

**Alexander Fedorov**

# **On Media Education**

**Moscow, 2008**

**Fedorov, Alexander. *On Media Education*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 2008. 156 p. ISBN 978-5-98517-070-2**

This monograph analyzes the theory and practice of media education and media literacy. The book also includes the list of Russian media education literature and addresses of websites of the associations for media education.

*The publication of the book was supported by the grant of the analytical departmental special-purpose program “Development of the Academic Potential of Higher Education” (2006-2008) of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. Project RNP 21.3.491- “The Development of Pedagogical Universities Students’ Critical Thinking and Media Literacy in the Framework of the Specialization “Media Education” (03.13.30). The research supervisor of the project is Dr.Prof. Alexander Fedorov.*

Published in 2008 by  
ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia),  
POB 44, Moscow, 121096, Russia  
E-mail [contact@ifap.ru](mailto:contact@ifap.ru)  
URL <http://www.ifap.ru>

Copyright © Alexander Fedorov (fedor@pbox.ttn.ru), 2008. All rights reserved.

## Contents

Preface: Greetings from the Colleagues	4
Introduction	6
Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum	11
Media Education Around the World: Brief History	19
Basic Media Education Models	37
An Outline of Media Education in Russia	49
Theoretical Tenets: Russian Perspective	59
Media Education in Russian Secondary Schools	65
Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis	74
Russian Teachers' Attitudes to the Problem of Media Education of Pupils and University Students	84
Classification of the Levels of Professional Development (knowledge and skills) Necessary for Teachers' Media Education Activities	97
Curricula on Media Education in Russian Universities: Comparative Analysis	101
Media Education in Kurgan	106
Film Education by Stal Penzin	117
Media Education Model by Alexander Sharikov	123
Russian Teachers' Attitude Towards the Problem of Screen Violence	128
Electronic/Digital Media and Russian Children: The Problem of Law Regulation	142
Lists of Russian Media Education Literature and webs	144

## Preface: Greetings from the Colleagues

“Dear Alex, greetings to you and to other colleagues in Russia who are developing media education. This is a concept that is beginning to gain ground in the UK now, and we hope that you will be having equal success in Russia”.

***Cary Bazalgette,***

Former Head of BFI Education, London, UK, author/coauthor, editor of many books and articles about media education and media literacy, including *Media Education* (1991). London: Hodder and Stoughton; *Teaching English in the National Curriculum. Media Education* (1991). London: Hodder and Stoughton; *Media Education: An Introduction* (1992). London: BFI; *New Directions: Media Education Worldwide* (1992). London: BFI/CLEMI/UNESCO.

“Alexander Fedorov is internationally recognised as a leading figure in media education in Russia. He has been tireless in his efforts in promoting innovative practice and informed debate. It is very valuable to have some of his key work collected in this form”.

***Professor Dr. David Buckingham,***

Director, Centre for the Study of Children, Youth and Media, London Knowledge Lab Institute of Education, University of London, UK, author of many books and articles about media education and media literacy, including *Watching Media Learning* (1990). London: Falmer; *The Making of Citizens* (2000). London – New York: Routledge; *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture* (2003). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

“I am delighted to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Alex Federov and his extensive work in the field of media. Indeed, Dr. Federov's work stands out as being a window on the use of media in Russia and it has multiple implications for those across our world. If Education for All is to truly serve each learner, teacher, and world citizen, then Alex's work clearly belongs in the «must-read» category”.

***Dr. Richard Cornell,***

Professor Emeritus, Instructional Systems, University of Central Florida, the USA, Past President, International Council for Educational Media, Board of Directors, Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

“Congratulations for Alexander Fedorov's hard and impressive works building up a base for media education in Russia”.

***Dr. Cecilia von Feilitzen,***

Scientific Co-ordinator, The International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media, at Nordicom, Goteborg University, Sweden, author/coauthor, editor of many books and articles about media education and media literacy, including *Influence of Media Violence* (2001). Goteborg: Nordicom; *Young People and Media Globalisation*. (2002). Goteborg: The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children Youth and Media, Nordicom; *Promote or Protect? Perspectives on Media Literacy and Media Regulations*. (2003). Goteborg: The International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media, Nordicom.

“I would like to send my warm greetings and congratulations concerning this valuable media education book of Prof.Dr. Alexander Fedorov”.

***Trygve Panhoff,***

Editor of Media Education Magazine ‘*Tilt*’, Norway, former President of Norwegian Media Education Association.

“Alexander Fedorov is a figure in media education who deserves world-wide attention, for he is one of the few genuine academics devoting himself exclusively to this vital cultural curriculum”.

***Chris M. Worsnop,***

Pilot Examiner, Film, International Baccalaureate Organization, Media Educator, Canada; author of many books and articles about media education and media literacy, including *Popular Culture* (1994). Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson; *Assessing Media Work* (1996). Mississauga: Wright Communication; *Screening Images: Ideas for Media Education* (1999). Mississauga: Wright Communication; *Media Connections in Ontario* (1999). Mississauga: Wright Communication.

## Introduction

According to the definition given in the UNESCO documents, *Media Education*

- deals with all communication media and includes the printed word and graphics, the sound, the still as well as the moving image, delivered on any kind of technology;
- enables people to gain understanding of the communication media used in their society and the way they operate and to acquire skills using these media to communicate with others;
- ensures that people learn how to
  - \* analyse, critically reflect upon and create media texts;
  - \* identify the sources of media texts, their political, social, commercial and/or cultural interests, and their contexts;
  - \* interpret the messages and values offered by the media;
  - \* select appropriate media for communicating their own messages or stories and for reaching their intended audience;
  - \* gain or demand access to media for both reception and production.

Media education is part of basic entitlement of every citizen, in every country in the world, to freedom of expression and the right to information and is instrumental in building and sustaining democracy” [Recommendations Addressed to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO, 1999, pp.273-274].

Therefore, media education in the modern world can be described as the process of the development of personality with the help of and on the material of media, aimed at the shaping of culture of interaction with media, the development of creative, communicative skills, critical thinking, perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, teaching different forms of self-expression using media technology. Media literacy, as an outcome of this process, helps a person to actively use opportunities of the information field provided by the television, radio, video, film, press and Internet [Fedorov, 2001, p.8].

There is a number of widespread terms often used as synonyms both in Russia and other countries: “information literacy”, “information culture”, “information knowledge” “information competency”, “media literacy”, “multimedia literacy”, “computer literacy”, “media culture”, “media awareness”, “media competence”, etc. For example, N.Gendina, having analyzed various definitions related to information culture, points to the following terminological inconsistency: in the modern world, “nonunified terms such as ‘computer literacy’, ‘information literacy’ or ‘information culture’, often without clear definitions, increasingly replace such semantically close notions denoting human information knowledge and abilities as ‘library and

bibliography culture', 'reading culture', 'library and bibliography knowledge', and 'library and bibliography literacy' ” [Gendina, 2005, p. 21].

Regarding media literacy as a major component of information literacy, it would be worth referring to a survey conducted among international experts in this field [Fedorov, 2005]. Many of them agree that media literacy is a result of media education. Yet there are certain discrepancies and confusion between such terms as “media education”, “media literacy”, and “media studies”.

S.Ozhegov defines *culture* as (1) the sum total of economic, social, and spiritual achievements of human beings; (2) the state or quality of being *cultured*, i.e., being at a high level of cultural development or corresponding to it; (3) the raising of plants or animals; (4) a high level of something, the development or improvement of an ability [Ozhegov, 1989, p. 314]. Hence it follows that *media culture* (e.g., *audiovisual culture*) is the sum total of material and intellectual values in the sphere of media and a historically defined system of their reproduction and functioning in society. In relation to the audience, it may be a system of personality development levels of a person capable of media text perception, analysis, and appraisal, media creativity, and integration of new media knowledge.

According to N.A. Konovalova, *personality media culture* is the dialogue way of interaction with the information society, including the evaluation, technology, and creativity components, and resulting in the development of interaction subjects [Konovalova, 2004, p. 9].

*Information culture* may also be regarded as a system of personality development levels, a “component of human culture and the sum total of sustained skills and ongoing application of information technologies (IT) in one’s professional activity and everyday practice” [Inyakin, Gorsky, 2000, p. 8].

N.Gendina believes that “*personality information culture* is part of human culture, the sum total of information world outlook and system of knowledge and skills ensuring independent purposeful activity to meet individual information needs by using both traditional and new information technologies. This component is a major factor of successful professional and nonprofessional work and social protection of an individual in the information society” [Gendina, 2005, p. 21].

Y.Inyakin and V.Gorsky point out that the model of shaping information culture includes personality culture components (knowledge, values and goal system, experience of cognitive and creative activity and communication) in relation to IT components (databases, Internet, TV, applications, e-mail, PowerPoint, etc.) [Inyakin, Gorsky, 2000, p. 10].

In my opinion, the notion of *information culture* is broader than *media culture*, because the former pertains to complex relationships between

personality and any information, including media and the latter relates to contacts between the individual and media.

Comparison of traditional dictionary definitions of the terms “literacy” and “competence” also reveals their similarity and proximity. For example, S.I. Ozhegov defines the term “**competent**” as (1) knowledgeable and authoritative in a certain area; and (2) possessing competence, and the term “**competence**” as (1) the matters one is knowledgeable of; and (2) one’s powers or authorities [Ozhegov, 1989, p. 289]. The same dictionary defines a **literate** person as (1) able to read and write, also able to write correctly, without mistakes; and (2) possessing necessary knowledge or information in a certain area [Ozhegov, 1989, p. 147].

Encyclopedic dictionaries define **literacy** as (1) in a broad sense - the possession of speaking and writing skills in accordance with standard language requirements; (2) in a narrow sense – the ability to read only or to read and write simple texts; and (3) the possession of knowledge in a certain area [*Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary*, 1984, p. 335]. The term **competence** [*compete(re)* (to) achieve, meet, be fitting] is defined as (1) the powers given by a law, statute or another enactment to a concrete office or an official; and (2) knowledge or experience in a certain area [*Soviet Encyclopedic Dictionary*, 1984, p. 613]. There are many other definitions of literacy and competence (competency), but in general, they only differ stylistically.

Regardless of the similarity of definitions of “competence” and “literacy”, we are inclined to agree with N.I. Gendina that in popular understanding, “the word ‘literacy’ has a connotation of simplicity and primitiveness, reflecting the lowest, elementary, level of education” [Gendina, 2005, p. 21]. At the same time, the term “**competence**” seems to be more pinpoint and specific in relation to human knowledge and abilities than the broad and polysemantic word “**culture**”.

Such terms as “information literacy”, “media literacy”, “information culture of personality” or “media culture” have been frequently used in publications of the past years [Fedorov, 2001; 2005 etc.], but the above terminological analysis leads us to the conclusion that the terms “**information competence**” and “**media competence**” are more accurate in denoting the individual’ abilities to use, critically analyze, evaluate, and communicate media messages of various types, forms, and categories and to analyze complex information processes and media functioning in society. Thus, **media competence** can be regarded as a component of the more general term **information competence**.

Naturally, it is assumed that human information competence can and should be improved in the process of life-long learning. This is true for school and university students, economically active population and retired citizens



(e.g., the information literacy development program for retired citizens at the Media Education Center of the South Urals University in Chelyabinsk).

We have developed a classification of information literacy/competence indicators inspired by the approaches of R. Kubey, J. Potter, and W. Weber and based on the six basic dimensions of media education, outlined by leading British media educators [Bowker, 1991; Hart, 1997, p. 202; Buckingham and Sefton-Green, 1997, p. 285 etc.]: **media agency** (studying media agencies' work, functions, and goals), **media categories** (studying media/media text typology – forms and genres), **media technologies** (media text creation methods and technologies), **media languages** (i.e., verbal, audiovisual, and editing aspects of media texts), **media representations** (ways of presenting and rethinking reality in media texts, authors' concepts, etc.), and **media audiences** (audience and media perception typologies).

Besides, we outlined the high, medium, and low levels of development for each information literacy/competence indicator. Undoubtedly, this kind of typology is rather tentative. Yet it gives an idea of a differentiated approach to information literacy/competence development when the high level of the communication or creativity indicators may be accompanied by the low level of the appreciation indicator. As for the perception, some people may have one articulated indicator (e.g., “initial identification”) while other strands may be undeveloped, “dormant”. One thing is clear: high-level information literacy/competence is impossible without the developed media perception and ability to analyze and evaluate media texts. Neither the high frequency of communication with media nor developed media text creation skills in itself can make an individual information competent.

## References

- Baake, D.** and all (Eds.) (1999). *Hanbuch Mediaen: Medienkompetenz. Modelle und Projekte*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 308 p.
- Blumeke, S.** (2000). *Mediaenpädagogische Kompetenz*. München: KoPad-Verlag, 400 p.
- Bowker, J. (Ed.) (1991). *Secondary Media Education. A Curriculum Statement*. London: British Film Institute.
- Buckingham D., Sefton-Green, J.** (1997). Multimedia Education: Media Literacy in the Age of Digital Culture. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.). *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, p.290.
- Buckingham, D.** (1991). Teaching about Media. In: Lusted, D. (Ed.). *The Media Studies Book*. London – New York: Routledge, pp.12-35.
- Buckingham, D.** (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 219 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A.** (2004). Specificity of Media Education in Pedagogical Universities. In: *Pedagogica*. N 4, pp. 43-51.
- Fedorov, A.** (2005). *Media Education for Future Teachers*. Taganrog: Kuchma. 314 p.

- Fedorov, A.** (2007). *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 616 p.
- Gendina, N.** (2005). Information Literacy and Information Culture: Alternative or Unity? (Research Results). *School Library* . N 3, pp.18-24.
- 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 and London: Transaction Publishers, p.202.
- Inyakin, Y., Gorsky, V.** (2000). From Information Culture to the Culture of Personality. *Supplementary Education*. N 10, pp. 6-10.
- Konovalova, N.** (2004). The Development of the Pedagogical Institute Students' Media Culture. Ph. D. dissertation. Vologda, p.9.
- Kubey, R.** (1997). Media Education: Portraits of an Evolving Field. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick & London: Transaction Publishers, p.2.
- Ozhegov, S.** (1989). *The Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow.
- Potter, W.J.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Silverblatt, A.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Weber, W.** Portfolio of Media Education. In: *Informatica and Education*. 2002. № 1 / [http://www.infojournal.ru/journal\\_arxiv/2002/](http://www.infojournal.ru/journal_arxiv/2002/)

## Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum \*

\* Copyright © 2006 by the RWCT International Consortium. [www.rwct.net](http://www.rwct.net) First publication in *Thinking Classroom. An International Journal of Reading, Writing and Critical Reflection*. 2006. Vol. 7. N 3, pp.25-30.

Interview with Alexander Fedorov,  
President of the Russian Association for Film & Media Education

*Today both his adherents and his critics refer to Alexander Fedorov as the “main enthusiast of Russian media education.” He is the chief editor of the specialized journal Mediaobrazovanie (Media Education), president of a professional association for media educators, winner of many prizes, director of several research projects, author of a dozen books and hundreds of articles on the theory, history, and problems of film and media education in and outside Russia, pro-rector of Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute... The list is far from complete, but even this small part of it is enough to make it evident that here is someone well informed about what is currently going on in the world of media education. Our editors, **Natalia Kaloshina** and **Alison Preece**, interested in his perspective on this topic, asked Dr. Fedorov a few questions. We hope that his answers will help our readers look into the processes of modern media education and decide for themselves to what extent matters of media literacy concern any one of us—for we all, either teachers or students, live under a continuous shower of media texts, widely ranging in their form and content...*

**N.K. Dr. Fedorov, as you are a recognized expert in media education, well-known in educational circles within and outside Russia, the questions that Alison and I are going to ask you will be related to this sphere. Nowadays the term media education seems to be known to everyone—however, many people tend to understand it differently. Let us first of all define the topic of our conversation. Does “media education” stand for knowledge of the means of communication, or the ways of their functioning, or their application, or something else?**

**A.F.:** In 2003 I interviewed 26 media educators from different countries, and, of all the definitions available, 25 gave preference to the UNESCO definition<sup>1</sup>:

Media Education

---

<sup>1</sup> Recommendations Addressed to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO. In: Education for the Media and the Digital Age. Vienna: UNESCO, 1999, p.273-274. Reprint in: Outlooks on Children and Media. Goteborg: UNESCO & NORDICOM, 2001, p. 152.

- deals with all communication media and includes the printed word and graphics, the sound, the still as well as the moving image, delivered on any kind of technology;
- enables people to gain understanding of the communication media used in their society and the way they operate and to acquire skills using these media to communicate with others;
- ensures that people learn how to
  - analyze, critically reflect upon and create media texts;
  - identify the sources of media texts, their political, social, commercial and/or cultural interests, and their contexts;
  - interpret the messages and values offered by the media;
  - select appropriate media for communicating their own messages or stories and for reaching their intended audience;
  - gain or demand access to media for both reception and production.

