Data on the implementation of the plan could enrich the research and shed light on the conflicts and negotiations which permeate the development of lessons within a school; this is, then, an aspect to be considered in subsequent researches. In the following topic, I analyze the class plan, highlighting how the digital literacies theory was incorporated.

5. ENGLISH LESSON ANALYSIS

Although that plan would not be implemented in a specific class, I considered pieces of information that could make it more contextualized; however, I acknowledge that modification can and should be made as the context requires. The lesson was created for 11th grade students. It was planned to last two classes of 50 minutes each – as it is common in Brazilian public schools. The resources required include smartphones or computers and internet.

The goal of the lesson is to analyze titles of reports that use the simple present, stemming from the mood (statement or question), realizing how the news shown in search results are related to social bubbles. The objective was defined in a way that would encompass the study of grammar – simple present – within an authentic text, that is, one that students would possibly find in a real-life situation – news reports online –, and the work with digital literacies. The goal of the class is not to teach how to use digital technology but to work on English and encourage reflection regarding language use in online environments, considering that we are dealing with an English class. Therefore, language teaching and digital literacies are approached in a balanced way. In other words, it is not part of the plan to teach pupils how to use technology, given that digital literacies are focused on social practices within digital spaces. However, bearing in mind that there are many different social practices which are related to factors like socioeconomic position, some students might not be familiarized with some of the technical abilities required. I emphasize again the importance of analyzing the context; it might be necessary for students to learn the technical abilities underlying this social practice, which would require strategies, such as having them teaching one another (if some pupils know how use the devices) or have them learning as they do it, allowing them to experiment.

Regarding the mood, Janks (2014) defines it as the manner through which the verb clauses are used to position the listener/reader. The author indicates four moods and defends that grammar should be approached from a critical perspective, which is why those involved with the meaning-making process should be aware of how they are positioned and/or position others.

Figure 1 - Verb moods

Mood	Speaker	Possible positions for the listener to take up
Statement	Gives information	The listener needs the information. Listeners can accept or reject it.
Question	Asks for information	The listener is someone who knows the answer. S/he can give the information or refuse to share it.
Command	Demands goods or services	The listener is someone that the speaker has the right to command. The speaker can obey or disobey the command.
Offer	Offers goods or services	The listener can accept or reject the offer.

Source: Janks (2014, p. 83).

In the lesson, I focused on two of the moods, statement and question, to work on the simple present, considering that it is common to find these structural features in news reports.

The warm-up of the class is a game called Tic-tac-toe, which aims at revising content previously taught and brainstorming new ideas to be

developed in the current class. Students should be divided into two groups, one of them plays with an ‘O’ and the other with an ‘X’. The teacher draws a hash (#) and writes the following topics in the squares: simple present spelling, simple present use – it should be written twice -, simple present form, report, internet, research, headline, and society. To place the ‘O’ or ‘X’, students have to explain their understanding of the given topic. It is presupposed here that the simple present was discussed in previous classes.

The second activity requires pupils to write a brief description of what they understand by ‘Brazilian society’. The goal is to make students realize their own understandings of the topic. After that, students should analyze, considering the mood, two news headlines the teacher found by searching on Google ‘Brazil society news’. Both have to include the use of simple present. The work with filter bubbles starts in this activity because the results the teacher gets will be different from the ones that will show up to students. The first headline is adapted from the website The Globe and Mail²: “Brazil is colour bind”, students will see it along with the video that can be found in the report; it shows images of Brazilian people who have different skin colors. The second headline is “Jair Bolsonaro: Who supports Brazil’s new president?” from BBC News³. Some of the images used in the report should be displayed to students.

To guide the analysis, I have elaborated the following questions that should be used with both headlines:

- a) Who are the people in the video? Can you describe them?
- b) How is the Brazilian society apparently portrayed?
- c) How is the image related to the headline of the report?
- d) Why is the simple present used?
- e) How do you feel about this headline? Is it questioning, stating, denying something?

This activity encourages students to analyze how the reader is positioned with the use of the moods statement and question, respectively. They should also think of reasons why the simple present is used and about the effects of this choice.

