



THE CONTEMPORARY MASS MEDIA EDUCATION IN RUSSIA: IN SEARCH FOR NEW THEORETICAL CONCEPTIONS AND MODELS

Alexander Fedorov

Abstract. Media education in Russia in general has still not moved from the theoretical conceptions and local experiments to the wide practical implementation. It is necessary to consolidate pedagogical institutions of higher education, universities, faculties of journalism, experimenters in media education and also the media community, coordination of the interaction of state structures, the existing media educational centers and experimental sites in this sphere.

Keywords: media education, media literacy, media competence, theoretical conception, models, Russia, researches.

Introduction

For many decades the professional educators and arts critics from Russian Academy of Education (L.M. Bazhenova, E.A. Bondarenko, S.I. Gudilina, A.A. Zhurin, L.S. Zaznobina, L.S. Pressman, K.M. Tikhomirova, Y.N. Usov, A.V. Sharikov, E.N. Yastrebtsova and others) and from pedagogical institutes and universities (O.A. Baranov, N.B. Kirillova, S.N. Penzin, G.A. Polichko, A.V. Fedorov, N.F. Khilko) have been working out theoretical conceptions and models of mass media education. Russian professional journalists and/or professorate, who taught journalism in institutes of higher education, didn't hurry to develop the theoretical sphere of this direction of pedagogics for the time being. They preferred to remain in the familiar range of problems of training of future media professionals, and/or to promote the traditional development of the practical branch of media education for schoolchildren and the youth (school and student newspapers, film/radio/television studios, etc.).

However, under the obvious influence of the significant progress of media education in the West (first of all in the leading English-speaking countries), and in Russia itself, the most mobile and active representatives of Russian journalism one after another began to develop this relevant field in the beginning of the XXI century.

Media Education and Journalism

The first serious theorist and journalist who paid attention to mass media education was A.P. Korochensky. In his doctoral thesis and monograph he justly substantiated the common tasks of media criticism and media education (Korochensky, 2003). Then S.G. Korkonosenko took the baton of interest of professional journalism to mass media education (Korkonosenko, 2004). In 2007 I.A. Fateeva published her monograph "Media Education: Theoretical Fundamentals and the Experience of Realization", which became a kind of manifesto of "journalistic view" on the problems of mass media education in Russia.

Firstly I.A. Fateeva proposed her own variant of the definition of the term "media education", interpreting it as "the scientific and educational field of study which subject is the means of mass media and communication in pedagogical aspect of their manifold connections with the world, society and mankind. In theoretical terms this field lies at the intersection of pedagogics and the complex science of media. In practical terms it presupposes joint activities of trainers and trainees in

preparation of people for the life in mediatized world, ... all the deliberate and systematic actions intended to satisfy the educational needs arising from the very fact of the existence of mass media. In other words it is the organized and sustained process of communication which gives rise to teaching of the production of mass media as well as their use” (Fateeva, 2007, p.11, 13-14).

As we can see, this definition is relatively tight and unlike the series of detailed definitions of UNESCO put forward from 1970s to 2000s (see, for example, the definition of UNESCO, 2001, which emphasizes the democratic and humanistic principles of media education), it tends to universality and neutrality of generalization.

Secondly, after analyzing various theories of media education elaborated by media educators in different countries, I.A. Fateeva concluded that to “derive” the media educational conception from theories of communication is not only unwise but also harmful, because in that way the conceptual disunity of teachers and their students is originally laid, it is burdened by the moral and ethical problems. Not having come to a common solution on the merits, teachers begin to impose their own vision of the problem on their audience” (Fateeva, 2007, pp.25-26).

Probably many media educators will consider such an obvious rejection of media theories of the conceptual approaches to media education to be rather questionable, but the confusing thing something different: why do teachers must “impose their own vision of the problem”? Can’t the process of correct joint comparative analysis of various theories and/or conceptions with the audience be productive?

Thirdly (and this probably is the most important), I.A. Fateeva considers the practical approach to be “the starting point of the theory of media education and the basis for the decision on which educational technology to prefer.” (Fateeva, 2007, p.26). At that the researcher interprets the practical approach much wider than its narrow treatment (that is to teach the audience to use media equipment and create media texts with the help of it). I.A. Fateeva believes that practical approach in media education must rest upon the “theory of media activity” (with the detailed classification of the forms of media education and the elaboration of its pedagogical principles), according to which “it is logical for media education as the form of organization of educational process to be built upon the consecutive unfolding of favorable conditions by the pedagogues for the audience to master the following *forms of activity*:

- adequate perception of media texts as products of human activity, understanding the mechanisms of their origin and replication, their critical evaluation and the qualified opinion about them;
- observation of the functioning of mass media and communication in the society (both the system and its individual enterprises), understanding of them for the deliberate choice and use of them;
- participation in the dialogue with mass media on the basis of modern technology;
- mastering of the process of the creation of media texts on the basis of participation in media educational projects of different scale” (Fateeva, 2007, p.34).