In my view, this definition provides a reasonably complete characterization of the main media educational goals.

There are several directions that can be distinguished within media education: (a) media education for future professionals—journalists (the press, radio, TV, Internet, advertisement), moviemakers, editors, producers, etc.; (b) media education for pre-service and in-service teachers—in universities and teacher training colleges, and in media cultural courses within the system of advanced training; (c) media education as a part of general education for secondary and higher school students; it may be either integrated in the traditional disciplines or autonomous (i.e. taught as a specialized or optional course); (d) media education in educational and cultural centers (community interest clubs, centers for out-of-school activities and artistic development, etc.); (e) distance education of young and adult learners through television, radio, and the Internet; an important part here belongs to media critique, a specific sphere of journalism engaged in evaluation, analysis, and criticism of the mass media; (f) autonomous continuous media education, which in theory can be life-long.

***N.K.:* If you were to compile a list of the main media educational objectives and arrange them in the order of their importance, what would be the first three points on your list?**

***A.F.:*** First, to develop the person’s critical thinking skills and critical autonomy. Second, to develop abilities to perceive, evaluate, understand, and analyze media texts of different forms and genres (including their moral implications and artistic qualities). And third, to teach students to experiment with the media, to create their own media products or texts.

**N.K.: Are there many people who are still skeptical about media education and who perhaps question its contribution to society? How do you answer them?**

**A.F.:** Yes, there are many skeptics, and some of them are well-qualified and educated people. For example, in *Mediaobrazovanie* N 2, 2005, we published an article “What Is Media Education” by Professor Kirill Razlogov, Director of the Russian Institute for Cultural Research, who holds a Ph.D. in cultural studies. He thinks that there is no sense in formal media education for all, because those who are really interested receive this kind of education spontaneously all through their life... Some people are certainly able to effectively develop their own media culture. However, public opinion polls show that the media competence of the majority of the audience, especially the younger generation, leaves much to be desired. True, there are some gifted individuals who successfully cultivate themselves without attending schools or universities — however, this is no cause for closing formal educational institutions... I have no doubt that all universities, especially pedagogical ones, need media literacy courses, and media education must become part and parcel of the curriculum — and in Canada and Australia media education is already officially included in the school programs.

**A.P.: What are the advantages of media literacy for an individual? Or perhaps it’s better to ask, what are the risks of “media illiteracy,” of the person’s unawareness of how the media operate?**

**A.F.:** I understand media literacy as the result of media education. In general, predominant among media educational concepts are the cognitive, educational, and creative approaches to the use of mass media potential. However, at the implementation level most media educational approaches integrate the three components. These are:

- acquiring knowledge about media history, structure, language, and theory —the cognitive component;
- development of the ability to perceive media texts, to “read” their language; activation of imagination and visual memory; development of particular kinds of thinking (including critical, logical, creative, visual, and intuitive); informed interpretation of ideas (ethical or philosophical problems and democratic principles), and images — the educational component;
- acquiring practical creative skills of working with media materials — creative component.

In each particular model these basic components are realized differently, depending on the conceptual preferences of the media educator.

The learning activities used in media education are also different: *descriptive* (re-create the media text, reconstruct the personages and events);

*personal* (describe the attitudes, recollections, and emotions caused by the media text); *analytical* (analyze the media text structure, language characteristics, and viewpoints); *classificatory* (define the place of the text within the historical context); *explanatory* (commenting about the media text or its parts); or *evaluative* (judging about the merits of the text basing upon personal, ethical or formal criteria). As a result, the learners not only are exposed to the pleasurable effects of media culture, but they also acquire experience in media text interpretation (analyzing the author's objectives, discussing—either orally or in writing—the particulars of plot and characters, ethical positions of personages or the author, etc.) and learn to connect it with personal experience of their own or others (e.g. putting themselves in the place of this or that personage, evaluating facts and opinions, finding out causes and effects, motives and consequences of particular actions, or the reality of events).

Moreover, while working with media texts young people have many opportunities to develop their own creative habits and skills. For example, they may write reviews or mini-scripts; they are exposed to representations of their cultural heritage — and through these to the personal, historical, national, planetary and other perspectives on those events. While studying the main media cultural genres and forms, scanning the development of a particular theme within different genres or historical epochs, becoming familiar with the styles, techniques, and creative activities of the great masters, etc., they acquire much relevant knowledge and learn methods and criteria of media text evaluation. All of that contributes to the development of the student's aesthetic awareness, artistic taste, and creative individuality and influences the formation of civic consciousness.

As for “media illiteracy,” I see its main danger in the possibility of a person becoming an easy object for all sorts of manipulation on the part of the media... or becoming a media addict, consuming all media products without discrimination.

**N.K.: Now let us suppose that some of our readers — persuaded by your arguments — have just decided that teaching media literacy is going to become an integral part of their work with students. Where do they begin? What goals should they follow?**

**A.F.:** It would make good sense to begin by studying the theory and methods of media education — I mean the works of such well known media educators as N. Andersen, B. Duncan, J. Pungente, C. Bazalgette, L. Masterman, A. Hart, D. Buckingham, D. Considine, R. Kubey, W.J. Potter, K. Tyner, J. Gonnet, Y. Usov, L. Zaznobina, O. Baranov, A.Korochensky, S. Penzin, A. Sharikov, N. Khilko, Y. Polat, G. Polichko, L. Bazhenova, Y. Yastrebtsseva, and others. The main media educational goals are provided by the

above UNESCO definition, but the particulars of their realization certainly depend on the working conditions and individuality of the teacher.

**A.P.: And how *not to teach* media literacy? What “cautions” would you offer teachers trying to introduce this topic with their students?**

**A.F.:** I see two approaches to media education that are very popular, but quite wrong. The first one is trying to screen the students from the “harmful effects” of the media by immersing the audience into the teacher-selected world of “masterpieces” (the “protective” approach). The second and perhaps even more prevalent approach (the “practical” one) is confining media education to the use of various media apparatus and computers in class as teaching aids, without critical analysis of media texts themselves. In this case media texts are only illustrations to the content under study, for example, to some physical or chemical laws.

**N.K.: What is now going on in this sphere in Russia? Are there any results that can be called concrete achievements of Russian media education?**

**A.F.:** In Russia we now have several specialized web-sites, offering materials on media literacy to all teachers — and your readers, too. In 2000, first two bilingual Russian/English sites on audio-visual media education were created ([www.medialiteracy.boom.ru](http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru) and [www.mediaeducation.boom.ru](http://www.mediaeducation.boom.ru)), then the Russian site ([www.mediaeducation.ru](http://www.mediaeducation.ru)). Later the Mediatheka of the School Sector (<http://school-sector.relarn.ru/efim/mainframe.html>), the School Mediatheka (<http://www.ioso.ru/scmedia>) and other sites appeared. In March 2004, the website of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>) organized the first all-Russian Internet-conference on media education. In recent years, Russian media educators have become active participants in international conferences, many of them publishing the results of their research in specialized journals and academic publications concerned with current problems of media and media literacy in the U. S., France, Great Britain, Germany, Belgium, Canada, Australia, and Norway. In Russia itself, the last five years have yielded no fewer than 20 monographs and study guides on media education, and dozens of articles and teaching programs in books and journals on research and education. In 2002, *media education* was officially registered as a new university specialty—which I think is a really important achievement. In the autumn of 2002 at Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute we began to train future media educators. Some Russian universities offer their students courses in media education. Several laboratories of the Russian Academy of Education actively promote media education in schools; in 2004, media educational centers in Perm and Chelyabinsk were established. In the autumn of 2004, the South-Ural Center for

Media Education held an all-Russian round-table conference, where representatives of UNESCO and the Russian Association for Film and Media Education took part. As one of its outcomes, the publication of the new specialized journal *Mediaobrazovanie (Media Education)* was initiated — you may read the full texts of all its issues at the website of the ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) (<http://www.ifap.ru/projects/mediamag.htm>).

**A.P.: Perhaps you could describe some particularly impressive teaching efforts that you have seen implemented in Russia?**

**A.F.:** Many projects are realized due to my colleagues from the Russian Academy of Education. A network of school mediathekas (libraries containing books, journals, audio and video cassettes, CDs, DVDs, etc.) has been created in recent years, and a number of most interesting creative network projects for schoolchildren have been launched—these directions are guided by Y. Yastrebtseva. Her colleagues, L. Bazhenova and Y. Bondarenko, aim their efforts at promoting media educational work in Moscow schools. During the lessons, play activities are often used (especially with younger children), students perform creative tasks (making a short video film, a photo collage, etc.), and have collective discussions of media texts. Similar work is going on in schools and universities of other Russian cities — Tver, Voronezh, Samara, Perm, Chelyabinsk, Rostov, Taganrog, Tambov, Krasnodar, Yekaterinburg, Volgodonsk... For example, the recognizable symbol of media education in Voronezh is the Student Film and Video Club, where participants come to discuss especially significant or problem films — the club is led by S. Penzin, an art critic and assistant professor of the Voronezh State University. Professor G. Polichko from the State University of Management is the initiator of annual media educational festivals for schoolchildren — with master classes, talks given by well-known figures of media culture, and collective discussions... Such festivals have taken place for about 10 years in different Russian cities. In 2005, the Center for Media Education in the city of Togliatti organized a *Virtual Tour of the Media Land*, an Internet game for schoolchildren ([http://mec.tgl.ru/modules/Subjects/pages/igra/priilog\\_1.doc](http://mec.tgl.ru/modules/Subjects/pages/igra/priilog_1.doc)). The participants form teams, visit some Russian media educational websites, study their content, answer questions, accomplish creative tasks, and create presentations. To find out more about the methods used in particular media educational classes your readers may visit the “Biblioteka” (*Library*) section of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education website.

**N.K.: Dr. Fedorov, as a person who has worked in many countries, you are in a position to evaluate and compare the level of media literacy and the trends in media education development in Russia and in other countries. Are there vital differences—or are we all moving in the same**



**direction at about the same speed? Who do you think could learn what from whom?**

*A.F.:* Both in the West and in Russia, the preference in media education today is given to the critical thinking / critical autonomy development theory, the cultural, sociocultural, and semiotic theories. Less popular is the protective theory, focusing upon screening the audience from the harmful influences of the media. However, my impression is that Western media educators seem to prefer the *practical* approach (with the emphasis on teaching practical skills for working with media equipment) and the *consumption and satisfying* (the needs of the audience) approach, whereas their Russian colleagues often favor the *artistic* approaches in media education. Universally recognized are the achievements of our colleagues from Canada and Australia, where media education is a compulsory school discipline. The philosophy and practices of the leading British, French, and American media educators have also obtained general recognition. Traditionally strong are the positions of media education in Scandinavian countries. As for the East European ones, the world obviously knows more about the experiences of Russian and Hungarian media educators, whereas the achievements of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Romania in this sphere remain little-known—not least on account of the language barrier. Of course, Canada and Australia are far ahead of others in making media education a reality. Here in Russia we have much to learn from them.

***A.P.:* Why do you think media education is so slow to be “taken up” or incorporated into mainstream education? It’s not given the attention it warrants in North America despite lots of talk about its importance. Why is that?**

*A.F.:* I think that North America should not be regarded as a whole in respect to media education. The achievements of media education are evident in Canada... on the other hand, the progress is much slower in the U. S. Perhaps it’s the U.S. domination in the world media markets—above all, the film market—that accounts for the situation: there are quite influential forces there that are not interested in the development of media education in the country. In fact, the lower the media literacy level, the easier to sell any media texts. As for the current situation in Russia, media education now receives backing and encouragement from the Ministry of Education and Science (I’ve already mentioned the registration of the new university specialty), media educational projects are supported by the Russian Foundation for Humanities, by the Program of Russian President’s grants “Support of the Leading Scientific Schools,” and the program of target grants of the RF Ministry of Education and Science “Development of the Scientific Potential of Universities” However, media education in Russian schools has no official

status yet, and courses on media literacy are still a rarity for many Russian universities.

**N.K.: When do you think real changes will come?**

**A.F.:** I'm sure serious changes are inevitable... keeping optimistic — within the next ten years.

**N.K.: Many of our readers are connected with the RWCT project — you may read about it at our website ([www.ct-net.net](http://www.ct-net.net)) — and in teaching they direct their efforts to the use of active methods and the systematic development of critical thinking. In the field of media education such practices are of vital importance; moreover, our teaching goals agree in many respects. Could you comment on their alignment?**

**A.F.:** As I've already said, the theories of media education as the development of critical thinking (Critical Thinking Approach, Critical Autonomy Approach, Critical Democratic Approach, Le Jugement Critique, L'Esprit Critique, Representational Paradigm) are now popular in many countries, so there is considerable agreement with respect to goals and purposes. According to these theories, students need to develop the capacity to purposefully navigate a world of diverse and abundant information. They should be taught to consciously perceive, comprehend, and analyze it, and be aware of the machinery and consequences of its influence upon the audience. One-sided or distorted information (conveyed, in particular, by television, possessing a strong arsenal of propaganda) is no doubt a matter for reflection. That is why it's so important for the students to be able to tell the difference between the given or known facts and the facts that need to be checked; to identify a reliable source, a biased judgment, vague or dubious arguments, faulty reasoning, etc.

Such skills are especially valuable for the analysis of TV information programs: they make the viewers "immune" to unfounded statements and all kinds of falsehood. Irrespective of the political system they live in, people who are not prepared to interpret the multiform information they are exposed to are not able to give it an all-round analysis. They cannot oppose the manipulative effects of the media (if there are such effects), and they are deprived of the tools of the media for expressing their own thoughts and feelings about what they have read, heard or seen.

Of course, we shouldn't oversimplify media education and, setting aside the artistic aspect, confine it to the development of critical thinking and to the study of TV commercials and information programs (where all sorts of manipulative techniques are the most obvious). However, I'm convinced that a developed capacity for critical thinking and mastery of such basic concepts of

media education as *category, technology, language, representation, and audience* are the best aids in the analysis and evaluation of any media text.

***N.K., A.P.:* Thank you for sharing your ideas with us, and with our readers. We wish you continued success in all your creative efforts and in your advocacy of media education.**

## Media Education around the World: Brief History

### *The Genesis (1920s-1940s)*

The first leader of European media education movement was no doubt, the motherland of the film art - **France**. In the early 1920s in Paris the cinema club movement emerged, with the distinct media education aims. As early as in 1922 the first national conference of the regional departments of film education (*Offices regionaux du cinema educateur*) was held in France. At one of the congresses on education it was suggested to prepare the cinema educators in universities (Martineau, 1988: 28). At the same time a lot of educational institutions were actively promoting the movement of young journalists. Thanks to C.Freinet's good graces school, lyceum and university newspapers were published (Freinet, 1927).

In 1936 the French League of Education initiated the creation of the movement for "Cinema and Youth" (*Cine-Jeunes*), which united children, participating in film discussions, developing their critical thinking and artistic taste, creative skills (Chevallier, 1980: 9).

Nazi occupation interrupted the intensive development of media education in France; however, after 1945 it got another impulse. The Federation of cinema clubs of France was formed (*Federation francaise des cine-clubs*). On the whole, the "practical", "aesthetical" and "protectionist" theories of media education dominated in France at that time.

The history of media education in **Great Britain** is also a few decades old. Similar to many other countries, this movement began from film education, and then embraced a wider spectrum (press, radio, television, video, advertisement, Internet).

There are several organizations in the UK that deal with various problems of media education. The British Film Institute (BFI), founded by the government in 1933 stands out among them. The educational department has conducted conferences and seminars, workshops for teachers, accomplished amplitudinous research, published books, textbooks, and teaching manuals for many years.

In the 1930s British media education (although this term was not used at the time, here it denotes integration of mass media in education) was developing mainly according the inoculative paradigm, aimed at opposing harmful media influences.

The history of **Russian** Media Education goes back to the 1920s. The first attempts to instruct in media education (on the press and film materials, with the vigorous emphasis on the communist ideology) appeared in the 1920s but were stopped by Stalin's repressions. The end of the 1950s - the beginning of the 1960s was the time of the revival of media education in secondary schools, universities, after-school children centers (Moscow, Petersburg, Voronezh, Samara, Kurgan, Tver, Rostov, Taganrog, Novosibirsk, Ekaterinburg, etc.), the revival of media education seminars and conferences for the teachers.