Next, students get together in groups of five people, but they search on Google the terms ‘Brazil society news’ individually. Note that the same words were used by the teacher. It is important that students choose their groups because they will be with their closest colleagues – the circle of friends who share similar views. They will, then, compare the results with their own group, and later, with other groups. They will be able to see how the filter bubble works: they will get different results based on what they access and on their beliefs. They will also realize that within their circle of

2 Available at: <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/brazils-colour-bind/article25779474/>. Access on: 19th March 2019.

3 Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-45979682>. Access: 19th March 2019.

close friends the results might be more similar than the ones students with different ideas get. The point is not only to see how filter bubbles work, but also to notice that they are related to the social bubble. We choose to be friends with people who share similar values and opinions with us. Santaella (2018) explains that this happens because the human mind is attracted to the same kinds of patterns that reinforce one's beliefs. This traps individuals into a social bubble, which is happening in online environments as well.

The next activity consists of choosing one report that includes simple present use to be analyzed according to the above-mentioned questions. They should write the answers, instead of discussing them like they did before. They will compare this analysis with the text they wrote about the Brazilian society in the beginning of the class. Once again, they will be able to see how the results they get are similar to their opinions. Finally, students share their analysis.

The activities in the class encourage students to investigate, reflect, and get to conclusions. That is why instead of having the teacher telling them how filter bubbles work, they find it out through the tasks which stimulate the act of questioning and analyzing content they find online as well as their own beliefs and ideologies. In this sense, the plan addresses one social practice which takes place within the online environment – reading news – and encourages reflection on it, in line with digital literacies theory. As I mentioned before, it may be necessary to work on technical skills if, for instance, students do not know how to look for news, but the lesson does not focus on that. The attention is on the above-mentioned specific social practice, which is approached from a critical perspective, so students reflect on what they do online and on their own understandings of the texts they access.

In summary, the class works on an online social practice (reading news) and an issue related to it (only accessing news which reinforce one's beliefs). One aspect of the English language, which can permeate such practice was addressed (simple present), considering how verb moods might position the reader. However, rather than teaching students a set of abilities they would need to deal with the social practice, the focus is on encouraging the acts of distrust and reflection.

5. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The education of critical citizens who can actively engage in social practices is part of English teaching objectives in public schools. This means that teaching a language cannot be restricted to working on its structure, it requires the understanding that language is a social construction which is embedded in a cultural, political, social, and economic context.

Digital technologies are part of students' realities, so they cannot be ignored. Teachers should encourage critical thinking in a way that also stimulates autonomy. In other words, instead of training students to develop a set of abilities, teachers should do activities that make them reflect and

find out things for themselves, so they can do the same in other contexts. This kind of activity demands teaching practices that differ from teacher-centered classes in which the teacher talks, and students listen most of the time. However, getting them to discover things by themselves is not an easy task; it demands that we reflect on how we have come to our own understandings, so we can trace a path that will do the same for them.

Working with digital technologies in class does not mean teaching how to use technology because this is a set of technical abilities, and being digitally literate goes beyond that. In addition, when thinking of a lesson plan that is linked to a theory – be it digital literacies or any other, it is crucial not to forget pedagogical aims. The English class aimed to analyze the verb tense simple present critically in news reports and, at the same time, work on filter bubbles through the lenses of the digital literacies theory, which has to be approached within social practices, just like language must be taught as part of a context.

The class plan seeks to show students that filter bubbles exist and can take away pupils' opportunity to get in contact with different perspectives. The difference exists in every possible way, when it is not recognized and understood as natural, the reaction to it is trying to erase it, in an attempt of homogenization, like what happened strongly in the second globalization (KALANTZIS; COPE, 2006). The lesson, therefore, succeeds in addressing how students can be affected by filter bubbles in and outside the classroom, but it fails in highlighting how being immersed in a bubble can be dangerous. This is one point that should be improved in the lesson.

Finally, I highlight again that the implementation of this lesson with a class would provide important insights not only to rethink the plan but also my teaching practice. As I sought to make clear, the development of class happens in and with the context, which requires that we, teachers, deal with whatever emerges from the complex interactions that take place within a classroom.