At that she justly mentioned that “in our time, the time of ever-increasing interactivity of modern means of mass communication, the passive media education is unable to meet the challenges of preparing people for the life in mediatized society”. The researcher concludes that among other practical forms of media education, the *media education project* should become the core technological form of media education, and “the mastering of the methodology of its implementation is mandatory for professional media educators” (Fateeva, 2007, p.120).

Thus the “theory of media activity” in the treatment of I.A. Fateeva is clearly synthetic in nature and it incorporates many elements of the earlier theories of media education.

A year after the publication of I.A. Fateeva’s monograph she formulated her position even clearer: “We offer the media education community to consider the theory of media activity capable of being the theoretical unifying, integrative axis, which modern media education lacks so much, for the consolidation of scientists and teachers from different schools as an alternative to the above mentioned conceptions (*semiotic, cultural, aesthetic, social and cultural, the theory of the development of critical thinking, etc. – A.F.*). The proposed theory originally comes from the consistently competent

approach to the educational process and aims at the final result of the mutual activities of students and teachers, for both types of media education (professional and mass)” (Fateeva, 2008, p.141).

Time will tell how I.A. Fateeva’s “theory of media activity” will be accepted by Russian and foreign media teachers, but it’s clear that its synthetic orientation correlates with the final result of media education – *media literate personality*, i.e. the totality of its motives, knowledge, skills, abilities (indicators: motivational, contact, informative, perceptive, interpretative / evaluative, practical and operational / activity, creative), to facilitate selection, use, critical analysis, evaluation, creation and transmission of media texts in a variety of types, forms and genres, the analysis of complex processes of functioning of media in society (Fedorov, 2007, p.54).

Discussions about Media Education

However, the community of theorists who have come from journalism does not always understand such interpretation of the concept of “media competence”. For example, quoting the indicators of media competence which I had worked out, I.M. Dzyaloshinsky and I.V. Zhilavskaya concluded that “all the authors quoted by A.V. Fedorov (and he himself) restrict themselves to media sphere when reflecting on the indicators of media competence. As if the ability to consume and produce media texts is needed only to consume and produce media texts. (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008, p.88; Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.109).

I don’t agree with this. Aren’t the indicators which I have worked out related to social issues (including moral, civic, etc.)? After all, people’s motives for choosing, perception and/or creation of media texts are always connected with social and cultural context, as well as its moral, civic attitudes. The same can be said about the interpretational and evaluative indicator of media competence. While interpreting and evaluating media texts the audience is always based on its (rather differentiated) social and cultural positions, again incorporating aspects of morality, religion, citizenship, etc. And how can we evaluate the processes of media functioning without the analysis of the problems of society, isolating ourselves within the media texts like in a shell?

No wonder that in the definitions of UNESCO (UNESCO, 2001 and others) media education and media competence are consistently connected with the development of democratic thinking and the development of civic responsibility of a personality.

Reasoning about the mission of media education in general, I.M. Dzyaloshinsky further states that “the social significance of media education is not so much in improving media competence of the individual, as in the formation of the aim at media activity” (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008, p.90), which controls “an individual’s actions for searching (or producing) information in the sphere of media” (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008, p.91) and has the “six basic types”: “search, reception, consumption, translation, production, distribution of mass information” (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008, p.93).

In my opinion there’s nothing new in I.M. Dzyaloshinsky’s definition of “media activity”. In fact it is the worsened version of the much more thoroughly grounded and developed I.A. Fateeva’s “theory of media activity” (Fateeva, 2007, p.34).

For example, “consumption” is mentioned among the types of “media activity”, but nothing is said about “the analysis of media texts” which is a crucial type for media education (incidentally, it was quite justly accented by I.A. Fateeva). Moreover, activities such as “translation”, “distribution of mass information” have never been considered in the key ones media education. What is important for any media agency (translation, distribution) is secondary for the purposes of media education. “Media active” schoolboy easily sends SMSes or simple-minded chat messages like “Maria, where are you? Let’s have a party!”, but at the same time completely unable to analyze a simple media text (published, for instance, in a popular paper), can hardly be called “media literate”...