### *Dominance of the “aesthetic concept” in the 1950s-1960s*

**France** maintained its status of a leader in the world media education process of that period. Since 1952 the courses of audiovisual education for teachers have been taught. Due to the rapid development of radio and television the French Union of the Regional Film Education Departments (*Union française des offices du cinéma éducateur laïque – U.F.O.C.E.L.*) was renamed into the French Union of Audiovisual Education in 1953 (*Union française des œuvres laïques d'éducation par image et par le son – U.F.O.I.E.I.S.*). In 1966 the Association “Press-Information-Youth” (*Association Press – Information – Jeunesse*) was founded.

In 1963 the ideas of aesthetical theory of media education were reflected in the documents of the Ministry of Education of France. Teachers were encouraged (including the money reward) to educate their students in cinema literacy (study of the history, language, genres of the film art, technology of the film shooting, appreciation of the aesthetical quality of a film). One of the founders of media education – C.Freinet joined the discussion and emphasized that cinema and photography are not only the entertainment and teaching aid, not only the art, but the new form of thinking and self-expression (Freinet, 1963: 12). He believed that schoolchildren must be taught the language of audiovisual media (Freinet, 1963: 4) the similar way they are practically taught basics of art. According to him, a person who himself can draw can appreciate the work of art of a painter better than a person who can't paint (Freinet, 1963: 13).

Since the beginning of the 1960s the school and university audiovisual education (courses on film education were taught in 23 universities) was developing under the influence of the breakthrough of European “author's cinema”, especially the French “new wave” (*nouvelle vague*). In the cineclubs of the 1960s left-wing radical ideas enjoyed popularity, that led to the numerous conflicts with the authorities.

And though courses on film art and journalism were taught in almost all French universities, media education in schools has been optional for a long time. One of the first attempts to introduce media studies into the school curriculum was undertaken in France in the middle of the 1960s.

In 1950 in **Britain** the concept of “screen education” was first formed, when school teachers founded the Society for Education in Film and Television (SEFT). The term “screen education” came into sight internationally in the beginning of the 1960s. Before that the term “film education” was wider spread, but with the development of television many started to believe that these two screen media should be united for the educational purposes (Moore, 1969: 10). Under the influence of the theory of “author's cinematography”, British media education of that time was connected with the study of media as popular culture through its best examples (popular arts paradigm). At the same time ideas of M.McLuhan had a certain impact on the development of media education in Britain. And though in 1964 only a dozen out of 235 colleges of education in England and Wales offered

special courses on screen arts (Marcussen, 1964: 73), media culture in this or that form was being studied in the majority of British universities.

The main problem was to find time in the school curriculum. Screen education was successfully taught autonomously in several English schools. But still British media educators considered that it would make more sense to integrate screen education into the language arts (Higgins, 1964: 51).

The distinct orientation of the British educators of the 1960s onto the aesthetical theory of media education might be traced in the curriculum, developed by A.Hodgkinson, with the following objectives: to increase the understanding and pleasure of school pupils they get from television and cinema; to promote learning about the human society and recognition of individual uniqueness; to provide the self defense from commercial and other exploitation; to encourage the self expression not only through the traditional forms (speech, writing, drawing, etc.) but through the language of the screen (making films) (Hodgkinson, 1964: 26).

Mass media education on the American continent was in its rudimentary stage until the 1950s. **Canada** is the home country of the famous media theorist-Marshall McLuhan. And it was he who developed the first in the country special course on media culture in the 1950s. The history of Canadian media and ICT education commenced with the film studies courses. Film education became a common phenomenon in Canadian secondary schools (Andersen, Duncan and Pungente, 1999: 140). This movement was called Screen Education. In 1968 the first organization united Canadian media educators – Canadian Association for Screen Education: CASE, a year later it held the first big national conference in Toronto. Like their British colleagues, Canadian media educators of that period relied mainly upon the aesthetic (discriminatory) theory of media education (Moore, 1969: 9; Stewart and Nuttall, 1969: 5).

Still in 1911 in the **USA**, when the National Council of Teachers of English was established, teachers discussed the topic of the educational value of films (Costanzo, 1992: 73). Thus, media and ICT education in the USA has to some extent existed in the form of separate directions since the 1920s (film education, media education on the material of press and radio). For instance, professor E.Dale of Ohio University promoted media education through press in the late 1930s. However such training was offered essentially at the selected departments (journalism, film) of few universities and was not widely spread. Since 1958 the program *Newspaper in Classroom* was introduced in secondary schools, which was sponsored by press through the American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA). 95000 teachers from 34000 schools joined it, involving more than 5 million students (Sim, 1977: 75).

While by the end of the 1940s only 5 American universities offered film electives, at the beginning of 1950s this number doubled. And by the mid 1960s courses on radio and television were taught in 200 colleges, and the number of such courses exceeded two thousands (Marcussen, 1964: 74).

In the 1960s media education in the USA like in many other countries (France, Canada, the UK) was centered around film education. Specifically practical, “hands-on” film education became popular, that presupposed that schoolchildren and students guided and supervised by a teacher made short documentaries and feature films on the 8mm film. This activity became possible due to the fact that comparatively inexpensive, compact amateur film cameras, corresponding film, and chemicals for its developing came on the market, followed by the rapid growth of the net of laboratories (including the school and university labs) for developing and printing films. At that time the first Association for Screen Education was organized. In 1969 Utah and Ohio universities supported the development of the series of materials for ‘critical viewing’ for integration in Oregon, Syracuse, NY, Nevada and Florida (Tyner, 1999). Thus, film education became the first step for modern media and ICT education.

However in most cases screen education focused on media technology (e.g., students acquired skills to use video equipment) and not media culture. That is, they shot film sequences with the help of audiovisual devices, or media materials served in the classroom as an illustration for group discussions on burning social issues (for example, Vietnam war, civil rights movement, etc.). Still, even back then a lot of teachers dedicated their classes to the studies of the film language, aesthetics of a film.

Certainly, school media education was not obligatory in the USA. But teachers-enthusiasts tried to broaden the horizons of media preferences of their students, lead them out of the “vicious circle” of pop culture, and get them interested in *art house* production. They believed that thus the artistic perception of the audience might develop up to the degree of an adequate understanding of O.Wells’ and S.Kubrick’s media texts. This aesthetical approach, media as popular art in its localized choice of media spectrum had something in common with the so-called inoculative approach and civil defense approach, that had appeared in the 1930s, 1940s and was criticized by many researchers (L.Masterman, C.Worsnop and others).

The truth is, from the gamut of media, media educators were choosing exclusively *art* media texts hoping to teach the audience to appreciate “art” and disapprove “trash”. ‘Inoculative’ approach concentrated on the adverse influence of media texts, containing violence scenes and representation of other negative phenomena in society. Teachers wanted to protect their students from media’s harmful impact on their moral values and behaviour.

The 1960s became ‘the Golden Age’ for the aesthetic approach to media education in the USA, however principally in the higher education domain. Many universities added film studies into their curricula, with contents based on the visual language, film history and works of outstanding directors. Such courses were as a rule analogues to the literature courses. But it was difficult to define the difference between a ‘good’ and a ‘bad’ film due to the ambiguity of concept of

‘good aesthetic perception and taste’ and a lack of criteria rubrics for the artistic value of a media text. Moreover, approaches of artistic media education, in fact, left out the information sphere of media – press, radio and TV-news. Advocates of the ‘pure’ art media education dispensed with such aspects as the production, distribution, regulation and consumption of media texts. But we should bear in mind, that in practice, a media educator may have integrated several directions of media education (for example, inoculative, ethics and art, - to develop the aesthetic perception and simultaneously discuss the issues of media education texts production and audience).

The first **Russian** Council for Film Education in School and Universities was created as the subdivision of the Russian Union of Filmmakers (Moscow) in 1967. As in most European countries and the USA, Russian media education of the 1960s was developing with the clear dominance of the aesthetical theory (although the Communist authorities undoubtedly tried to impose the ideological approach on them). The analysis of the artistic quality of films came up to the foreground of media classes at schools and universities. The study of media culture was to a large extent integrated with Literature courses.

#### ***From Press and Film – to Media (1970s – 1980s)***

The powerful theoretical impact on media education all over the world was executed by the studies of H.Lasswell and M.McLuhan. It was M.McLuhan who among the first supported the argument for importance of media literacy in the ‘global village’ (McLuhan, 1967: 31-36), into which according to him, our planet would turn after the unbound distribution and mass consumption of a wide spectrum of media texts in all parts of the world.

The development of media and ICT education at all its stages of existence was significantly promoted by UNESCO. In the mid 1970s UNESCO proclaimed not only its support of media and ICT education, but included media education in its list of priority directions for the next decades. In 1972 media education aspects were included into the program documents of the Ministry of Education in **France**. In 1975 the Institute of Training for Film Culture Development (*L’Institute de formation aux activites de la culture cinematographique – IFACC*) was established. It revived the process of media education in universities, now to a great extent, semiotics oriented. In 1976 media education was officially part of the national curriculum of secondary schools. Schools were recommended to spend up to 10% of the time on realization of this objective. In the Ministry’s document of 1978 one can trace the synthesis of the aesthetic and practical concepts of media education (Chevallier, 1980: 14).

Since 1979 media education (*education aux medias*) in France has been maintained by several French Ministries. For instance, until 1983 the Ministries of Education, Entertainment and Sports carried out the project ‘An Active Young TV-viewer’ (*Le Telespectateur actif*). It affected masses of population – parents, teachers, youth clubs supervisors, etc. At the same time, researchers on the television impact on adolescent audience were conducted. The organization that



this project gave birth to was called APTE (*Audiovisuell pour tous dans l'éducation* – Audiovisual Media in Education for All).

An exemplary project in media education in France is the Week of Press in School that has been conducted annually since 1976. Significantly, the term 'press' is not limited to print media only, but includes also radio and TV (particularly, regional TV networks). The Week of Press is aimed at the cooperative work of students and professional journalists. As a rule, a method of 'learning by doing' is used, when students themselves must inquire into the ways media function (e.g. through the activities imitating the process of the creation of media texts of different genres and types). About 7000 French schools usually participate in the event.

In 1982 the famous French media educator and researcher J.Gonnet made a suggestion to the Ministry of Education of France to create the national media education centre, which could assist teachers of various educational institutions to integrate effectively mass media into the process of education. Together with P.Vandevoorde he distinguished the following aims of the center:

- to develop critical thinking by comparison of different sources of information and to contribute to educating more active and responsible citizens;
- to develop tolerance, ability to listen to the arguments of each other, understanding of the pluralism of ideas, their relativity;
- to integrate dynamic pedagogic innovations at educational institutions of all levels;
- to overcome the isolation of school from media, i.e. to establish tight connections with life realities;
- to take advantage of the specific forms of print and audiovisual culture in our society (CLEMI, 1996: 12).

J.Gonnet's plan was not only approved, but also financially supported by the French Ministry of Education - in April, 1983 in Paris the Center of Contact Between Education and Media (*Centre de liaison de l'insegnement et des moyens d'information* – CLEMI) was open. Professor J.Gonnet was appointed its director. CLEMI has productively worked for more than 2 decades not only in Paris but almost in all French provinces and French-speaking overseas territories as well. Since the time of its establishment CLEMI has promoted the integration of media in teaching and learning, conducted regular courses for teachers, collected the archive of resources on media culture and media and ICT education.

In the 1970s-1980s media education in the **UK** grew with the emergence of new film education courses for secondary schools and later new media and ICT courses that were included into the list of examinations for 16-18-years-old pupils. Due to the development of semiotic theories in the 1970s media education headed towards the structuralist interpretation of media texts as sign systems (semiotic/representation paradigm). The publications '*Screen*' (and later '*Screen Education*') addressed the 'ideological' theory of media education and reflected debates of specialists in higher education on media integration.

The opportunity to use video equipment and the growing impact of television highlighted the work of the TV-materials in British model of media and ICT education. However up until the 1980s it was carried out in those schools only where there were genuinely engaged teachers-enthusiasts, willing that their pupils develop competence in mass media.

Further changes initiated by the BFI (British film Institute) happened in 1988-1989, when media education for the first time in history became a component of the National curriculum in England and Wales. Media studies were to be handled in the English Language subject (mainly at the age of 11-16), though could be seen as cross-curricula too (within Foreign language, history, Geography, Art, Sciences, and other subjects).

C.Bazalgette – the coordinator of media education work in BFI and one of the leading architects of media education policy of the UK during the last 20 years – thought that media education should be aimed at educating more active, critical, literate, demanding media consumers, who could contribute to the development of a wider range of media production (Bazalgette, 1989). Besides, the integrated approach was recognized as the most effective way of media education development.

Across the ocean at that time media education was suffering privation. In the 1970s media educators in **Canada** were deprived of the state sponsorship and support. Despite that in April, 1978 the Association for Media Literacy (AML) was formed in Toronto, headed by Barry Duncan. By the way, today this organization numbers more than a thousand members.

However, since the 1980s, the situation has drastically changed. In 1986 owing to the mutual effort of the Association for Media Literacy and Ministry of Education of Ontario province, the fundamental text book on media education '*Media Literacy Resource Guide*' was published and soon translated into French, Spanish, Italian and Japanese. AML organized workshops for teachers, held conferences on a regular basis. Since 1987 media and ICT education has become an integral part of the secondary education in Ontario province, where one third of the 30-million population of Canada lives.

By the 1970s television surpassed cinema in the degree of influence on the audience. During these years the number of TV channels in the **U.S.** cities exceeded several dozens. In this connection the status of advertisement grew, commercials had a distinct impact on the market demand. American educators could not ignore these changes. In the 1970s film education was gradually transformed into media education (i.e. education about all existing mass media of the time; press, TV, cinema, radio.). By the middle of the 1970s nearly 35 per cent to 40 per cent of all secondary schools offered their students units or courses described as Media or Mass Communication (Sim, 1977: 86), substantially, television-oriented. In the 1970s the movement for 'critical viewing' emerged in the USA, that combined political and research reasoning. The stimulus was a complex of social and cultural factors, connected with the more graphic, as, for

example, in the 1950s – ‘60s, representation of violence on the American screens (Tyner, 1998).

During the 1980s media and ICT education in the USA continued to widen the sphere of its influence. One after another, pedagogic and research associations were set up in various states, with an agenda to integrate some aspects of media and ICT education and media culture in schools and universities. In the majority of universities media courses became a common phenomenon in the 1980s. However, media education did not gain the status of an academic compulsory subject in primary and secondary school. Certainly, the USA is a country embracing huge territories and populations, compared to Norway or Finland for instance. Still, the American researcher R.Kubey suggests that not only geographic and demographic factors hindered the development of media education (Kubey, 1998: 59). A certain obstacle in the way of consolidation of media educators’ efforts was the American system of education on the whole, where each of the 50 states has its own policy in education and every educational institution – its own curriculum and programs. Moreover, unlike other English-speaking countries (for example, Canada or the UK), the leading media education communities in the USA are located outside the system of academic education. Besides, the pace of the media education development in the USA was slowed down by the relative cultural isolation of Americans from the rest of the world. It is known that Americans traditionally prefer watching, listening to or reading American media.

During the time when the intensive rethinking of media education approaches was on the upgrade in the Western hemisphere, in **Russia** of the 1970s–1980s media education was still developing within the aesthetic concept. Among the important achievements of these years one can recall the first official programs of film education, published by Ministry of Education, increasing interest of Ph.D. candidates to media education, experimental theoretic and practical work on media education by O.Baranov (Tver), S.Penzin (Voronezh), G.Polichko, U.Rabinovich (Kurgan), Y.Usov (Moscow) and others.

#### *Search for the New Landmarks (the 1990s – early 2000s)*

Along with Britain, **France** still remains one of the most active European countries to develop the media and ICT education. In France, the cradle of the cinema, the film education is still standing its ground. However a film is studied among other cultural and language means of expression. The theory and practice of audiovisual education (film education, in the first place) in France was first systematized and analyzed by the group of researchers headed by M.Martineau and published in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Martineau, 1998; 1991). A little later, UNESCO, CLEMI (Bazalgette, Bevort, and Savino, 1992) and the European Council (Masterman and Mariet, 1994) published several fundamental researches, this time dedicated to media education on the whole. The considerable part of these works was devoted to the analysis of the French experience in the field.

CLEMI works nowadays not only with teachers, students and pupils, but also with the instructors in clubs, journalists, and librarians. CLEMI considers the

work with information as a priority, due to its understanding of media education as primarily civic education. The CLEMI staff believes that media and ICT education can be integrated with any school subject.

In 1995, already at an international level, a CLEMI team launched the program 'FAX'. The pupils issued school-newspapers that were then sent by fax to partner schools in different countries. Now this program takes advantage of the Internet technology logically, because recently CLEMI has paid much attention to the educational potential of the World Wide Web (Bevort and Breda, 2001). Particularly, in the early 2000 the program 'Educanet' was developed, with the mission to develop the critical, autonomous thinking related to Internet information; the responsibility and safety of students.

