Proposition de corrigé DS du 23 janvier 2026

1. Fill the table – éléments exigibles soulignés, il fallait inclure au minimum ces informations pour que votre résumé de chaque document soit acceptable.

Document 1	Document 2	Document 3	Document 4
The Times (2025) **Opinion piece**	***BBC*** **(November 2025) NB before the ban News article**	***Ben Jennings*** **(2025) Cartoon**	***JMIR (2025)*** **Scientific article**
• A politician advocates a strict ban on social media for under-16s. • Social media blamed for sharp rise in anxiety, depression, self-harm and eating disorders. • The Australian ban is an example that Britain should follow. • Algorithms accused of pushing harmful content (body image, violence, radicalization): psychological justification. • Links drawn with crime, extremism and classroom disruption: social justification. • Teachers' unions and security agencies support action: democratic justification? • Ban framed as urgent, popular and already implemented abroad.	• Teenagers legally challenge the ban, which they see as unfair. • Seen as a violation of freedom of expression and communication – infringes on the fundamental rights of teenagers. • Social media valued for education, inclusion and political awareness: positive aspect of SM, tools for growth and self-development (an idea that challenges preconceptions). • Blanket ban considered disproportionate and ineffective. It will not solve mental health issue – if anything, it will make matters worse. • Responsibility should lie with platforms, not users. • Calls for moderation, digital literacy and age verification. A blind ban is not the solution: there are more progressive and rational approaches to this issue, that would also safeguard the fundamental rights of expression and socialization.	• Satirical visual commentary on the ban / Sydney Opera House poster for context • Father pushes his son out, mother on the couch, both parents can't look away from their phones, which matches the father's dramatic statement "it's too late for us" (prisoners of their digital tools) • Meaning of the light: warm, powerful light coming from the outside (real life) VS white, electric light coming from the smartphones (cold technological bubble). • Faces: mesmerized parents, alarmed father, drooling mother, speechless son): confusion reigns supreme. • Likely exposes contradictions or absurdity of prohibition for children only (hypocrisy?) • Criticizes the political shortsightedness of the ban, its bias, and its failure to address algorithms and business models which the whole population falls victim to.	• Confirms widespread exposure of youth to harmful content. • Existing moderation tools largely ineffective, and easily circumvented. • Debate between human moderators and AI systems as new tools are being developed to monitor online activity. • AI moderation easily bypassed by coded language, coined slang and verbal lookalikes. • Highlights platforms' retrenchment of moderators – moderating online content is less and less effective, but also less and less of a priority for tech companies. • Calls for platform liability and adaptable regulation: companies should bear the brunt of online moderation and social media regulation.
Main point of each document			
Should governments ban social media to protect children from long-term psychological and social harm?	**Does a social media ban unjustly restrict young people's rights and democratic participation?**	**Is banning social media for children a genuine solution or a hypocritical political move?**	**How can harmful online content be regulated effectively without relying on bans?**

2. The documents all discuss the consequences of exposure to social media at a young age and the solutions to protect the young from them.
3. Limiting the exposure of the young to social media // The controversy about banning social media for the young
4. Is a social media ban an effective solution to protect young people from the harmful effects of exposure to social media?
5. As Australia introduced a blanket ban on social media for all under-16s, it has come under a lot of controversy. This is the main issue discussed in this set of four documents. While Lord Nash advocated for such a ban in *The Times* in December 2025, it was criticized by teens rejecting it, as described by the *BBC* last November – or challenged by a cartoon by Ben Jennings (2025). The *Journal of Medical Internet Research* offered a more neutral approach in June. These documents present conflicting opinions about the need for a ban on social media, thus prompting one to wonder whether a social media ban is an effective solution to protect young people from the harmful effects of social media exposure. (123 words)

NB: l'exemple utilisé en accroche vient de l'article de la BBC, on ne peut pas inclure d'éléments/de connaissances personnels dans une synthèse, y compris dans l'accroche de l'intro. En présentant les sources, l'idéal est de les confronter dès l'introduction, témoignant ainsi de la diversité des approches dans le dossier proposé. Bien sûr, cette confrontation n'était pas exigible à ce stade, mais il faudra savoir le faire pour le DS d'avril et en spé.