The following statement of I.M. Dzyalozhinsky seems to me extremely controversial. He says that “the traditional “pedagogical” approach to media education, which restricts itself to the analysis of “individual - media text” relations, cannot answer the main questions:

- What is the reason of the existence of exactly this configuration of informational and media environment in contemporary Russia?

- Why do media produce just these media texts rather than other?

- What has an individual to do when he needs not only to protect himself from “the corrupting influence of media”, but also to search for the necessary information for success in life?” (Dzyalozhinsky, 2008, p.99).

The reality is quite the opposite. “Pedagogical” media education approaches never limited themselves to the “hermetic” analysis of media texts, on the contrary, they have always reached for the analysis of multifaceted relationships between media and society (see, for example: Masterman, 1997, p.51-54; Silverblatt, 2001, p.45-47, 55; Zaznobina, 1996, pp.75-76; Fedorov, 2001, pp.81-84; Fedorov, 2003; 2010; Fedorov, 2007, pp.189-193; Fedorov, 2010; Sharikov, 1991 and others).

Moreover, “critical thinking in relation to the system of media and media texts is a complex reflective process of thinking, which includes associative perception, synthesis, analysis and evaluation of the mechanisms of functioning of media in society and media texts (information / messages) which come to people by means of mass communication. Thus the development of critical thinking is not the final goal of media education; it is its constant component” (Fedorov, 2007, p.86).

At the end of his article, I.M. Dzyalozhinsky comes to another conclusion which is very controversial in my opinion, that “further development of media education is connected with the development of the civilian-based approach, which aim is not just to increase the level of media competence of students, but to increase media activity of the population. That in turn would stimulate the development of civil communications, ensuring the establishment and development of civil society” (Dzyalozhinsky, 2008, p.99).

I.V. Zhilavskaya shares approximately the same opinion. She states that “media education is the activity in the field of media, the work of consciousness and subconsciousness, the analysis and correlation of self and society with the global problems of mediatized environment. In fact, media education is a form of civic education. It allows young people to become responsible citizens who understand how and by means of what their town, their country and the whole world lives” (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.75).

Of course media education absorbed the orientation to civic responsibility, humanism and democracy a long time ago (see, for example: UNESCO, 2001, p.152; Buckingham, 2000; Ferguson, 1997; Gonnet, 2001, p.24; Korochensky, 2003; Fedorov, 2003; Fedorov, 2001; 2007, p.370, etc.). However if to highlight the “civic approach” out of the broad spectrum of tasks of media education, then it’s better not to deal with media education, but with citizenship or social studies (including them as the academic disciplines). Besides we shouldn’t forget that the concept of “media competence” seamlessly incorporates the component of “media activity” as well...

Putting forward the new interactive (journalists) model of modern media education I.V. Zhilavskaya wrote (though without giving any particular examples), that “the overwhelming majority of research papers and theses which deal with the matters of media education one way or another, and related to the field of pedagogics, virtually doesn’t explore the productive function of media education in relation to the phenomenon of media, which in this context is equivalent to the educational component of the subject” (Zhilavskaya, 2009, pp.104-105). “This conception is realized in the new interactive (journalists) model of media education, which should be differentiated from the pedagogical model. The basis for distinguishing between these models is the spatial and role arrangement of the participants of media education activity in the existing system of coordinates” (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.106).

Supporting her proposed model I.V. Zhilavskaya refers to the “conception of Russian media education module”, “worked out by Y.N. Zasursky and E.L. Vartanova” (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.177). Further in her monograph I.V. Zhilavskaya cites a table from the article “Russian media education module: conceptions, principles, models” (Vartanova, Zasursky, 2003, pp.5-10), containing a list of the following key “aspects of media education”: media agencies, media categories, media technologies, language of media, media audience, representation of reality in media.

In fact, this table is just a Russian translation of the original table worked out by British teachers of media – C. Bazalgette and A. Hart in the early 1990s (Bazalgette, 1991, p.8; Bazalgette, 1995; Hart,

1991, p.13; 1997, p.202). Moreover, the foundations of pedagogical media education model based on the above mentioned six key aspects/concepts of media education, had been stated by C. Bazalgette herself during the Russian-British seminar on media education in Moscow in 1995 and were translated and published in Russian the same year (Bazalgette, 1995).