As it has already been mentioned, media education in France is by and large integrated into the required school subjects (for example, French, History, Geography), though there are optional courses on media culture as well. Autonomous courses on film, television journalism and media culture are offered in numerous specialized lyceums and universities. In higher education institutions of Paris, Lyle, Strasbourg and some other cities the special media studies courses are taught for pre-service teachers. Still, J.Gonnet reasonably notes that 'the development of the single approach to media education is nothing but illusion' (Gonnet, 2001: 9).

Since the late 1990s a new program of the ICT integration has begun in France. According to it, for instance, each class should have an access to Internet and its own e-mail address. The project is sponsored by regional administrations and the Ministry of Education. New ICT promotes the connection between the smaller schools in remote rural areas, so that they can exchange information and research results, communicate and use computers in teaching and learning. Teachers have access to the database CNDP (*Centre National de Recherche Pédagogique*) and download necessary materials from there.

The key concept of media education in France is the word combination *l'éducation critique aux medias* (or *le jugement critique*) – critical thinking development. Evidently, one can draw a clear parallel with the concept of the critical thinking by the British L.Masterman. The view is that not only should students critically perceive and evaluate media texts, but also realize what kind of impact they exercise in surrounding reality (media as instruments of self expression of a personality, as means for the cultural development, etc.), the way media texts influence the audiences, etc. (Bazalgette, Bevort, and Savino, 1992; Bevort et al, 1999; Gonnet, 2001).

Thus, the distinguishing feature of media and ICT education in France is the emphasis on the education of a conscious, responsible citizen of a democratic society, while, for example, the Russian media education, having taken up its stand upon the rich traditions of literature-centered education, still remains aesthetically orientated.

The 1990s and early 2000s became quite productive years for the media and ICT education progress in the UK too (C.Bazalgette, D.Buckingham, A.Hart, S.Livingstone, L.Masterman and others leading media educators and researchers). In 1996 the College of Education of the University Southampton opened Media Education Center led by professor A.Hart. This center initiated large scale research, both national and international. The main projects of the centre (and before that – the research team of A. Hart) in the 1990s were the research of media and ICT education in the English curriculum and international outlooks of media education. The results were published in books and academic magazines (Hart, 1988; 1991; 1998), were reported at conferences and seminars to the international media education community.

At the turn of the century A.Hart launched another major research called ‘*Euromediaproject*’ aimed at the analysis of the current state of media education in European countries. Sadly, the tragic death of A. Hart in 2002 interrupted the course of the project. The conclusions of this project were drawn by the research team guided by his Swiss colleague, Professor of Zurich University D.Suss (Hart and Suss, 2002).

In 1998 under the patronage of the government Department of Culture the BFI created Film Education Working Group that engaged in research activity of media/film education problems. BFI closely collaborates with another influential organization – Film education that also develops programs for film and TV curricular, and teachers’ manuals.

However, unlike Canada and Australia, the study of media culture within integrated classes is not so spread in British schools (for instance, media education may occupy only 1-2 weeks a year, and more advanced study of media culture takes place in only 8 per cent of schools).

A.Hart critically estimated the UK situation in the field of media education. His findings related to the effectiveness of media education, integrated in English, are based on the practical activities of the Centre in 1998-1999, and include the following statements: teachers of English tend to be the followers of the discriminatory, protectionist paradigm of media education; topics of majority of media related lessons exclude political sphere; the dialogue form of work is rather poor, there’s a scarcity of practical application of the experience of pupils, lack of connection with their previous knowledge.

These conclusions affirm that the problem of the quality of media and ICT education is on the agenda in the UK. But the other hand, the criticism from a different perspective – aesthetic theory may be possible here too. For example, A.Breitman argues that “accentuating the social and communicative functions of the screen media to the detriment of the aesthetic one, the British model of media education is losing one of the most effective means of the aesthetic and artistic development of the students” (Breitman, 1999: 17). This tendency that takes place in the UK can be explained by the fact that the aesthetic theory of media education

is considered to some extent to be 'obsolete' and it's ceded to the cultural studies theory.

Recently quite a few books, collections of articles textbooks and other publication have been published in Great Britain, and translated into foreign languages. And though there is no unity of opinion in British media education (the vivid example is the debate between L.Masterman and C.Bazalgette on the theory and technology approaches), it remains one of the most influential not only in Europe, but in the world scale too.

Schools in **Germany** began their media education practice with its integration into the required curriculum. Media education was included into Arts, Geography, and Social Sciences. In the opinion of many modern German teachers, the study of media culture should promote the development of the civic self consciousness of pupils, their critical thinking.

Media culture is taught in the majority of German universities. Besides there are several research institutes, such as the National Institute of Film in Science (FWU). It publishes literature and teaching aids for schools (videos, leaflets, brochures, etc.). Another research centre on media is situated in Muenchen. Significant locations on the media education map of Germany are Kassel University with the media pedagogy centre headed by Professor B.Bachmair, and Humboldt University in Berlin with media education projects by Prof.Dr. Sigrid Bloemeke and her colleagues.

On the whole, media education (*Mediaenpaedagogik*) in Germany is understood as a wide range of various media related classes.

Within the broader media education field there are several directions:

- media training, and upbringing: defines the aims and pedagogic means necessary for this achievement;
- media didactics: defines which media can or should be used for the achievement of pedagogic aim;
- media research: embraces all scientific activity to find or/and prove aims, means, evidence, hypothesis related to media and systematizes them (Tulodziecki, 1989: 21).

The synthesis of the church and media pedagogy is quite typical for modern Germany; church has its own radio, newspapers, books, films, TV programs production. Understandably, there are quite a few proponents of the inoculatory or protectionist theory of media education among the German media educators working for the church. That is why activists of the church centres consider the means of media influence and strive for participation in the pedagogic process, realizing that media today is an inalienable part of the everyday lives of people, their education, work and recreation. Thus, taking advantage of media, one can efficiently influence the perception and the way of thinking of audiences.

Unfortunately, the impact of German media and ICT education is actually limited to the few German-speaking countries. As a rule the theoretical and

methodological works of German media educators are known abroad among the small specialists' circle.

Despite all the achievements of European media education, for the last 10-15 years **Canada** holds the leadership in the field (N.Andersen, B.Duncan, C.Worsnop, J.Pungente, L.Rother, etc.). At least, media culture here is an integral component of school curricula of the English language. Media and ICT course are offered in almost all Canadian universities. And nearly each Canadian province has its own association of media education activists that conducts conferences, publishes periodicals and other materials. French speaking Canadians also do not fall behind in the movement of media education.

In 1991 Vancouver hosted the opening of the CAME: Canadian Association for Media Education. In 1994 this association organized summer courses for teachers and began publications of the teaching recommendations and programs. Finally, the strong chain of efforts led to victory – in September 1999 the study of media culture became obligatory for pupils of all Canadian secondary schools, grades 1-12. Of course, Canadian provinces have certain peculiarities in educational practice. But the coordination of media educators from different regions is implemented by the CAMEO (Canadian Association of Media Education Organizations) founded in 1992. Today one can state that media education in Canada is on the upgrade and holds the leading position in the world.

Along with Canada and UK, **Australia** is one of the most advanced countries in media education field. Media studies are provided in the school curricula of all Australian states. Media educators in Australia are united in a professional association ATOM (Australian Teachers of Media), issuing the quarterly magazine *METRO*. ATOM holds regular conferences, publishes books, audiovisual aids, etc.

Every Australian child has to attend school until the age of 15. 70 per cent of students continue their education until 17 (McMahon, and Quin, 1999: 191). Media education is taught essentially in senior classes, although the process starts in elementary school. In high school the specific course Media Studies is taught but at the same time media education is integrated with subject like 'The English Language', 'Arts', 'Technology', etc.

The majority of Australian teachers believe that media literacy is necessary for teaching and learning, because media education is the means of culture dissemination and a source of new knowledge (Greenaway, 1997: 187). Media preferences of the particular audience, appreciation of media texts should be considered (McMahon and Quin, 1997: 317). There are also the proponents of media as popular art approach in Australia (Greenaway, 1997: 188). However many media and ICT education activists in Australia interpret it in a broader than merely art context. Due to the development of the Internet the work of Australian media educators is spread overseas and is acknowledged internationally.

One cannot deny the fact that the **USA** has become a leading country in media culture. American press, radio, and especially cinema, TV and Internet

dominate the world's information field. The impact of American mass media on the formation of the personalities of adolescents from different culture is hard to overestimate.

Though media education in the USA initially was not developing so intensely as in Europe, by the beginning of the XXI century we can see a mature system of American media pedagogy, which communicates with other countries through the web sites, publications, conferences. There are several major associations for media education in the USA.

By the early 1990s more than a thousand of American universities have offered over 9000 courses on film and television (Costanzo, 1992: 73). In the mid 1990s the growth of the prestige of media education resulted in the integration of media education into the educational standards of the 12 states (Kubey and Baker, 2000: 9). However 10 year later – by 2004 the number of states that officially recognized media literacy as part of the curricula, raised to 50.

As for media and ICT education in American universities – it has traditionally developed more lively. Nearly all American universities and colleges beginning from the 1960s have one way or another allocated media courses (at journalism departments, Film, Art, Cultural Studies, etc.).

In 46 states media education is woven with the English language or Arts. 30 states integrate media education in Social Science, History, civics, Ecology, Health. Professional associations try to include media education into the state standards (although optional but considered as desirable examples) because the acceptance of the state education standards would facilitate the dissemination of successful media education practices (Kubey, 1998; Tyner, 2000).

In the 1990s media education in the USA was used as a strategy for a television reform, propaganda of the health values, and as means of resistance against destructive stereotypes in multicultural society – in other words, as an extended inoculatory model, that strives to protect the audience from harmful media effects.

American media and ICT educators began to collaborate more closely with their foreign colleagues in the 1990s, particularly from other English-speaking countries. But in order to apply the borrowed experience successfully, Canadian or British models of media education must be certainly adapted to cultural, social, historic and economic conditions lying at the basis of the American education.

Perestroika, initiated by M.Gorbachev has changed the practice of media education in **Russia** dramatically. Media and ICT education encountered numerous difficulties during the whole history of its existence (ideological, financial, technical, etc.). In the 1920s - 1980s the political and censorship control, and the poor technical equipment of schools and higher educational institutions hindered the media education movement. Finally in the 1990s Russian media teachers were granted the freedom and independence for making programs and their practical introduction. But the raised costs increased technical problems of introducing media and ICT education. Many Russian schools and colleges in the



1990s didn't have enough money for paying salary to teachers, to say nothing of the audiovisual equipment. Moreover, at the time few universities were preparing future teachers for media and ICT education of pupils.

And still Russian media and ICT education was evolving. In May 1991 the first Russian Cinema Lyceum was opened (and it existed until 1999). International conferences on media education were held in Tashkent (1990), in Moscow region – Valuevo (1992), in Moscow (1992, 1995), Taganrog (2001). The total number of media teachers – members of the Association for Film and Media Education – reached 300. Unfortunately, “the epoch of reform” of the 1990s affected media and ICT education movement not to its advantage. The state support given to the Society of Film Friends (SFF) in the late 1980s ran out by the early 1992. The private firm “VIKING” (Video and Film Literacy), organized by the Head of the Association for Film and Media Education G.Polichko, sponsored a lot of successful projects, such as the Russian-British seminars on media education and conferences, mentioned above. But in late 1990s the firm went bankrupt and closed. However in the 1990s the summer festivals of film & media education for children took place in some Russian cities with workshops on media and ICT. The screen arts and media education laboratories at the Russian Academy of Education continue their projects. The ICT Education development is supported by Russian Federation for Internet Education. Books and teaching materials, media education curricula are published (A.Fedorov, S.Penzin, N.Hilko, A.Sharikov, A.Spichkin, and others), etc.

The important events in media and ICT education development in Russia are the registration of the new specialization (since 2002) for the pedagogical universities – ‘Media Education’ (№ 03.13.30), and the launch of a new academic journal ‘*Media Education*’ (since January 2005), partly sponsored by the ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia). Additionally, the Internet sites of Russian Association for Film and Media Education <http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation> (English and Russian versions) and <http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru> (Russian version) were created.

Taking into account the fact that UNESCO defines media education as the priority field of the cultural educational development in the XXI century, media literacy has good prospects in Russia. We can also see the fast progress of media education in other Eastern European countries. For example, Hungary (since the beginning of the XXI century) became the first European country to introduce obligatory media education courses in secondary schools.

Summing up, at the beginning of the XXI century media and ICT education in the leading world countries has reached the mass scale, supported by the serious theoretical and methodological research. However media and ICT education is still not equally spread in all of the European, African and Asian countries.

### References

Andersen, N., Duncan B. & Pungente, J.J. (1999). Media Education in Canada – the Second Spring. In: Feilitzen, C. von, and Carlsson, U. (Eds.). *Children and Media: Image. Education. Participation.*

- Bagenova, L.** (1992). *In the World of Screen Arts.* (in Russian). Moscow: VIPK, 71 p.
- Baranov, O.** (2002). *Media Education in School and University.* (in Russian). Tver: Tver State University, 87 p.
- Bazalgette, C.** (1997). An Agenda of the Second Phase of Media Literacy Development. *Media Literacy in the Information Age.* New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.): Transaction Publishers, pp.69-78.
- Bazalgette, C.** (Ed.) (1989). *Primary Media Education: A Curriculum Statement.* London: BFI.
- Bazalgette, C., Bevort, E., Savino, J.** (Eds.) (1992) *Media Education Worldwide.* Paris: UNESCO, 256 p.
- Bevort, E., Breda, I.** (2001) *Les jeunes et Internet.* Paris: CLEMI, 160 p.
- Bevort, E., Cardy H., De Smedt, T., Garcin-Marrou, I.** (1999) *Evaluation des pratiques en education aux medias, leurs effets sur les enseignants et leurs eleves.* Paris: CLEMI, 152 p.
- Breitman, A.** (1999). *The Basics of the Film Art.* (in Russian). Khabarovsk, 112 p.
- Buckingham, D.** (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture.* Cambridge, UK: Polity, 219 p.
- Chevallier, J.** (Ed.) (1980). *Cine-club et action educative.* Paris: CNDP, 64 p.
- CLEMI (1996). *L'Actualite' et les medias `a l'ecole primaire, au college at au lycee.* Paris: CLEMI, 120 p.
- Costanzo, W.V.** (1992). *Reading the Movie.* Urbana, Illinois: National council of Teachers of English, 201 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods.* (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2005). *Media Education for Future Teachers.* (in Russian). Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 314 p.
- Fedorov, A. and Chelysheva, I.** (2002). *Media Education in Russia: Brief History of Development.* (in Russian). Taganrog: Poznanie, 266 p.
- Fedorov, A.** *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students.* (in Russian). Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 2007, 616 p.
- Freinet, C.** (1927). *L'imprimerie a l'ecole.* Boulogne: Ferrary.
- Freinet, C.** (1963). *Les techniques audiovisuelles.* Cannes: Bibliotheque de l'ecole moderne, 144 p.
- Gonnet, J.** (2001). *Education aux medias: Les controverses fecondes.* Paris: CNDP, Hachette, 144 p.
- Greenaway, P.** (1997). Media and Arts Education: A Global View from Australia. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) *Media Literacy in the Information Age.* New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp.187-198.
- Hart, A, & Suss, D.** (Eds.) (2002) *Media Education in 12 European Countries.* Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. <http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/show?type=bericht&nr=246>
- Hart, A.** (1988). *Making 'The Real World'.* Cambridge: CUP.
- Hart, A.** (1991). *Understanding Media: A Practical Guide.* London: Routledge, 268 p.
- Hart, A.** (1998). Introduction: Media Education in the Global Village. In: Hart, A. (Ed.). *Teaching the Media. International Perspectives.* Mahwah, New Jersey – London: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Publishers, pp.1-21.
- Hilko, N.** (2001). *The Role of Audiovisual Culture in the Creative Self Expression of the Personality* (in Russian). Omsk: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 446 p.
- Hilko, N.** (2004). *Social and Cultural Aspects of Screen Creativeness.* (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 96 p.
- Hodgkinson, A.W.** (1964). A Specimen Screen Education Syllabus. In: Hodgkinson, A.W. (Ed.) *Screen Education.* Paris: UNESCO, pp.26-27.
- Kirillova, N.** (1992). *Theory and Practice of World Film Art.* (in Russian). Ekaterinburg: Ekaterinburg State Theatre Institute, 48 p.
- Korkonosenko, S.** (2004). *Journalism Education: Professional and Mass Media Education.* (in Russian). St-Petersburg: Mikhailov, 240 p.