PRÁTICAS DE LETRAMENTOS DIGITAIS NA SALA DE AULA DE LÍNGUA INGLESA: *FILTER BUBBLES*

RESUMO

A globalização é um fenômeno contínuo que afeta todo o mundo. A partir da terceira globalização, as tecnologias digitais passaram a ser desenvolvidas (KALANTZIS; COPE, 2006). Uma delas é a internet, que se destaca pelo seu uso crescente. Nesse contexto, as *filter bubbles*, isto é, a personalização de conteúdo baseada nos sites acessados pelos usuários, emergiram. Elas impedem os usuários de entrar em contato com perspectivas diferentes, mostrando apenas o que eles já concordam e gostam; porém, viver com a diferença é crucial no mundo diverso em que vivemos e as escolas são uma das instituições responsáveis por ensinar isso. Desse modo, este artigo objetiva discutir o trabalho com letramentos digitais nas aulas de língua inglesa, através da análise de um plano de aulas sobre *filter bubbles*. A base teórica desse estudo inclui Lankshear e Knobel (2006), Santaella (2018) e Selwyn (2014). Trata-se de uma pesquisa qualitativa, baseada na pesquisa-ação (BURNS, 2015; PAIVA, 2019). Finalmente, conclui que ensinar alunos a lidar com uma prática social on-line específica não coincide com os objetivos da teoria dos letramentos digitais; em vez disso, professores devem encorajá-los a refletir e desconfiar, para que eles possam fazê-los em qualquer contexto. Também, o plano de aulas sucede em trabalhar como os alunos podem ser afetados pelas *filter bubbles* tanto em ambientes on-line, quanto off-line; no entanto, ele falha em ressaltar o perigo de estar rodeado apenas por pessoas que compartilham de suas ideias.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Letramentos digitais. Aula de inglês. *Filter bubbles*.

REFERENCES

BEZERRA, S. S. Letramentos em questão: um resgate histórico. **Linguagem em Foco**, Fortaleza, v. 9, n. 1, p. 131-139, 2017.

BURNS, Anne. Action Research. *In*: PALTRIDGE, Brian; PHAKITI, Aek. **Research methods in applied linguistics: a practical resource**. London: Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2015.

CANAGARAJAH, Suresh. Lingua Franca English, Multilingual Communities, and Language Acquisition. **The Modern Language Journal**, v. 91, 2007.

COPE, Bill; KALANTZIS, Mary. “Multiliteracies”: New Literacies, New Learning?. **Pedagogies: An International Journal**, [S.l.], v. 4, n. 3, p. 164-195, 2009.

FREEMAN, D. **Doing Teacher Research: from inquiry to understanding**. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning, 1998.

JANKS, Hilary. Grammar as a resource for critical literacy. *In*: JANKS, Hilary. et al. **Doing critical literacy: texts and activities for students and teachers**. New York: Routledge, 2014.

JENKINS, Henry. **Cultura da convergência**. São Paulo: Aleph, 2009.

JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes. O que todos sabem.... ou não: letramento crítico e questionamento conceitual. **Revista Crop**, 2007.

KALANTZIS, Mary; COPE, Bill. On Globalisation and Diversity. **Computers and Composition**, v. 23, n. 4, 2006.

LANKSHEAR, Colin; KNOBEL, Michele. Digital literacies: policy, pedagogy and research considerations for education. **Digital Kompetenz: Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy**, 2006.

LANKSHEAR, Colin; KNOBEL, Michele. Sampling the “new” in the new literacies. *In*: LANKSHEAR, Colin; KNOBEL, Michele (Eds.). **A New Literacy Sampler** (new literacies and digital epistemologies). New York, Peter Lang, 2007. p. 1-24.

LÉVY, Pierre. **Cibercultura**. (Trad. Carlos Irineu da Costa). São Paulo: Editora 34, 2009.

PAIVA, Vera Lucia Menezes de Oliveira. Pesquisa-ação. *In*: PAIVA, Vera Lucia Menezes de Oliveira. **O Manual de Pesquisa em Estudos Linguísticos**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2019. p. 72-78.