Thus, to put it mildly, the basis of the so-called “Russian module of media education” published by E.L. Vartanova and Y.N. can hardly be attributed to innovations... Moreover, not well-informed readers of the article “Russian module of media education: conceptions, principles, models” (Vartanova, Zasursky, 2003, pp.5-10) might get the false impression that the development of mass media education in Russia began almost in the XXI century, and not 80 years earlier, as it was in fact (see, for example, the works of 1920s: A.M. Gelmont, S.N. Lunacharskaya, B.N. Kandyrin; 1960-1990s: L.M. Bazhenova, O.A. Baranov, E.A. Bondarenko, I.V. Vaisfeld, L.S. Zaznobina, L.A. Ivanova, I.S. Levshina, V.A. Monastyrsky, S.N. Penzin, G.A. Polichko, L.P. Pressman, Y.M. Rabinovich, V.S. Sobkin, Y.N. Usov, A.V. Fedorov, A.V. Sharikov, A.Y. Shkolnik, N.F. Khilko and others).

The Attempt of New Journalistic Media Education Model

Anyway, let’s get back to I.V. Zhilavskaya’s monograph. In tabular form (Table 1) she tried to describe the benefits of the interactive (journalists) model of media education in comparison with pedagogical models.

Let’s try to analyze this table reasoning from the characteristics of the components which are given in it.

I think we can agree with the formulation of aims and subjects of pedagogical and interactive models, they are defined rather laconically and correctly, at that journalistic specificity was manifested in the second case. But in my opinion the formulation of the recipients/audiences is evidently incomplete. Of course, the audience of the journalists model represents most different sections of the population. But why does I.V. Zhilavskaya deny this in the pedagogical model? After all, in pedagogical models as well the students (including the process of self-education) can also be (and they are) people of different ages and professions.

The division of communicative strategies into “influence” (pedagogical model) and “interaction” (journalists model) is even more objectionable. The contemporary pedagogics (and media education) rejected the methods of one-sided “top-down” influence (“omniscient” teachers – «tabula rasa» students) long time ago. Pedagogics of interaction, collaboration, and designing methods are being implemented in “pedagogical” media education since several decades.

The category “means” also arouses similar objections. Current pedagogical models of media education include the aspects of modeling as well (E.A. Bondarenko, L.S. Zaznobina, E.S. Polat and many others), and not only the reproductive approaches. The same can be said about the forms of media education: almost everything listed by I.V. Zhilavskaya in the column relating to the interactive/journalists model of media education has long been practiced in pedagogical models as well (eg., media educational seminars and contests, the meetings of media cultural workers with the audience organized by Prof. O.A. Baranov and Associate Professor S.N. Penzin; annual media education festivals of Russian Association for Film and Media Education under the leadership of Prof. G.A. Polichko, etc.).

The line of Table 1 which compares the levels of motivation of pedagogical and journalists models of media education also deserves attention. We can agree that media educational motivation of ordinary teachers in Russia is low at present (see Fedorov, 2005, pp.259-277). But why does I.V. Zhilavskaya think that the level of media educational motivation of the subjects of the journalists model (journalists, directors, cameramen, media managers, other representatives of media society) is high?

Yes, Russia’s leading media agencies are working on a professional basis and pursuing commercial objectives, but do these goals really match with the true aims of media education? For example, the phenomenon of social (and based on the principles of humanistic orientation – also media educational) irresponsibility was brilliantly researched by A.V. Sharikov (Sharikov, 2005, pp.100-105, 137-140).

Table 1. Models of media education activity (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.107)

<i>Models of media education activity</i>		
	Pedagogical	Interactive (journalists)
Aim	Upbringing of media competent personality	Attracting the audience to mass media. Attracting the audience to the creation of media texts. Forming of its own mass media by the media competent audience. Forming of a positive image of mass media.
Subjects	Teachers of media, educators, librarians, other teaching staff.	Journalists, directors, cameramen, media managers, other representatives of media society.
Recipients	Students	The audience representing different social groups: young people, pensioners, representatives from business, government, HKO
Communicative strategies	Influence	Interaction
Means	Teaching, suggestion, demonstration, description	Modeling
Forms	Integration into the basic education, lessons, courses, educational programs with the use of media technology, study groups, production of student newspapers, magazines, radio and TV programs.	Creation of informational products in the form of newspapers, magazines, TV and radio programs, publications in mass media, products of online journalism, master classes, seminars, trainings, media festivals, competitions, meetings with readers / viewers / listeners, etc.
Level of motivation	Low in general. Individual enthusiasts are working based on personal interests.	High. Commercial. Professional structures are working.
Result	The society of media competent citizens	Forming of the communicative environment based on mutually beneficial cooperation with the audience. Forming of a positive image of mass media. Attracting audiences, the increase of circulation, ratings and income.
Effectiveness	Less high	Higher

Of course, in the ideal the real (i.e. aimed at the development of media competence of personality in the spirit of humanism and democracy) media educational motivation of media agencies and their staff could be really high. But alas, it is still a long way off. After all, in terms of the requirements of the journalistic model put forward by I.V. Zhilavskaya even the Russian TV channel “Culture” which is the most free from the commercialization is not very interactive.