- Korochensky, A.** (2003). *Media Criticism in the Theory and Practice of Journalism*. (in Russian). Ph.D. Diss. St-Petersburg: St-Petersburg State University.
- Kubey, R. & Baker, F.** (2000). Has Media Literacy Found a Curricular Foothold? *Telemedium, The Journal of Media Literacy*. Vol. 46. N 1, pp.8-9, 30.
- Kubey, R.** (1998). Obstacles to the Development of Media Education in the United States. *Journal of Communication* (Winter), pp.58-69.
- Levshina, I.** (1974). *Education of Pupils by Means of Film Art*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 25 p.
- Malobitskaya, Z.** (1979). *Film Art as Moral and Aesthetic Education of Pupils*. (in Russian). Ph.D. Diss. Irkutsk: Irkutsk State Pedagogical Institute.
- Marcussen, E.B.** (1964). Teaching Screen Education to the Teachers. In: Hodgkinson, A.W. (Ed.) *Screen Education*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.72-76.
- Martineau, M.** (Ed.) (1988). *L'enseignement du cinema et de l'audiovisuel*. Paris: CinemAction, 299 p.
- Martineau, M.** (Ed.) (1991). *L'enseignement du cinema et de l'audiovisuel dans l'Europe des douze*. Paris: CinemAction, 433 p.
- Masterman, L. & Mariet, F.** (1994). *L'Education aux medias dans l'Europe des annees 90*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, 180 p.
- Masterman, L.** (1985). *Teaching the Media*. London: Comedia Publishing Group, 341 p.
- 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.
- McLuhan, M.** (1967). *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 294 p.
- McMahon, B. and Quin, R.** (1997). Living with the Tiger: Media Education Issues for the Future. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.). *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp.307-321.
- McMahon, B. and Quin, R.** (1999). Australian Children and the Media Education, Participation and Enjoyment. In: *Children and Media. Image.Education.Participation*. Geteborg: The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen, Nordicom, pp.189-203.
- Minkkinen S.** (1978). *A General Curricular Model for Mass Media Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Monastyrsky, V.** (1979). *Art Education of Pupils by Means of TV in After School Programs*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Academy of Education.
- Moore, G.J.** (1969). The Case for Screen Education. In: Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J. (Eds.). *Screen Education in Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, pp.6-26.
- Nechai, O.** (1989). *The Basics of Film Art* (in Russian). Moscow: Prosveshenie, 288 p.
- Penzin, S.** (1987). *Cinematograph and Aesthetical Education* (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 176 p.
- Penzin, S.** (2004). *Film Education and Modern Times* (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, pp.151-163.
- Polichko, G.** (1990). *Introduction to Film Education* (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 23 p.
- Potter, W.J.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Rabinovich, U.** (1991). *Cinema, Literature and my Life* (in Russian).Kurgan: Periodika, 120 p.
- Rother, L.** Media Literacy and At-Risk Students: A Canadian Perspective.*Telemedium, The Journal of Media Literacy*. 2002. Vol.48. N 2.
- Semali, L.M.** (2000). *Literacy in Multimedia America*. New York – London: Falmer Press, 243 p.
- Sharikov, A., Cherkashin, E.** (1991). *Experimental Curricula for Media Education*. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 43 p.
- Silverblatt, A.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Sim, J.C.** (1977). Mass Media Education in the U.S.A. In: *Media Studies in Education*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.74-88.
- Spitchkin, A.** (1999). *What is Media Education?* (in Russian). Kurgan: Kurgan Teacher Training Institute, 114 p.

- Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J.** (1969). What's the Idea? In: Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J. (Eds.). *Screen Education in Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, p.5.
- Tulodziecki, G.** (1989). *Mediaenerziehung in schule und unterricht*. Bad Heilbrunn.
- Tyner, K.** (1998). *Literacy in the Digital World: Teaching and Learning in the Age of Information*. Mahwan, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 291 p.
- Tyner, K.** (2000). Directions and Challenges for Media Education. *Telemedium. The Journal of Media Literacy*. Vol. 46. N 1, p.4.
- Usov, Y.** (1989). *Film Education as Aesthetic and Art Education and Development of Pupils*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical University, 32 p.
- Usov, Y.** (1998). *Basics of Screen Arts*. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 60 p.
- Vartanova, E. And Zassursky, J.** (2003). Russian Module of Media Education: Conceptions, Principles, Models. (in Russian). *Information Society*, 3: 5-10.
- Worsnop, C.** (1999). *Screening Images: Ideas for Media Education*. Second Edition. Mississauga: Wright Communication.
- Zaznobina, L.** (1996). Media Education Standard Integrated in Humanities and Others Disciplines of Secondary Education', in L.Zaznobina (Ed.), *Media Education*. (in Russian). Moscow: Moscow Institute of Teachers' Education, pp.72-78.
- Zaznobina, L.** (1998). Media Education Standard Integrated Across the Curriculum. (in Russian). *Standards and Monitoring in Education*, 3: 26-34.

## Basic Media Education Models

Models of media education can be divided into the following groups:

- educational-information models (the study of the theory, history, language of media culture, etc.), based on the cultural, aesthetic, semiotic, socio-cultural theories of media education;
- educational-ethical models (the study of moral, religious, philosophical problems relying on the ethic, religious, ideological, ecological, protectionist theories of media education;
- pragmatic models (practical media technology training), based on the uses and gratifications and 'practical' theories of media and ICT education;
- aesthetical models (aimed above all at the development of the artistic taste and enriching the skills of analysis of the best media culture examples). Relies on the aesthetical (art and cultural studies theory);
- socio-cultural models (socio-cultural development of a creative personality as to the perception, imagination, visual memory, interpretation analysis, autonomic critical thinking), relying on the cultural studies, semiotic, ethic models of media education.

We must bear in mind that these models rarely exist in their 'pure' form and are often tied to one another.

Methods of ICT and media education may be classified according to

- a) the mode of presentation: aural (lecture, conversation, explanation, discussion); demonstrative (illustration, audio, visual or audiovisual); practical (various media activities);
- b) the level of the cognitive activity: explanatory-demonstrative (communication of certain information about media, its perception and assimilation; reproductive (exercises, tasks that help students masters the technique of their solution); problem (problem analysis of certain situations or texts targeted (creative quest activities). Close attention is paid to the process of perception and media texts analysis, units of simulations, creative activities, and practical activity of the print and audiovisual production, web pages elaboration.

There has been a long debate about the conditions necessary for more effective media education. There have been and there are proponents of the extra-curricula/out of class media pedagogy (Levshina, 1974: 21). But there are a lot more supporters of the integrated media education (L.Zaznobina, A. Hart and others).

Overwhelming spread of mass media, arrival of new ICT, to my mind, provides the opportunity to apply many of the existing media education models, synthesize and integrate them.

For convenience, I divide them conventionally into groups A, B, and C.

***Group A. Media Education Models, Presenting the Synthesis of Aesthetic and Sociocultural Models (Usov, 1989; 1998)***

**Conceptual Ground:** aesthetic and cultural studies theories of media education.

**Aims:** aesthetic, audiovisual, emotional, intellectual education of the audience, developing:

- various kinds of the active thinking (imagery, associative, logical, creative);
- skills of perception, interpretation, analysis and aesthetic evaluation of a media text;
- need for verbal communication about the new information and the want of the art, creative activity;
- skills to pass on the knowledge, gained at classes, impression of the different forms of art, and environment, with the help of ICT in multimedia forms: integration of media education into the study, extra-curricula and leisure activities of students. **4 kinds of activities** may be distinguished: 1) learning about media arts, their functioning in society; 2) looking for the message of a media text communicated through the space-and-time form of narration; 3) interpreting the results, aesthetic evaluation of a media text; 4) artistic, creative activity (Usov, 1989a: 7-8).

**Main components of the media education program's contents** (based on the key concepts of media education: agency, category, technology, language, representation and audience) are:

- Introduction to media education (the definition of media education, media text, main criteria for its assessment, process of the creation of media texts, etc.);
- Media reality in media education (means of the visual image, media culture, model of its development, etc.);
- A human being and the environment – study, comprehension and identification (correlation of the perceptive units, various means of the establishment of these interconnection; information space, its interpretation through word, music, image, etc.);
- Technologies, improving the study of the environment, modeling the human consciousness (the development of media technology, modeling of the world and a person's picture of it, etc.);
- Digital millennium – a new phase of civilization (philosophical, aesthetical, cultural evaluation of mass media; peculiarities of the digital society, narration, impact of modern media; potential of ICT technologies, etc.).

On the whole, Y.Usov's model integrates media studies with the traditional arts and ICT. The contents of the model is determined by the concept of "aesthetical culture as a system of levels of the emotional and intellectual pupil/students' development in the field of the image, associative logical thinking, perception of fiction and reality, skills for interpretation, reasoning for

evaluation of various types of media information, need for the creative artistic activity on the material of traditional arts and mass media” (Usov, 1998: 56). Usov’s model is aimed at the effective development of such important aspects of culture of a personality as: active thinking (including imaginative, creative, logic, critical, associative); apprehension, interpretation, evaluation and analysis of different media texts; the need for the comprehension and a qualified usage of media language; need for the verbal communication during the reception of the media information; skill to transfer the knowledge, results of the perception through media (Usov, 1998: 56).

**Application fields:** required and optional subjects (in educational institutions of different types), clubs, extra-curricula forms of education. While validating this model, Y.Usov found possibilities for its implementation in special and integral media education.

Our study has shown that media education models, suggested by L.Bagenova (1992), I.Levshina (1974), V.Monastyrsky (1979), G.Polichko (1990), U.Rabinovich (1991) and some other media educators also present a synthesis of the aesthetic and sociocultural models of education. In Western countries the orientation to the aesthetic models, as it is known, was popular until the 1970s. Among their advocates were British A.Hodgkinson (1964: 26-27), Canadians F.Stewart and J.Nuttal (1969: 5) and G.Moore (1969: 9). Nowadays a similar approach is supported by the Australian P.Greenaway (1997: 188). But on the whole, aesthetic (art orientated models of media education) yielded to the socio-cultural models based on the cultural studies theory and critical thinking theory.

**Group B. Media Education Models Presenting a Synthesis of the Aesthetic and Ethic Upbringing Models (Penzin, 1987; 2004; Baranov, 2002)**

**Conceptual ground:** aesthetic and ethic theories of media education: one cannot confine to a specific – aesthetical or critical – aim only, because a person above all must be ethical, *homo eticus* (Penzin, 1987: 47).

**Aims:** the development of a personality on the material of art media texts, resulting, according to S.Penzin, in acquirement of the fine aesthetical taste, awareness of the clichés of the perception, imaginative thinking, realizing that media is an art construct, and not a mirror reflection of real life, understanding of the need for art study, - general aesthetic qualities. And some specific qualities are: the demand of the serious media art, ability to interpret media texts adequately, interest in media history, etc. (Penzin, 1987: 46-47).

**Objectives are:**

- knowledge acquisition (and as a result – understanding the need for studying media theory and history, ability to interpret all elements of a media text, accurately analyze of its language, making conscious choices related to media consumption;

- training the skills of visual thinking, post-viewing reflection;
- upbringing aimed at the fine aesthetic taste development, cultural requirement to communicate with the ‘serious art’ vs. pop art (Penzin, 1987: 47-48);
- moral development of the audience, steady ethical values, principles and orientations (Baranov, 2002: 25).

**Forms of work:** integration of media education into the school, extra-curricula and leisure activities of the pupils- through the organization of the media text perception, explanation, activities.

**Main components of the media education program’s contents:** (dealing with the key aspects of media education- “media agency”, “media category”, “media technology”, “language”, “representation”, and “the audience”):

- introduction to the aesthetics and art studies (particularly, film studies), history of the cinematograph, assisting the valid aesthetic perception of any film;
- pragmatic spheres of application of the theoretical knowledge;
- challenging problems in modern state of research;
- activities, with the help of which the pupils acquire the experience of analysis of film art samples” (Penzin, 1987: 46; Penzin, 2004).

Having made a start from the traditional principles of didactics, S.Penzin distinguishes the following specific principles of media education: the film study in the system of arts; the unity of the rational and emotional in the aesthetic perception of film art; bi-functionality of the aesthetic self upbringing, when the aesthetic sense clarifies the ethical (Penzin, 1987: 71). Hence follows the “trinity of objectives of the training to analyze a film, as a piece of art. The first objective is the understanding of the author’s concept, study of everything that is directly connected to the author - the main **agent** of the aesthetical origin. The second one is the comprehension of the character- the main **vehicle** of the aesthetical origin. The third one is the fusion, synthesis of the above two. (...) All the three objectives are inseparable; they emerge and require a solution simultaneously” (Penzin, 1987: 56).

**Fields of application:** required and optional subjects (mainly at university level), club/extra school centers; integrated media education.

Our analysis has shown that media education models, suggested by A.Breitman (1999), N.Kirillova (1992), Z.Malobitskaya (1979) and others, also in one form or another synthesize the aesthetical, informative, and ethical upbringing models. In many countries such models since the early seventies (together with the study of the oeuvre of the authors of media masterpieces, and inoculation of the “expert” taste for the “high quality art media texts”) have been gradually substituted by the models of socio-cultural education based on the cultural studies theory of media education and the theory of the audiences’ critical thinking development.



***Group C. Media Education Models, Presenting a Synthesis of the Sociocultural, Informative and Practical/Pragmatic Models (Fedorov, 2001; Sharikov, 1991; Spitchkin, 1999; Zaznobina, 1996, 1998)***

Media education is regarded as the process of the personality's development with and through mass media: i.e. the development of the communicative culture with media, creative, communicative skills, critical thinking, skills of the full perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, training of the self-expression with media technology, etc. The resulting media literacy helps a person to use possibilities of the information field of television, radio, video, press, and Internet effectively, contributes to the more sophisticated insight into the media culture language (Fedorov, 2001: 38).

**Conceptual basis:** the sociocultural theory, elements of the critical thinking theory, semiotic, cultural studies, ethical and ecological theories of media education. The cultural studies component (the necessity for media education as a result of the development of media culture) and sociocultural component (acknowledgment in pedagogy of the importance of the social role of media) condition, according to A.Sharikov's concept, the main postulates of sociocultural theories of media education: 1) the development of media obligates to the necessity of the special professional training in each new field, connected with new mass media; 2) taking into account the mass scale of the media audience, professionals, especially the teachers of the special media subjects, face the need of the media language education for the bigger audiences; 3) this tendency grows because the society realizes the growing influence of media and, as a result, persuades media educators to further development of the media education process.

**Aim:** sociocultural development of a personality (including the development of the critical thinking) on the material of mass media.

**Objectives:**

- introduction of the basic concepts and laws of the theory of communication;
- development of the perception and comprehension of media texts;
- development of the skills of analysis, interpretation, evaluation of media texts of various types and genres, critical thinking of the audience;
- development of the media communicative skills;
- training to apply the new knowledge and skills for the creation of own media texts of various types and genres.

**Forms of work:** media educational (special) and long-term course, accounting the specifics of the educational institution, interrelation of different levels in the system of continuous education (for example, pre-service education of teachers); integrated courses, autonomous courses.

**Main components of the media education program's contents:** (dealing with the study of the key concepts of media education: media agency, category, technology, language, representation and audience):

- types and genres, language of media; the place and role of media education in the modern world;
- basic terminology, theories, key concepts, directions, models of media education;
- main historical stages of the media education development in the world (for high education institutions only);
- problems of media perception, analysis of media texts and the development of the audience related to media culture;
- practical application activities (literature-simulated, art-simulated, and drama-situational).

**Fields of application:** may be used in educational institutions of different types, in colleges of education, in-service teacher upgrade qualification training.

The views of professionals in media studies E.Vartanova and J.Zassursky (2003: 5-10) are quite close to this concept too. At the beginning of the XXI century they suggested the drafts of media and ICT education curricula for the various institutions and audiences.

For the full implementation of the model the rubric for the criteria of the media literacy development is necessary (A.Fedorov, 2005: 92-114), which are: 1) motivational (motives of contact with media texts: genre, thematic, emotional, gnoseological, hedonistic, psychological, moral, intellectual, aesthetical, therapeutic, etc.); 2) communicative (frequency of contact with media culture production, etc.); 3) informative (knowledge of terminology, theory and history of media culture, process of mass communication); 4) perceptive (skill of the perception of a media text); 5) interpretive/ evaluative (skills to interprets, analyze media texts based on the certain level of media perception, critical autonomy); 6) practically-operated (skill to create/ disseminate own media texts); 7) creative (creativity in different aspects of activity- perceptive, role-play, artistic, research, etc., related to media).

***Media Education Model of the Critical Thinking Development (Masterman, 1985; 1997; Silverblatt, 2001)***

**Conceptual basis:** the theory of the critical thinking development, ideological and semiotic theories of media education.

**Aims:** to develop the critical autonomy of the personality, to teach the audience to realize how media represent/ rethink the reality, to decode, critically analyze media texts, to orientate in the information/ideology flow in modern society.