PARISER, Eli. **The filter bubble**: What the internet is hiding from you. London: Penguin, 2011.

PHAKITI, A.; PALTRIDGE, B. Approaches and Methods in Applied Linguistics Research. *In*: PALTRIDGE, B.; PHAKITI, A. **Research methods in applied linguistics**: a practical resource. London: Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2015. p. 19-33.

SANTAELLA, Lucia. **Comunicação ubíqua**: repercussões na cultura e na educação. São Paulo: Paulus, 2013.

SANTAELLA, Lucia. **A pós-verdade é verdadeira ou falsa?** São Paulo: Estação das Letras e Cores, 2018.

SANTAELLA, Lucia. Prefácio. *In*: SALES, Mary Valda Souza. (Org.). **Tecnologias digitais, redes e educação**: perspectivas contemporâneas. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2020. p. 7-9.

SELWYN, Neil. **Distrusting Educational Technology**: critical questions for changing times. New York: Routledge, 2014.

APPENDIX

Lesson plan

Target-students: 11th grade students from a public school.

Duration: two classes of 50 minutes each.

Resources: smartphones or computers and internet, sheets of paper, pencil or pen, board.

General objective: to analyze titles of reports that use the simple present, stemming from the mood (statement or question), realizing how the news shown in search results are related to social bubbles.

Specific objectives and procedures: - To revise the simple present and to activate previous knowledge in relation to researching titles of news online.

Warm-up: students play Tic-tac-toe in two groups which will compete between them. One of them plays with an 'O' and the other with an 'X'. The teacher draws a hash (#) on the board and writes the following topics in the squares: simple present spelling, simple present use – it should be written twice -, simple present form, report, internet, research, headline, and society. To place the 'O' or 'X', students must explain their understanding of the given topic.

E. g.:

Simple present spelling	Simple present use	Simple present form
Simple present use	Report	Internet
Research	Headline	Society

Possible duration: 10 minutes

- To describe the Brazilian society, revealing one's interpretations about it;

Each student writes, in a sheet of paper, a description of Brazilian society.

Possible duration: 10 minutes

- To analyze in groups two news stories found by the teacher in which the moods statement and question are used, realizing how the Brazilian society is portrayed in the teacher's search results and how the moods position the reader.

Two titles of news reports (which the teacher found using the keywords 'Brazil society news') in which the simple present was used will be analyzed by students, considering mood and how it positions the reader.

The questions that will guide the analysis are: Who are the people in the video? Can you describe them?

How is Brazilian society apparently portrayed?

How is the image related to the headline of the report?

Why is the simple present used?

How do you feel about this headline? Is it questioning, stating, denying something?

Possible duration: 20 minutes

- To gather in groups of five people and individually search for news reports which use the simple present, using the keywords: 'Brazil society news'.

Students will gather in groups of five people but will search on Google individually news reports in which the simple present is used. They will use the same keywords the teacher used: Brazil society news.

Students must choose their own groups, given that they will probably gather with their closest friends in the classroom.

Possible duration: 5 minutes

- To compare the results with other members of the group and with members of other groups, so they see that the results are different for each person, even when the keywords are the same, and that this is related to the social bubble in which they are inserted;

Students walk around the classroom and compare orally their results with the members of the group and then with the members of other groups.

Possible duration: 10 minutes

- To analyze individually a news report they found in the search, noticing how the Brazilian society is described and how the moods position them as readers;

Individually, students should select a news report and analyze it in written form, considering the following questions: Who are the people in the image? Can you describe them?

How is Brazilian society apparently portrayed?

How are the images related to the headline of the report?

Why is the simple present used?

How do you feel about this headline? Is it questioning, stating, denying something?

Possible duration: 10 minutes

- To compare the description of the Brazilian society which they wrote in the second activity with that of the news report they found, so as to see how the results are similar.

Students take the text they wrote in the second activity (in which they described the Brazilian society) and compare it with the analysis of the news report they found.

Possible duration: 5 minutes

Share the analysis with the class, so students can see how the Brazilian society can be portrayed and understood from different perspectives.

Students orally share the results with the class.

Possible duration: 30 minutes