Our objections are also related to the effectiveness and efficiency of pedagogical and journalistic models. For instance, we don’t think the high “media educational effectiveness” of the TV channels TNT (“Dom-2”) or NTV (speculation in the topics of crime and violence).

Recall that according to I.V. Zhilavskaya the effectiveness of journalistic model of media education is manifested in “forming of the communicative environment based on mutually beneficial cooperation with the audience; forming of a positive image of mass media; attracting audiences, the increase of circulation, ratings and income” (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.107). And that’s supposedly better than the result of the traditional pedagogical model of media education aimed at the creation of “the society of media competent citizens”...

There's no doubt that modern media agencies (both Russian and foreign) are successfully "forming the communicative environment" and "the positive image of mass media" (everybody wants to be the public's favorite), and are seeking any way to attract the audience, to increase circulation, ratings and income... But what does this have to do with the true humanistic aims and tasks of media education? And why is it better than the "pedagogical" efforts to create "the society of media competent citizens"?

By the way, I.V. Zhilavskaya realizes the vulnerability and the idealistic character of her journalists model of media education. "However it must be understood that today not all the leaders of the media are ready to put the task of raising the level of media competence of the audience and to conduct a purposeful media educational activity. Moreover, many of the mass media pursue other aims: to get quick and maximum profit at lower costs. This is possible in case of exploitation of human weaknesses and primitive needs. Media education doesn't contribute to the solution of this task, it also impedes it. Media educated audience sensitively reacts to changes in the content and quickly changes its preferences" (Zhilavskaya, 2009, p.108).

And here we can't but agree that "poorly educated audience brings to naught all the efforts to improve the quality of the functioning of mass media and vocational training institutions. The reason for this is the phenomenon of "communicative aberration", misunderstanding of messages by the recipients which makes the professionals to lower their aesthetic, moral and intellectual level. This tendency is most clearly manifested in the conditions of the present commercialization of Russian mass media" (Fateeva, 2007, p.35).

Psychological Conception of Media Education

Another contemporary researcher, M.V. Zhizhina (Zhizhina, 2009), unlike I.M. Dzyaloshinsky, I.V. Zhilavskaya and I.A. Fateeva with their journalists model puts forward the psychological conception of media education. She is convinced that "the conditions of globalization and technization of the contemporary society makes it important to study a wide range of psychological problems of media culture. Among them are:

- psychological safety of personality in the informational society;
- the study of the influence of specific types of media culture on the human psyche;
- the study of psychological mechanisms and consequences of the influence of media on the development of the personality of young people and their spiritual culture;
- psychological analysis of personality's well-being in the media environment;
- personal identity in the conditions of the global spread of mass media (the problem of crisis and the conflict of identity);
- the influence of media environment on the socialization of the individuals;
- the analysis of social and psychological functions of the computers and the Internet;
- virtual communication: specifics and effects;
- the study of social and psychological impact of the Internet on personality, including the analysis of age and gender characteristics of the users;
- gender characteristics of Internet users;
- psychology of dependence on virtual reality and cyberspace;
- movements of personality in multicultural media space (social and cultural adaptation and transitions of cultural boundaries);
- social and psychological effects of mass media in the life of individuals and in mass, group consciousness;
- the influence of social and cultural factors of the media environment on leisure practices;

- media education as a phenomenon of the development of personality in the media environment” (Zhizhina, 2009, p.60).

Hence she comes to a logical conclusion that media education is a “trend in pedagogics and psychology which advocates the study of the mechanisms of social and personal influences of means of mass communication and on the basis of this, the forming of media literacy of personality” (Zhizhina, 2009, p.70).

In my opinion this definition doesn't contradict with the already known ones (including the definitions of UNESCO). Psychological component of M.V. Zhizhina's conception is manifested in the way how the following is represented “in the concept of media competence as the result of personal media education: mental reflection and forming of (adequate) social ideas of media world; the behavior and the development of the new forms of behavior; attribution of behavioral patterns including group behavior through the mechanisms of conformity, imitation, infection, the expression of “oneself through action” and identification; relation of the subject in the forms socialization and individualization, the protection from personal identity, the manifestation of tolerance and immunity (to negative or manipulative influence of media world)” (Zhizhina, 2009, p.90).