**Objectives:**

- teaching the audience about 1) those who are responsible for the creation of a media text, who own mass media and control them; 2) how the intended effect

is achieved; 3) what values orientations are presented; 4) how it is perceived by the audience (Masterman, 1985);

- development of the critical, democratic thinking, “critical autonomy”, skills to understand the hidden meaning of a message, to resist the manipulation of the consciousness of an individual by the media, evaluate the credibility of the source, etc.

**Forms of work:** autonomic and integrated media education in the educational institutions of various types.

**Main components of the media education program’s contents** (dealing with the key aspects of media education: media ideology, media agency, category, technology, language, representation, audience):

- media education units integrated into the school/ university curriculum;
- media education autonomic courses for schools/ universities.

These activities include: content-analysis, narrative analysis, historical, structural, genre analysis of media texts, and analysis of the characters’ representation.

**Application fields:** educational institutions of various types.

***Cultural Studies Model of Media Education (Bazalgette, 1989; 1997; Buckingham, 2003; Hart, 1991, 1998; Andersen, Duncan & Pungente, 1999; Worsnop, 1999; Rother, 2002; Potter, 2001; Semali, 2000; Fedorov, 2001; 2005; 2007 and others)***

**Conceptual Foundation:** cultural studies theory of media education (with some elements of the semiotic and practical theories).

**Aims:** based on the six key concepts (C.Bazalgette) (agency, category, language, technology, representation, audience): to prepare young people to live in a democratic mediated society. In D.Buckingham’s handling of the question, the concepts “agency”, “category”, and “technology” are united into one, related to the media text production (Buckingham, 2003: 53). According to the Canadian media educators, there are 7 key concepts (all media texts are results of media construction; each text has its unique aesthetic form; the form and contents are closely connected; each type of media has its peculiarities of the language, hints and codes of the reality; media construct reality; the audience evaluate the significance of a media text from the point of view of such factors as gender, race, age, experience; media have socio-political and commercial meanings; media contain ideological and values messages).

**Objectives:**

- development of the skills of perception, “decoding”, evaluation, comprehension, analysis of a media text;
- development of the awareness of social, cultural, political, and economic meanings and sub-meanings of media texts;
- development of critical thinking skills;
- development of communicative skills;

- ability for a self-expression of a person through media;
- ability to identify, interpret media texts, experiment with different ways of the technical applications of media, to create media production;
- ability to apply and transfer knowledge about the theory of media and media culture.

**Form of work:** integrated and autonomic media and ICT education in secondary, high and supplementary education institutions.

**Main components of the media education program's contents**

(dealing with key aspects of agency, category, language, technology, representation, audience.):

- media education units, integrated into the basic school/university courses;
- autonomic media education courses

**Conclusions.** The analysis conducted has shown, that the models of S.Minkinen (1978: 54-56], A.Silverblatt , and others are quite close to the media education model, targeted at the critical thinking development, suggested by L.Masterman. However, a greater number of media educators adhere to the synthesis of socio-cultural, informative, and practical-pragmatic model, presented in the model of C.Bazalgette, D.Buckingham, A.Hart. I suppose that the theoretical and methodological viewpoints of J.Bowker, B.Bachmair, J.Gonnet (and the leading media education organization in France, CLEMI - *Centre de liaison de l'insegnement et des moyens d'information*), D.Considine, B.McMahon, R.Quin, T.Panhoff, J.Potter, L.M.Semali, K.Tyner, leaders of the Belgium media education organization CEM (*Conseil de l'Education aux Medias*) also gravitate towards it.

The analysis has also demonstrated that the media education model, suggested by the leading Canadian educators is rather allied to C.Bazalgette's and other European educators' model, although undoubtedly, it is different in some ways, first of all - in a more tolerant attitude to the study of the aesthetic/artistic spectrum of media culture.

To a great extent we can trace a correlation between the model of C.Bazalgette, D.Buckingham and A.Hart and the concepts of A.Sharikov (1991), L.Zaznobina (1998), A.Spichkin (1999), A.Fedorov (2001), E.Varnanova and J.Zassursky (2003), A.Korochensky (2003), S.Korkonosenko (2004), N.Hilko (2001; 2004) and some other Russian media educators, who also somewhat synthesize the sociocultural, informative, and practical-pragmatic models of media education.

Therewith the synthesis of the aesthetical and sociocultural models, suggested for instance in the models by Y.Usov (1989a; 1998), S.Penzin (1987; 1994), O.Baranov (2002), U.Rabinovich (1991), G.Polichko (1990), nowadays is supported mainly by the Russian media education activists - L.Bagenova (1992), I.Levshina (1975), V.Monastyrsky (1999).

On the other hand, in the ethical approaches to media education one can discover the coherence of viewpoints of the Russian (O.Baranov, Z.Malobitskaya, S.Penzin, N.Hilko, etc.) and foreign media educators (S.Baran, B.Mac-Mahon, L.Rother, etc.).

Thus, in different countries there is a wide range of the prospective media education models, which are used in the process of education and upbringing. With that the analysis of the central models demonstrates that the most typical synthetic models belong to three groups:

Group A. Media education models, representing the synthesis of the aesthetical and sociocultural models.

Group B. Media education models, representing the synthesis of the aesthetical, informative and ethical models.

Group C. Media education models, representing the synthesis of the socio-cultural, informative and practical-pragmatic models.

Therewith the models of group C are most spread and supported today in the majority of countries.

Modern media education models lean towards the maximum usage of the potential possibilities of media education depending on the aims and objectives; they are characterized by the variability, options of the entire or fragmental integration into the education process.

The methods, suggested for the realization of the modern media education models, as a rule, are based on the units (modules, blocks) of the creative and simulation activities, which can be used by the teachers in class and in extra-curricula lessons. The important feature of these models is the extensiveness of implementation: schools, colleges, universities, leisure centers. Moreover, media education classes can be conducted in the form of special lessons, electives, or integrated with other subjects, may be used in clubs' activities as well.

### References

- Andersen, N., Duncan B. & Pungente, J.J.** (1999). Media Education in Canada – the Second Spring. In: Feilitzen, C. von, and Carlsson, U. (Eds.). *Children and Media: Image. Education. Participation.*
- Bagenova, L.** (1992). *In the World of Screen Arts.* (in Russian). Moscow: VIPK, 71 p.
- Baranov, O.** (2002). *Media Education in School and University.* (in Russian).Tver: Tver State University, 87 p.
- Bazalgette, C.** (1997). An Agenda of the Second Phase of Media Literacy Development. *Media Literacy in the Information Age.* New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.): Transaction Publishers, pp.69-78.
- Bazalgette, C.** (Ed.) (1989). *Primary Media Education: A Curriculum Statement.* London: BFI.
- Bazalgette, C., Bevort, E., Savino, J.** (Eds.) (1992) *Media Education Worldwide.* Paris: UNESCO, 256 p.
- Bevort, E., Breda, I.** (2001) *Les jeunes et Internet.* Paris: CLEMI, 160 p.
- Bevort, E., Cardy H., De Smedt, T., Garcin-Marrou, I.** (1999) *Evaluation des pratiques en education aux medias, leurs effets sur les enseignants et leurs eleves.* Paris: CLEMI, 152 p.
- Breitman, A.** (1999). *The Basics of the Film Art.* (in Russian). Khabarovsk, 112 p.

- Buckingham, D.** (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 219 p.
- Chevallier, J.** (Ed.) (1980). *Cine-club et action educative*. Paris: CNDP, 64 p.
- CLEMI (1996). *L'Actualite' et les medias `a l'ecole primaire, au college at au lycee*. Paris: CLEMI, 120 p.
- Costanzo, W.V.** (1992). *Reading the Movie*. Urbana, Illinois: National council of Teachers of English, 201 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2005). *Media Education for Future Teachers*. (in Russian). Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 314 p.
- Fedorov, A. and Chelysheva, I.** (2002). *Media Education in Russia: Brief History of Development*. (in Russian). Taganrog: Poznanie, 266 p.
- Fedorov, A.** *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students*. (in Russian). Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 2007, 616 p.
- Freinet, C.** (1927). *L'imprimerie a l'ecole*. Boulogne: Ferrary.
- Freinet, C.** (1963). *Les techniques audiovisuelles*. Cannes: Bibliotheque de l'ecole moderne, 144 p.
- Gonnet, J.** (2001). *Education aux medias: Les controverses fecondes*. Paris: CNDP, Hachette, 144 p.
- Greenaway, P.** (1997). Media and Arts Education: A Global View from Australia. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp.187-198.
- Hart, A, & Suss, D.** (Eds.) (2002) *Media Education in 12 European Countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. <http://e-collection.ethbib.ethz.ch/show?type=bericht&nr=246>
- Hart, A.** (1988). *Making 'The Real World'*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hart, A.** (1991). *Understanding Media: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge, 268 p.
- Hart, A.** (1998). Introduction: Media Education in the Global Village. In: Hart, A. (Ed.). *Teaching the Media. International Perspectives*. Mahwah, New Jersey – London: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Publishers, pp.1-21.
- Hilko, N.** (2001). *The Role of Audiovisual Culture in the Creative Self Expression of the Personality* (in Russian). Omsk: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 446 p.
- Hilko, N.** (2004). *Social and Cultural Aspects of Screen Creativeness*. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 96 p.
- Hodgkinson, A.W.** (1964). A Specimen Screen Education Syllabus. In: Hodgkinson, A.W. (Ed.) *Screen Education*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.26-27.
- Kirillova, N.** (1992). *Theory and Practice of World Film Art*. (in Russian). Ekaterinburg: Ekaterinburg State Theatre Institute, 48 p.
- Korkonosenko, S.** (2004). *Journalism Education: Professional and Mass Media Education*. (in Russian). St-Petersburg: Mikhailov, 240 p.
- Korochensky, A.** (2003). *Media Criticism in the Theory and Practice of Journalism*. (in Russian). Ph.D. Diss. St-Petersburg: St-Petersburg State University.
- Kubey, R. & Baker, F.** (2000). Has Media Literacy Found a Curricular Foothold? *Telemidium. The Journal of Media Literacy*. Vol. 46. N 1, pp.8-9, 30.
- Kubey, R.** (1998). Obstacles to the Development of Media Education in the United States. *Journal of Communication* (Winter), pp.58-69.
- Levshina, I.** (1974). *Education of Pupils by Means of Film Art*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 25 p.
- Malobitskaya, Z.** (1979). *Film Art as Moral and Aesthetic Education of Pupils*. (in Russian). Ph.D. Diss. Irkutsk: Irkutsk State Pedagogical Institute.
- Marcussen, E.B.** (1964). Teaching Screen Education to the Teachers. In: Hodgkinson, A.W. (Ed.) *Screen Education*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.72-76.

- Martineau, M.** (Ed.) (1988). *L'enseignement du cinema et de l'audiovisuel*. Paris: CinemAction, 299 p.
- Martineau, M.** (Ed.) (1991). *L'enseignement du cinema et de l'audiovisuel dans l'Europe des douze*. Paris: CinemAction, 433 p.
- Masterman, L. & Mariet, F.** (1994). *L'Education aux medias dans l'Europe des annees 90*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, 180 p.
- Masterman, L.** (1985). *Teaching the Media*. London: Comedia Publishing Group, 341 p.
- Masterman, L.** (1997). A Rational 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.
- McLuhan, M.** (1967). *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 294 p.
- McMahon, B. and Quin, R.** (1997). Living with the Tiger: Media Education Issues for the Future. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.). *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, pp.307-321.
- McMahon, B. and Quin, R.** (1999). Australian Children and the Media Education, Participation and Enjoyment. In: *Children and Media. Image.Education.Participation*. Geteborg: The UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen, Nordicom, pp.189-203.
- Minkkinen S.** (1978). *A General Curricular Model for Mass Media Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Monastyrsky, V.** (1979). *Art Education of Pupils by Means of TV in After School Programs*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Academy of Education.
- Moore, G.J.** (1969). The Case for Screen Education. In: Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J. (Eds.). *Screen Education in Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, pp.6-26.
- Nechai, O.** (1989). *The Basics of Film Art* (in Russian). Moscow: Prosveshenie, 288 p.
- Penzin, S.** (1987). *Cinematograph and Aesthetical Education* (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 176 p.
- Penzin, S.** (2004). *Film Education and Modern Times* (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, pp.151-163.
- Polichko, G.** (1990). *Introduction to Film Education* (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 23 p.
- Potter, W.J.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Rabinovich, U.** (1991). *Cinema, Literature and my Life* (in Russian).Kurgan: Periodika, 120 p.
- Rother, L.** Media Literacy and At-Risk Students: A Canadian Perspective.*Telemidium, The Journal of Media Literacy*. 2002. Vol.48. N 2.
- Semali, L.M.** (2000). *Literacy in Multimedia America*. New York – London: Falmer Press, 243 p.
- Sharikov, A., Cherkashin, E.** (1991). *Experimental Curricula for Media Education*. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Pedagogical Academy, 43 p.
- Silverblatt, A.** (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Sim, J.C.** (1977). Mass Media Education in the U.S.A. In: *Media Studies in Education*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.74-88.
- Spitchkin, A.** (1999). *What is Media Education?* (in Russian). Kurgan: Kurgan Teacher Training Institute, 114 p.
- Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J.** (1969). What's the Idea? In: Stewart, F.K. and Nuttall, J. (Eds.). *Screen Education in Canadian Schools*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, p.5.
- Tulodziecki, G.** (1989). *Mediaenerziehung in schole und unterricht*. Bad Heilbrunn.
- Tyner, K.** (1998). *Literacy in the Digital World: Teaching and Learning in the Age of Information*. Mahwan, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 291 p.
- Tyner, K.** (2000). Directions and Challenges for Media Education. *Telemidium. The Journal of Media Literacy*. Vol. 46. N 1, p.4.
- Usov, Y.** (1989). *Film Education as Aesthetic and Art Education and Development of Pupils*. Ph.D. Diss. (in Russian). Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical University, 32 p.
- Usov, Y.** (1998). *Basics of Screen Arts*. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 60 p.

- Vartanova, E. And Zassursky, J.** (2003). Russian Module of Media Education: Conceptions, Principles, Models. (in Russian). *Information Society*, 3: 5-10.
- Worsnop, C.** (1999). *Screening Images: Ideas for Media Education*. Second Edition. Mississauga: Wright Communication.
- Zaznobina, L.** (1996). Media Education Standard Integrated in Humanities and Others Disciplines of Secondary Education', in L.Zaznobina (Ed.), *Media Education*. (in Russian). Moscow: Moscow Institute of Teachers' Education, pp.72-78.
- Zaznobina, L.** (1998). Media Education Standard Integrated Across the Curriculum. (in Russian). *Standards and Monitoring in Education*, 3: 26-34.



## **An Outline of Media Education in Russia**

One can say that the hearth of film education in Russia was lit in 1919 when a film school was opened in Moscow. Important constituents of general media education in this country in the 1920's were film clubs and clubs of young journalists, amateur film/photo studios. In 1925 the Soviet Cinema's Friends Society (SCFS) was organized. A lot of well-known Russian directors like Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Dziga Vertov and others were in the Central Council of this society. There were about 50 SCFS' amateur studios in Moscow that had film cameras and – 93 in St.Petersburg (Ilyichev, Naschekin, 1986, p.7). Similar clubs where films were shown, discussed and made; lectures, exhibitions were held, worked in Astrakhan, Vologda, Rostov-on-Don, Voronezh, Tomsk, Omsk, Novosibirsk and other cities. Due to the initiative of the Central Council of SCFS in Moscow the special educational course for club leaders from different cities were taught. Zarkhi, Romm, Pudovkin and other Russian filmmakers were teaching there. Teaching manuals were published. The first All-Russian Conference of SCFS was held in 1928 with delegates from 60 cities. For several years SCFS published its newspaper "Cinema". In 1930 this society included 110 thousand members. The SCFS' statutes distinguished the following objectives: to study the mass audience and to teach by the means of cinema.

Simultaneously media education of pupils and students through press was developing. "The government supported this process, pursuing two main goals: the spread of the communist ideology and the liquidation of illiteracy of population (almost half of the country's population couldn't even read). These two goals were closely connected with each other. The role of media in a Soviet society was increasing rapidly. Dozens of newspapers and magazines published by different schoolchildren' – and youth unions appeared. Kids-journalists often joined the clubs where professional journalists taught them to prepare articles for newspapers and magazines" (Sharikov, 1990, p.29-30). Schools in almost all cities of Russia issued some kind of press or school papers in the 1920's.