V.A. Vozchikov also decided to make a ponderable contribution to the development of modern media education. He put forward a “media cultural model of the development of dialogical personality” (Vozchikov, 2007, p.231). Unfortunately, this model hasn't been clearly represented yet, but its general outlines can be traced by such key theses as “journalists work as a creative expression of personality; dialogical parties of text-formation and perception; mass communicative interaction; the place of media culture in the system of social priorities and values; contemporary newspapers, TV and radio programs: characteristics, orientation, peculiarities; anthropological and sociological aspects of media culture (“man-man”, “man-society” relationships); informational and communicative function as one of the main functions in the activity of media; verbal and nonverbal ways of handing over information by an anchorman; mass communication process – the dialogue between the creators of media culture and their audience” (Vozchikov, 2007, p.233).

Attempts for Pedagogical Media Education of Media Education

“Classical pedagogues” don't stand aside from media educational innovations as well. Thus not so long ago G.P. Maksimova put forward the justification of “media upbringing” as a direction in pedagogical theory and practice oriented to “overcome the contradiction between human values and personal meanings expressed by a set of media means. ... The very media process is media upbringing. ... Media upbringing is upbringing based on the use of media means creating a space filled with artistic values and images, which awakens the state of creation and semantic experiences in the process of upbringing. ... Creative personality in media upbringing is a man of culture, a free, spiritual, moral, humane and practical person capable of value and semantic communication in space, time and in the media, who creates a creative space in the activity and creative self-expression with the social and professional relevance” (Maksimova, 2006, p.22, 27).

Despite some stylistic imperfection (the word “media” implies the means of communication, so the phrase “media means” seems far-fetched to me), the introduction of the term “media upbringing” along with “media education” is quite justified, because in classical pedagogics the terms “education” and “upbringing” have long been existing...

Moreover, pedagogues wrote about media upbringing (as well as film upbringing) in earlier years as well. Another thing is that unlike G.P. Maksimova none of them have ever tried to so thoroughly separate the sphere of “media education” and “media upbringing”.

Examining the aims of media upbringing within the framework of personally oriented theory, G.P. Maksimova brings out the following:

- “disclosure and support of spiritual and moral abilities of the creative ascent of personality in media spaces (internal and external).
- forming the need for creative value and semantic and emotional self-expression through media;

- providing scientific and educational support in the formation of the project of the subjective value of the objectives, support and purposefulness in media processes;
- active development of media spaces in the aspect of upbringing opportunities;
- involvement into the process of vital and creative work, value meaning, emotional balance, social professionalism, tolerant communication and the development of personality through media;
- organization and use of creative systems of mutually enriching media spaces” (Maksimova, 2006, p.29).

In my opinion the above mentioned aims can be achieved within the framework of “traditional” media education. But it’s good that pedagogical ideas are not standing still, trying to find new perspectives in the seemingly well-studied processes...

One way or another, the problems of media culture and media education attract representatives of different sciences today. The reason is not only that “media culture is the dominant culture of the information society which way of existence is the activity of traditional and electronic media which recreate social and cultural picture of the world with the help of verbal, symbolic and visual images; the culture- universe which incorporates the functional diversity of mass, popular, elite cultures and their modifications, ontologically rooted in human activity; the culture-metamessage about the outlook of mankind” (Vozchikov, 2007, pp.61-62). But also in the intersubject and boundary character of media education which incorporated a wide range of ideas of pedagogics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, philology, political science, art history and other sciences. .

Media Education and the World’s Public Interest

For more than ten years media education is a compulsory component of education of *all* pupils in Canada and Australia from 1st to 12th forms. Similar programs of school media education have been adopted recently in Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

Media education today is at the peak of the world’s public interest. Not for nothing the recently adopted European Parliament Resolution:

- “maintains that media education should be an element of formal education to which all children should have access and which should form part and parcel of the curriculum at every stage of schooling;
- calls for media literacy to be made the ninth key competence in the European reference framework for lifelong learning set out in Recommendation 2006/962/EC;
- calls on the Commission, when, as announced, it lays down the media literacy indicators, to take into account both the quality of school tuition and teacher training in this field;
- notes that, in addition to educational and education-policy considerations, technical equipment and access to new technologies are also of vital importance, and maintains that school facilities need to be substantially improved so as to enable all schoolchildren to have access to computers, the Internet, and the necessary instruction” (European Parliament Resolution, 2008).