However many of the creative attempts in Russian media education were abolished by the Stalin regime in 1934, when SCFS was closed. From the late Thirties till early Fifties on the whole only those film activities were allowed, which served aims of propaganda. However, in spite of the strict censorship, the debate clubs of SCFS developed in this way or another not only the creativity of children but also the critical thinking of the audience. Therefore they could provoke (undesirable for the regime) thoughts about life in the country and its social structure. Also cameras of some non-professional SCFS members could shoot something not very appropriate, not sanctioned by the authorities...

It was not until late 50s – early 60s that media education was given a second birth in Russian schools and universities. The amount of institutions

where courses of film education were taught was growing (Moscow, Petersburg, Voronezh, Rostov, Samara, Kurgan, Taganrog, etc.).

Beginning from 1957 film clubs began to appear again, uniting thousands of the “The Tenth Muse” lovers of different ages. In 1967 the first big seminar of film clubs’ leaders from 36 cities took place in Moscow. A statute of many clubs included not only the watching and discussion of films, but studying the history of cinema, works of outstanding masters, sociological research, etc. (Lebedev, 1969, p. 52-54).

By 1967 there were about 4 thousand small amateur film studios and circles (Ilyichev, Naschekin, 1986, p.38). Some of them became sort of media education centres. For example, they did sociological research about the role of movies in people’s life, studied the history of cinema, organized film shows and discussions of films, exhibitions, made documentary, feature and animated amateur films and so on. The movement of school journalists and photographers was also given a new start.

The social and cultural situation in Russia at that time provided grounds for a great interest in cinema among school children and teachers. Video and PCs were only dreamt of in science fiction novels. Films were seldom shown on TV, (in fact there was only 1, later 2 TV channels). Therefore cinemas were crowded (statistics showed that in average, a person went to the cinema about 18 times a year), and school children went to the movies much more often than adults. For many Russians the screen was the only window into the world, cut through the still thick “iron curtain”. Thanks to the production of 8- and 16-mm cameras the amateur film studios movement developed very actively until the early 1980’s. Instructors or teachers of such clubs were taught at the Moscow Institute of Culture, some Pedagogical Institutes and Universities. The number of clubs and studios grew from 5 thousand (1974) to 11 thousand (1983), and the number of members of these youth groups grew from 60.000 to 120-130 thousand people (Ilyichev, Naschekin, 1986, p.53-60). In the second half of the 1980s many of these clubs began to use videotapes for making films, that was, no doubt, easier and cheaper.

“Curricula for the basics of cinema art for schools and pedagogical institutes were written in the 60s-70s. These programs were significantly different from many programs of other subjects: their authors avoided strict regulation, dogmatic approach (...). It was emphasized in these curricula that communication with art should be enjoyable. One more important peculiarity of the programs on cinema art was that the task was not to prepare specialists in a small field, because the country did not need 50 million film critics. The objective of cinema pedagogic was to widen the spiritual, cultural world of school children, to develop their personality” (Waisfeld, 1993, p.4-5). I agree here with I.Waisfeld who said that “classes of media teachers can be described as a dialogue. An old “teacher-centered” scheme, where a teacher is a source of

knowledge and a pupil is its receiver, is broken. Both pupils and teachers get a bigger field for creativity, improvisation, for game activities. A game is treated as kind of a reality model. It helps to grasp the inner dynamics of a film, its deep roots” (Waisfeld, p.5).

However, some Russian teachers of media education still practiced outdated pedagogical approaches. For instance, A.Bernstein believed that “teaching with film is impossible without constant control of what a pupil sees on TV and in cinema theatres every day” (Bernstein, 1971, p.7). Here, I think, one can clearly see the similarity with viewpoints of many American media teachers (especially in the 1940s – 1970s) who also considered that the main goal of media education was a strict control, “information defense”, “inoculative approach”, aimed against the harmful impact of press, screen, etc.

In early 80s there was a big experiment of introducing film education into the primary and middle school curriculum in some Moscow schools. Similar experiments on media education (on the press, cinema and TV materials) were conducted in summer children centres like “Ocean” and “Orlyonok”. As for the universities, lectures and practical classes for the teachers-to-be were held. Some Institutes of Teachers’ Professional Development (in Moscow, Kurgan, Tver) have also made a contribution to media education. Seminars and workshops on teaching cinema were conducted. Some universities integrated media education into courses of the aesthetic education.

Media education in Russia is not a required subject (with the exception of some secondary schools used as an experimental field and media orientated universities and faculties). Thus there is no national curriculum for media education, no standards or guidelines. Many Russian teachers still confuse media education with using media as a technical aid. Media language is seldom a topic in its own right. Only few school principals encourage the integration of media education, or support teachers’ initiative. Media education can be integrated across the curriculum into Informatics (Internet & computer application lessons), Language and Literature, Arts, or Science. Another variant is an optional autonomous media education course.

For example, Film Studies courses have been taught in Voronezh Pedagogical Institute since 1970. Then similar courses appeared in Voronezh University and Institute of Arts, and several schools. Since 1965 the film club has been working in Voronezh. Some other Russian cities and towns (Moscow, Petersburg, Kurgan, Tver, Rostov, Samara, Taganrog, etc.) have a similar structure of media education centres. As a rule, it is a net of courses on media education in universities, teachers’ training colleges, institutes, school elective subjects, film clubs in schools and community centers.

In 1967 the Council for Film Education in schools and higher educational institutes was established by the Union of Filmmakers (Moscow). It was headed first by a film critic N.Lebedev and then by Professor I.Waisfeld. He was the

first Russian media educator who delivered a report on problems of media education at UNESCO conference in Rome in 1966. Some other Russian media/film educators who began their work in schools, colleges and clubs in the Sixties are: Ury Usov, Inna Levshina, Zinaida Smelkova (Moscow), Nina Gornitskaya (Petersburg), Stal Penzin (Voronezh), Uly Rabinovich (Kurgan), Oleg Baranov (Tver), Evdokiya Gorbulina (Armavir), Elvira Gorukhina (Novosibirsk) and others.

From the very start the Council tried to consolidate the efforts of media teachers-enthusiasts from different Russian cities (Moscow, Petersburg, Voronezh, Kurgan, Samara, Novosibirsk, Rostov, Taganrog, etc.). It collaborated with the Ministry of Education, Pedagogic Academy and State Committee of Cinema specifically in publishing teaching plans, curriculums, sponsored seminars, workshops and conferences. Starting from the second half of the 60's such conference were held in Moscow, Tallinn, Alma-Ata, Erevan, Tbilisi, Petersburg, Kiev, Kurgan, Bolshevo.

At all the stages of the media education development in Russia there were its opponents too. They were afraid that “fast and awkward accomplishment of the ideas of school film education can destroy the direct contact between the screen and young audience by its importunate interference. Thus, after special training newly educated “film literate” audience would critically evaluate, not simply enjoy a film. But in order to enjoy cinema one should watch films freely, without any bias. One cannot turn a visit to a cinema theatre into the obligatory school subject. It is not right to “freeze” love of the youth for the cinema” (Rybak, 1980, p.4).

However, despite of all the difficulties, the 80s in Russia were marked by “the process of “deepening” of media education researches; transition from the description and summing up of the pedagogic experience to the revealing of psychological and/or sociological grounds of this phenomenon; the growth of the researchers’ interest to children creativeness through media. Researchers began to explore media effects on smaller children. In the 1980s their activity affected the elementary school too” (Sharikov, 1990, pp.38-39).

In the end of the 1980s the vigorous development of the video began to change the work of clubs and amateur children’s studios. VCRs and video cameras were used more and more often for making and showing films. School TV studios were emerging. In 1990 the Association of Young Journalists was established. In 1998 the Council for Film Education was transformed into the Association for Film and Media Education. In the 90s it joined the European Association for Audiovisual Media Education.

Today the number of members of Russian Association for Film & Media Education is about 300: primary & secondary level schoolteachers, high school, university, college, lyceum teachers & professors, leaders of film-clubs, journalists, etc. Russian Association for Film & Media Education includes also

members of the Laboratories of Screen Arts and Media Education (Russian Academy of Education, Moscow). The main directions of Association's work are: integration of media literacy courses in school and universities; development of school and university curricular; teacher training programs; conferences and seminars; publications; research; maintaining web resources on media education.

At the same time, as it has already been mentioned, media education in Russia has come across numerous difficulties during the whole time of its existence (ideological, financial, technical, etc.). In the 1920s - 80s the political and censorship control, and poor technical equipment of schools and higher educational institutions hindered media education movement. In the 1990s media teachers were granted freedom and independence for developing programs and their practical implementation. But they lacked financial and technical support. Many Russian schools and colleges in the 90s didn't have enough money for teachers' salary, not mentioning the audiovisual equipment. Moreover, still just the few universities were preparing future teachers for media education of pupils.

The drastic change in social and cultural situation in Russia effected serious alteration in media education's development. The remains of the "iron curtain" fell down. More and more Russian were getting the opportunity to travel abroad. Cinema stopped being the only window into the world. Films (including foreign films) were not a deficit anymore; you could watch them on TV on different channels. Media repertoire was satiated with American action movies. Information about film and music stars, new releases and premiers could be read in hundreds of newspaper, magazines and books. By the end of the nineties nearly every urban family owned a VCR. Computers, interactive games, Internet spread very rapidly. Thus, an uncomfortable question arised: could a school teacher, as a rule lagging behind his pupils as far as media consumption concerned, have authority in the sphere of media culture with his pupils?

But Russian media education was developing. International conferences on media education were held in Tashkent (1990), Valuevo (1992), Moscow (1992, 1995). The Screen Arts Laboratory at the Research Institute for Art Education of the Russian Academy of Education (this laboratory was headed by Professor Dr. Ury Usov until his death in April 2000) published books and teaching materials, programs on media and film education (by Prof.Dr.Ury Usov, Dr.Larissa Bazhenova, Dr.Elena Bondarenko, etc.).

Similar processes were going on in Russian film clubs in 1990s. After a long resistance by authorities (who looked at film clubs and media education movement as potentially dangerous encouragement of oppositional critical thinking) finally, in 1988 the Russian Federation of Film Clubs was officially established.

“Perestroika” years at first seemed as the golden age for film clubs. The foundation of the Federation promised an anticipated liberation from the censorship’s dictatorship, an opportunity of the exchange with the best Russian and foreign films. In fact, the Film Clubs Federation began to collect its own film library, club enthusiasts were invited to regional and All-Russian seminars, conferences and festivals, famous actor and directors toured the country meeting their audience face-to-face. But the drastic growth of prices forced its rules. By the end of the 1990s even big Russian film clubs could not afford buying a new film copy from Moscow. Not to mention small film clubs in small provincial towns. Together with the film club movement the economic crisis hit amateur school film and video studios too. The vast majority of them closed down.

The publication of programs and study guides has always been an important component of media education. Moscow publishing houses (“Prosveschenie”, “Pedagogica”, “Detskaya Literatura”, “Novaya Shkola”, “Kino Center”, “Iskusstvo”) have published quite a monographs, programs dedicated to the issues of media education. Articles on film/media education were published in magazines “Iskusstvo Kino”, “Pedagogica”, “Specialist”, “Ecran”, etc.

One of the most active enthusiasts of literature on film education was Lev Rybak – a teacher, film critic, the chief editor of the “Kino Centre” publishing house. The author of several brilliant cineastes’ biographies, Lev Rybak founded the book series “Cinema & School”. There he published four of his books, written in an entertaining way, using the language, comprehensible both for teachers and high school students. Three of these books tackled the problem of screening Russian classical and modern literature. And in his book “Alone with a Film” L.Rybak wrote about the subjectivity of film perception. “Before I became a film critic, - Rybak wrote, - I had been a school teacher for more than 15 years. I went to the cinema with my pupils. And sometimes I was really hurt when a pupil of mine, after having seen a good film, said: “Rubbish!” evidently not considering the film to be a good one. I was mad: you can interpret a film in your own way, but try to comprehend it! Viewers’ impressions of a film are always different, individual; there is no sense in trying to level them. But how can one make these impressions emerge at all and not be so poor?”(Rybak, 1980, p.6). I must agree that this is still one of the key questions on the media education agenda though many media education researchers and teachers have tried to find an answer to it.

So, there was no scarcity of pedagogical literature. However no regular academic journal on media education has been issued till 2005. The journal of “Media Education” was set up by ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), <http://www.ifap.ru>, the Association for Film and Media Education, and Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute. The magazine offers a needed forum for

the exchange of information about different forms and contents of media education, thus fostering essential coordination of efforts of Russian media educators.

As far as the research work is concerned, the Laboratory of Screen Arts at the Institute of Art Education of the Russian Academy of Education was in the lead for several decades. First doctor's theses on media education appeared in the 1960s. Researches by O.Baranov (1968), A.Karasik (1966), Y.Rabinovich & R.Rabinovich (1966) were dedicated to the problem of film education of school pupils. And V.Saperov's thesis (1969) analyzed the problem of using radio broadcasting in education. In the 1970s many dissertations about teaching audiovisual literacy were defended (N.Goncharova, 1970; S.Sokolova, 1971; U.Usov, 1974; I.Levshina, 1974; G.Labkovska, 1976; S.Ivanova, 1978; Z.Malobitskaya, 1978; V.Monastyrsky, 1979). Later studies of media education for pupils included: producing and using audiovisual means in school (L.Pressman, 1981; V.Bulavko, 1982), filmmaking by school children (E.Yanelauskas, 1983; U.Bozhkov, 1984; P.Genkin, 1985), social & psychological aspects (Ch.Shakeeva, 1983; N.Kirillova, 1983), morals education of teenagers (Z.Smelkova, E.Zharinov, 1986), analysis of using foreign films in media education (A.Fedorov, 1986), inter-disciplinary ties of literature and film courses (G.Polichko, 1987), employment of cinema as a complex education of pupils (N.Gutova, 1987), aesthetic education and artistic development of school children (N.Yakovleva, 1988; U.Usov, 1989; G.Evtushenko, 1991, E.Bondarenko, 1994).

Theses based on the school data made way for the research of media education in universities. The most important works on film education in Universities appeared in the 1980s-1990s (L.Seregenkova, 1982; S.Odintsova, 1981; S.Penzin, 1987; A.Fedorov, 1993; L.Platunova, 1995). In 2000 the first Russian thesis analyzing the foreign experience, more specifically, the theory and history of media education in the U.S., was written (A.Novikova). In the 1990s the Laboratory of Technology and Media Education (Russian Academy of Education) headed by Professor L.Zaznobina worked out a concept of school media education, integrated into the basic curriculum.

From the 1990s onwards, Russian media education specialists (U.Usov, L.Bazhenova, A.Novikova, G.Polichko, A.Spitchkin, A.Sharikov, A.Fedorov and others) have joined the international media educators' community, participating in international conferences for media education (held in France, Canada, Austria, the UK, Brazil, Spain, Greece, Switzerland), publishing their works in French, American, English, Australian, and Norwegian journals.

By the year 2001 the number of secondary and higher educational Russian institutions training professionals in media, has quite grown. Besides VGIK (Russian State Institute of Cinematography), School for Script Writers and Film Directors, Russian Institute of Professional Development in the Field

of Film, now there are St.Petersburg State University of Film and Television, Film-Video Colleges in Sergeev Posad and St. Petersburg, film/television colleges in Irkutsk, Sovetsk, and Rostov-on-Don. Professional media education is included into the curriculum of St. Petersburg State Academy of Culture, St.Petersburg Academy of Theatre Art, Institute of Professional Development of TV & Radio Specialists (Moscow), Independent School of Cinema and Television (Moscow), Grymov's School of Advertising, Institute of Modern Art (Moscow), New Humanities University of Natalia Nesterova (Moscow), several schools of animation, etc.

First works summarizing general problems of media education, appeared in 1990s (A.Sharikov, A.Fedorov, L.Zaznobina). In February 2000 (A.Fedorov and others) the first in Russia bilingual (Russian-English) Internet site <http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru> (and after - <http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>) on media education was created. More than 20000 people visited the site during the first 7 years of its existence.

The same year staff of the Laboratory headed by L.Zaznobina in the Russian Academy of Education opened one more Russian web site on media education.

The important event in media education development in Russia was the registration of the new specialization (minor) for pedagogical universities – ‘Media Education’ (№ 03.13.30) in 2002. Since 2002 this specialization includes in education process in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (head of this educational project is professor A.Fedorov, media educators: I.Chelysheva, E.Murukina, N.Ryzhykh, N.Babkina and others).

The media educators team (head is Alexander Fedorov) from Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute since 1994 published about 30 monographs (Fedorov, 2001; 2005; 2007 and others), textbooks and more than 400 articles about media education and media literacy. This team also received the research grants (media education topics) from many Russian and foreign foundation (foundation of President of the Russian Federation, Russian Foundation for Humanities, Foundation of Russian Ministry of Education, Kennan Institute (US), IREX (US), MacArthur Foundation (US), Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation, US), DAAD (Germany), Fulbright Foundation (US) and other).