In the ideal it would be very helpful if the resolution of the European Parliament received a positive comment in the Russian Parliament, in the structures of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. And nowadays it seemingly has a good basis. In 2002 the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation officially approved university specialization 03.13.30 “Media Education” (the first specialists graduated in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute in 2007). In May, 2009 the Moscow Municipal Duma (at the suggestion of the dean of the faculty of journalism of MSU E.L. Vartanova) recommended to introduce media education in the capital schools. In the spring of 2009 Russian Minister of Communications and Mass Media I. Schegolev expressed support for mass media education...

Finally, “the increased use of information and communication technologies for the development of new forms and methods of education including remote education and **media education**” is named among the priority directions of the development of information and communication technologies in

the long-term perspective, “the Conception of long-term social and economical development of the Russian Federation until 2020” (approved by the Government of the Russian Federation, November 17, 2008).

Problem Areas in the Development of Mass Media Education

However, in relation to the Russian situation I.A. Fateeva (Fateeva, 2007, pp.144-145) notes the following *problem areas* in the development of mass media education:

- backwardness of mass media education in institutions of formal media education (secondary and vocational);
- lack of development of media education programs “for adults”;
- lack of attention to the problem of specialists training for different types of media education;
- extreme isolation of different levels of education and different thematic educational programs which doesn't meet modern requirements of openness and flexibility of education;
- lack of development of programs of additional journalistic education;
- lack of adequate diversity of programs because of the weakness of partnership between the educational sphere, media business and other interested parties;
- the complete absence of organized forms of mass media education in institutions of continuing education (in leisure and educational centers, offices of the society “Znanie”, institutions for middle-aged people, etc.) (however, this statement of I.A. Fateeva is quite debatable because namely in Russian leisure centers/cultural centers/clubs the practical branch of media education has been successfully developing for more than 80 years as photo/film/video circles, discussion film/video clubs – A.F.).

I can probably add the following difficulties in the development of media education:

- inactivity of the officials in institutes of higher education who don't hurry make concrete moves for introduction of media educational courses (while the potential for this is considerable, both in the spectrum of disciplines of regional component approved by the institutes themselves, and optional disciplines);
- traditional approaches of the structures of the Ministry of Education and Science which are focused on the support of the courses on information science and informational technology in education while the urgent problems of media education receive much lesser attention.

Conclusions

The successes of Russian theory and methodology of media education are much more noticeable: more than 100 monographs and textbooks, dozens of educational programs for schools and universities, and more than 1000 articles on the subject were published in the past 10-15 years. A specialized magazine “Media Education” is regularly issued since 2005. More than 70 theses on media education, media competence and media literacy have been successfully defended from 2000 till 2010, including 8 doctoral theses (see: Fedorov, 2009, pp.53-117). Russian media educators have received grants (including the Federal target program) of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (1999-2012), Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation (1999-2012), Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research (2002-2004), President's Programme “Support for Leading Scientific School of Russia” (2003-2005), UNESCO, the number of foreign foundations (“Open Society Institute”, MION – Ino-center, Fulbright, IREX, DAAD, etc.). More than 40 research grants have been received for the last 10 years.

Unfortunately, media education in Russia in general has still not moved from the experiment to the wide practical implementation. It is necessary to consolidate pedagogical institutions of higher education, universities, faculties of journalism, experimenters in media education and also the media community, coordination of the interaction of state structures, the existing media educational centers and experimental sites in this sphere.

References

- [1] Bazalgette, C. (1989). *Primary Media Education: A Curriculum Statement*. London: BFI, p.8.
- [2] Bowker, J. (Ed.) (1991). *Secondary Media Education: A Curriculum Statement*. London: BFI.
- [3] Buckingham, D. (2000). *The Making of Citizens*. London – New York: Routledge, 235 p.
- [4] Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 219 p.
- [5] *European Parliament Resolution of 16 December 2008 on media literacy in a digital world (2008/2129(INI))*<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2008-0598+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>
- [6] Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- [7] Fedorov, A. (2010). *Media Education and Media Literacy: Russian Point of View*. Saarbrücken (Germany): Lambert Academic Publishing, 364 p.
- [8] Ferguson, R. (1997). Moyens de communication de masse, éducation et démocratie. *Revue Éducations*. 1997. N 14, pp.16-20.
- [9] Gonnet, J. (2001). *Education aux médias: Les controverses fécondes*. Paris: CNDP, Hachette, 144 p.
- [10] Hart, A. (1991). *Understanding the Media: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge, p.13.
- [11] Hart, A. (1997). Textual Pleasures and moral Dilemmas: Teaching Media Literacy in England. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (UK): Transaction Publishers, p.199-211.
- [12] Masterman, L. (1997). A Rationale for Media Education. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (UK): Transaction Publishers, pp.15-68.
- [13] Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- [14] UNESCO (2001). Recommendations Addressed to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO. In: *Outlooks on Children and Media*. Göteborg: UNESCO & NORDICOM, 2001, p. 152.
- [15] Bazalgette, C. *Key Aspects of Media Education*. Moscow: Published by the Association for Film Education, 1995. 51 p.
- [16] Vartanova E.L., Zasursly Y.N. Russian module of media education: conceptions, principles, models // *Informational Society*, 2003. № 3. pp.5-10.
- [17] Vozchikov V.A. *Media Sphere of the Philosophy of Education*. Biysk: Biysk State Pedagogical University, 2007. 284 p.
- [18] Dzyaloshinsky I.M. Media Education: Pedagogical Technology of the School of Civil Communication? // *Media Education: from Theory to Practice* / Ed. Zhilavskaya. Tomsk: Edition of Tomsk Institute of Informational Technologies, 2008. pp.84-102.
- [19] Zhizhina M.V. *Media Culture: Cultural and Psychological Aspects*. Moscow: Vuzovskaya Kniga, 2009. 188 p.
- [20] Zhilavskaya I.V. *Media Education of the Young Audience*. Tomsk: Tomsk Institute of Informational Technologies, 2009. 322 p.
- [21] Zaznobina L.S. Media Educational Standard Integrated in the Humanities and Natural Sciences in Primary and Secondary General Education // *Media Education* / Ed. L.S. Zaznobina. Moscow: Moscow Institute of Teacher Training, 1996. pp.72-78.

- [22] Kirillova N.B. *Media Culture: from Modern to Post-modern*. Moscow: Academical Project, 2005. 448 p.
- [23] Korkonosenko S.G. *Teaching Journalism. Professional and Mass Media Education*. St. Petersburg: Mikhailovs Publ., 2004. 240 p.
- [24] Korochensky A.P. *“The Fifth Power”? Media Criticism in Theory and Practice of Journalism*. Rostov: Rostov State University, 2003. 284 p.
- [25] Maksimova G.P. *Media Upbringing in Higher Vocational Schools*. Rostov: Rostov State Pedagogical University, 2006. 180 p.
- [26] Fateeva I.A. *Media Education: Theoretical Basis and the Experience of Implementation*. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University, 2007. 270 p.
- [27] Fateeva I.A. Theory of Media Activity as an Alternative to the Traditional Theories of Media Education // *Media Education: from Theory to Practice* / Ed. I.V. Zhilavskaya. Tomsk: Tomsk State Institute of Informational Technologies, 2008. pp.140-147.
- [28] Fedorov A.V. *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. Rostov: TSVVR, 2001. 708 p.
- [29] Fedorov A.V. Scientific Research in the Field of Media Education in Russia (1960–2008) // *Innovations in Education*. 2009. № 3. pp.53-117.
- [30] Fedorov A.V. Teachers’ Attitude to the Problem of Media Education of Schoolchildren // *Education in the Cultural Space*. Issue 2. / Ed. I.M. Bykhovskaya. Moscow: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 2005. pp.259-277.
- [31] Fedorov A.V. *Development of Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Students of Pedagogical Institutes of Higher Education*. Moscow: UNESCO “Information for All Programme”, 2007. 616 p.
- [32] Fedorov A.V. *Развитие медиакомпетентности студентов в процессе медиаобразования*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010. 580 с.
- [33] Fedorov A.V. Терминология медиаобразования // *Искусство и образование*. 2000. № 2. С. 33-38.
- [34] Sharikov A.V. Social Irresponsibility of Television in Russia // *Teleforum*. 2005. №1. pp.100-105. №2. pp.137-140.
- [35] Sharikov A.V., Cherkashin E.A. *Experimental Programs of Media Education*. Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Research Institute of Educational Means, 1991. 43 p.

Acknowledgment

This article was written with the support of the special Federal program “Scientific and pedagogical manpower of innovation Russia” (2009-2013) within the bounds of activity “The conduction of scientific research by the teams of Scientific-Education Centers in the fields of psychology and education”, project “The analysis of the effectiveness of the Russian Media Education Centers in comparison with the leading foreign centers”. Head of the project is Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov.

Author

Alexander Fedorov, Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, Taganrog (Russia) and Russian Association for Media Education, e-mail: 1954alex@mail.ru