In 2004, ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) in cooperation with the South Urals Media Education Center conducted the interregional round-table discussion “Media Education: Problems and Prospects” in Chelyabinsk. The participants discussed the concept and notions of media education and educational standards in this area and mapped out the ways of concerted efforts to be made by national and regional mass media in the coverage of media education problems. According to the participants, media education is a way of shaping national information and education policies and promoting information literacy, media culture of personality, and civil society. Media education



problems were considered in the reports of the head of ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) A.Demidov, Professor of the Journalism Faculty (the Ural State University) M.Kovaleva, the head of the South-Ural Centre of Media Education A.Dragunov, leaders of Russian Association for Film and Media Education, etc. Media education was proclaimed as one of ways of the development of a national information and educational policy, social integration, and media literacy.

The final document of the “round table” included suggestions to introduce a major specialty *Media education* with a qualification *Media educator* for universities of Russia; to develop the plan of effective realization of Media Education in various regions of the Russian Federation; to create a databank about forms and methods of media education activities with the purpose of the analysis and generalization of experience; to publish “Encyclopedia of Media and Media Education”; to support the regular release of a journal *Media Education*.

Another step of ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) was the organization and participation in the All-Russian conference “Through Libraries - to the Future”, which took place in Anapa (2005), supported by the UNICEF, Ministry of Education, the Federal Agency for Culture and Cinematography, Krasnodar Regional Library for Youth, Department of Culture of Krasnodar Region, National Fund for Professional Training, The Russian School Library Association, Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>).

In the begin of XXI century Media Education Centers or projects (including media education/literacy conferences) were created in Belgorod (A.Korochensky and others), Byisk (V.Vozchikov and others), Chelyabinsk (A.Minbaleev and others), Ekaterinbourg (N.Kirillova and others), Irkutsk (L.Ivanova and others), Krasnodar (T.Shak and others), Omsk (N.Hilko and others), Perm (P.Pechenkin and others), Samara (A.Sharikov and others), Tomsk (I.Zhilavskaya and others), Toliatti and others Russian sites.

Within the framework of conferences the reports directly concerning questions of media education, problems of the organization of multimedia databases, electronic libraries, and mediateques in libraries for children and youth were heard. Important objective for Russian media educators is to open (get it registered by the Russian Ministry of Education and Sciences) a new university major speciality (major) “Media Education” within the framework of which it will be possible to prepare professional media educators for universities and schools.

Another events were the presentation of a multimedia product of ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) - a CD *Media Education. Media Pedagogy. Media Journalism* (also sponsored by the administration of Hanty-Mansijsk Autonomous Region - UGRA, Russian Association for Film and Media

education and Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (<http://www.tgpi.ru>). This CD includes monographs, teaching manuals, programs and articles. And a recently fulfilled initiative is Media Literacy page on the UNESCO Moscow Office website:

<http://www.unesco.ru/eng/pages/bythemes/stasya29062005124316.php>

The next project of ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia) and Russian Association for Film and Media Education will be the “Encyclopedia of Media and Media Education” with contributions by the leading experts in the field of theory and history of mass communication and media education.

Within the context of increasing interest to media education worldwide, the UNESCO program’s support, recent developments such as the introduction of a pre-service teacher training, and the systematic publication of a journal, media education has good prospects in Russia.

### References

- Bernstein, A.** (1971). *Feature Film in the Classroom*. Moscow: BPSK, 52 p.
- Fedorov A.,** and all. (2005). *Media Education. Media Pedagogic. Media Journalism*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia). CD. 1400 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. Rostov: CVVR. 708 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2005). *Media Education of Future Teachers*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 314 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2007). *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University’s Students*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 616 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2007). *Media Education: Sociology Surveys*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 228 p.
- Ilyichev, S., Naschekin, B.** (1986). *Cinema Amateur Movement: The Start and Perspectives*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 110 p.
- Lebedev, N.** (1969). *Film and Audience*. Moscow: BPSK, 55 p.
- Penzin, S.** (1987). *Cinema and Aesthetic Education: Methodological Problems*. Voronezh: Voronezh University Press, 175 p.
- Rybak, L.** (1980). *Alone with a Film. Cinema and School*. Moscow: BPSK, 57 p.
- Sharikov, A.** (1990). *Media Education: International and Russian Experience*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 66 p.
- Waisfeld, I.** (1993). Screen Evolution, Perception Evolution. *Specialist*. N 5, p. 3-6.

## Theoretical Tenets: Russian Perspective

Media education in Russia can be divided into the following main **directions**:

- 1) media education of future professionals in the sphere of press, radio, television, cinema, video and internet-journalists, editors, directors, producers, actors, directors of photography, etc.;
- 2) pre-service media education of school and university level instructors at Universities, Pedagogical Institutes and in-service professional growth courses;
- 3) media and ICT education (integrated into the existing curriculum or autonomous - special courses, electives, clubs activities) as part of the general curriculum in secondary schools, colleges and institutes;
- 4) “out-of-school” media and ICT education in children/students’ clubs, leisure centres, institutions of extracurricular work, clubs;
- 5) distant media and ICT education of schoolchildren, students and adults through press, television, radio, video, and Internet;
- 6) independent, continuous (theoretically, life-long ) media and ICT self- education.

The following types of Russian **media education models** can be distinguished:

- educational-informative models (studies of the theory and history of media and media language);
- ethical and philosophical models (study of moral, philosophical problems on the media material);
- developing models (social and cultural development of a creative person in aspects of perception, critical thinking, analysis, imagination, visual memory, interpretations, etc.);
- applied models (hands-on Internet, computer applications, photography, camera work training, etc.) [Penzin, 1987; Sharikov, 1990; Usov, 1993, Spitchkin, 1999; Zaznobina, 1999; Fedorov, 2001; 2005].

**The key principles** of media education in Russian pedagogy are:

- development of a personality (development of media perception, aesthetic consciousness, creative capabilities, individual critical thinking, analysis, etc.) in the process of study;
- connection of theory with practice; transition from training to self-education; correlation of education with life;
- consideration of idiosyncrasies, individuality of students.

**The main functions** of media education are the following: tutorial, adaptational, developing and directing.

The tutorial function presupposes the understanding of theories and laws, the adequate perception and critical analysis of a media text, capability to apply this knowledge in out-of-school contexts, logical capability.

The adaptational function displays in an initial stage of communication with media.

The developing function implies the development of creative, analytical and other capacities of personality.

Task directing functions provide conditions for the analysis of media works (Penzin, 1987; Sharikov, 1990; Spitchkin, 1999; Usov, 1993, Fedorov, 2001, 2005, etc.).

The important element in media education curriculum is the **evaluation of the level of students' media literacy**.

***Classification of Levels of Media Literacy/Media competence***

Table 1. Media Literacy/Competence Levels' Classification

<b><i>Media Literacy/Competence Indicators</i></b>	<b><i>Description</i></b>
<b>Motivation</b>	Motives of contact with media: genre- or subject-based, emotional, epistemological, hedonistic, psychological, ethical, intellectual, esthetic, therapeutic, etc.
<b>Contact (Communication)</b>	Frequency of contact/communication with media
<b>Contents</b>	Knowledge of media terminology, theory, and history
<b>Perception</b>	Ability to perceive various media texts
<b>Interpretation/Appraisal</b>	Ability to analyze critically social effects of media and media texts of various genres and types, based on perception and critical thinking development levels
<b>Activity</b>	Ability to select media and to skills to create/distribute one's own media texts; self-training information skills
<b>Creativity</b>	Creative approach to different aspects of media activity

Detailed descriptions of the audience's media literacy development levels for each indicator (based on the above classification) are given in Tables 2-8.

**Table 2. Motivation Indicator Development Levels**

<b><i>Level</i></b>	<b><i>Description</i></b>
<b>High</b>	<p>A wide range of genre- or subject-based, emotional, epistemological, hedonistic, psychological, creative, ethical, intellectual, and esthetic motives to contact media flows, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- media text genre and subject diversity;</li> <li>- new information;</li> <li>- recreation, compensation, and entertainment (moderate);</li> <li>- identification and empathy;</li> <li>- confirmation of one's own competence in different spheres of life, including information;</li> <li>- search of materials for educational, scientific, and research purposes</li> <li>- esthetic impressions;</li> <li>- philosophic/intellectual,</li> <li>- ethical or esthetic dispute/dialogue with media message authors and critique of their views;</li> <li>- learning to create one's own media texts.</li> </ul>
<b>Medium</b>	<p>A range of genre- or subject-based, emotional, epistemological, hedonistic, psychological, ethical, and esthetic motives to contact media flows, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- media texts' genres and subject diversity;</li> <li>- thrill;</li> <li>- recreation and entertainment;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identification and empathy;</li> <li>- new information;</li> <li>- learning ethical lessons from media texts;</li> <li>- compensation;</li> <li>- psychological “therapy”;</li> <li>- esthetic impressions;</li> </ul> <p><i>Intellectual and creative motives to contact media are poorly expressed or absent.</i></p>
<b>Low</b>	<p>A narrow range of genre- or subject-based, emotional, hedonistic, ethical, and psychological motives to contact media, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- entertainment</li> <li>- information;</li> <li>- thrill;</li> <li>- compensation;</li> <li>- psychological “therapy”;</li> </ul> <p><i>Esthetic, intellectual, and creative motives to contact media flows are not present.</i></p>

**Table 3. Contact Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High	Everyday contacts with various types of media and media texts
Medium	Contacts with various types of media and media texts a few times a week
Low	Contacts with various types of media and media texts a few times a month

This indicator is ambivalent. On the one hand, the audience’s high level of contacts with various media and media texts does not automatically mean the high level of media literacy in general (one may watch TV, videos or DVDs for hours every day but be still unable to analyze media texts). On the other hand, low-frequency contacts may mean not only the individual’s introvert character but also his high-level selectivity and reluctance to consume bad-quality (in his opinion) media products.

**Table 4. Content Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High	Knowledge of basic terms, theories, and history of mass communication and media art culture, clear understanding of mass communication processes and media effects in social and cultural context
Medium	Knowledge of some basic terms, theories and facts of history of mass communication processes, media art culture and media effects
Low	Poor knowledge of basic terms, theories and facts of history of mass communication processes, media art culture and media effects.

**Table 5. Perception Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High: “comprehensive identification”	Identification with an author of a media text with basic components of primary and secondary identification preserved
Medium: “secondary identification”	Identification with a character (or an actor) of a media text, i.e., the ability to empathize with a character, to understand his/her motives; adequate perception of certain elements of a media text (details, etc.)
Low: “primary identification”	Emotional and psychological connection with the environment and a story line (sequence of events) of a media text, i.e., the ability to perceive the sequence of events of media text and naïve identification of reality with the plot; assimilation of the message environment.

When analyzing the perception indicator, it should be noted that the majority of people remember 40 percent of what they saw and 10 percent of what they heard [Potter, 2001, p. 24], and that the perception of information is both an *active* and *social* process [Buckingham, 1991, p. 22]. There are many factors contributing to the success of mass media texts: reliance on folklore and mythology; permanency of metaphors; consistent embodiment of the most sustained story lines; synthesis of the natural and supernatural; addressing the emotional, not the rational, through identification (imaginary transformation into characters and merger with the aura of a work); protagonists’ “magic power”; standardization (replication, unification, and adaptation) of ideas, situations, characters, etc.; motley; serialization; compensation (illusion of dreams coming true); happy end; rhythmic organization of movies, TV programs or video clips where the audience is affected not only by the content of images but also their sequence; intuitive guessing at the audience’s subconscious strivings; etc.

**Table 6. Interpretation/Appraisal Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High	Ability to analyze critically the functioning of media in society given various factors, based on highly developed critical thinking; analysis of media texts, based on the perceptive ability close to comprehensive identification; ability to analyze and synthesize the spatial and temporal form of a text; comprehension and interpretation implying comparison, abstraction, induction, deduction, synthesis, and critical appraisal of the author’s views in the historical and cultural context of his work (expressing reasonable agreement or disagreement with the author, critical assessment of the ethical, emotional, esthetic, and social importance of a message, ability to correlate emotional perception with conceptual judgment, extend this judgment to other genres and types of media texts, connect the message with one’s own and other people’s experience, etc.); this reveals the critical autonomy of a person; his/her critical analysis of the message is based on

	the high-level content, motivation, and perception indicators.
Medium	Ability to analyze critically the functioning of media in society given some most explicit factors, based on medium-level critical thinking; ability to characterize message characters' behavior and state of mind, based on fragmentary knowledge; ability to explain the logical sequence of events in a text and describe its components; absence of interpretation of the author's views (or their primitive interpretation; in general, critical analysis is based on the medium-level content, motivation, and perception indicators.
Low	Inability to analyze critically the functioning of media in society and to think critically; unstable and confused judgments; low-level insight; susceptibility to external influences; absence (or primitiveness) of interpretation of authors' or characters' views; low-level tolerance for multivalent and complex media texts; ability to render a story line; generally, analysis is based on the medium-level content, motivation, and perception indicators.

**Table 7. Activity Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High	Practical ability to choose independently and skills to create/distribute media texts (including personal and collaborative projects) of different types and genres; active self-training ability
Medium	Practical ability to choose and skills to create/distribute media texts (including personal and collaborative projects) of different types and genres with the aid of specialists (teacher/consultant)
Low	Inability (or insufficient ability) to choose and skills to create/distribute media texts; inability or reluctance to engage in media self-training.

**Table 8. Creativity Indicator Development Levels**

<i>Level</i>	<i>Description</i>
High	Creativity in different types of activities (perceptive, game, esthetic, research, etc.) connected with media (including computers and Internet)
Medium	Creativity is not strongly expressed and manifests itself only in some types of activity connected with media
Low	Creative abilities are weak, fragmentary or absent at all.

Regretfully, there is a danger of narrowing down media literacy/competence to computer or Internet literacy levels (which is the case with some Russian media organizations). In our view, such practices ignore influential mass media (the press, TV, radio, and cinema), which is a discriminatory approach to the problem.

Thus we arrive at the conclusion that *media literacy/competence of personality is the sum total of the individual's motives, knowledge, skills, and abilities (indicators: motivation, contact, content, perception, interpretation/appraisal, activity, and creativity) to select, use, create, critically analyze, evaluate, and transfer media texts in various forms and genres and to analyze the complex processes of media functioning.*

### References

**Buckingham, D.** (1991). Teaching About Media. In: Lusted, D. (Ed.). *The Media Studies Book*. London – New York: Routledge, pp.12-35.

- Fedorov, A.** (1989). *It is Hard to Be Young: Cinema and School.* (in Russian). Moscow: Cinema-Center.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods.* (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.
- Fedorov, A.** (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean.* Paris: UNESCO.
- Fedorov, A.** (2004). Specificity of Media Education in Pedagogical Universities. (in Russian). In: *Pedagogica.*, N 4, pp.43-51.
- Fedorov, A.** (2005). Media Education and Media Literacy in the Knowledge Societies. In: *UNESCO between Two Phases of the World Summit on the Information Society.* Moscow: Institute of the Information Society, pp. 329-339.
- Fedorov, A.** (2006). Media Education: Creative Assignments for University and Schools Students. (in Russian). In: *Innovation in Education.* N 4, pp.175-228.
- Fedorov, A.** (2007). *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students.* Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 616 p.
- Fedorov, A.,** and others. (2005). *Media Education. Media Literacy. Media Journalism.* Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia). CD.
- Potter, W.J.** (2001). *Media Literacy.* Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Sharikov, A.** (1990). *Media Education: International and Russian Experience.* (in Russian). Moscow: Academy of Pedagogic Science.
- Spitchkin, A.** (1999). *What is Media Education.* (in Russian). Kurgan: Institute of Teachers Training.
- Usov, U.** (1993). *The Basics of Screen Cultur.* (in Russian). Moscow: New School.
- Yestrebsteva, E., Bykhovsky, Y.** (2001). *My Region is the Center of the Universe: The Development of Telecommunications and Educational Activity in the Regions.* (in Russian). Moscow: Federation for Internet Education, 240 p.



## Media Education in Russian Secondary Schools

### Full paper first published in:

Fedorov, A. Media Education in Secondary School in Russia. In: Hart, A., and Suss, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Media Education in 12 European countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, pp.102-111.

The chapter is based on the study conducted in 10 secondary schools in the southern federal region of Russia. The age group of pupils encompasses 14-16 year-old teenagers, including 126 girls and 95 boys.

The study includes structured interviews with 10 Russian teachers and lesson observation of 10 different classes. The procedure took place in 1999 (May 17, 20, 24; September, 7, 15, 24; October, 5, 15, 18, 29). Each interview and lesson observation was recorded (on audiotapes), then studied and analysed.

All of the selected Russian teachers graduated from either the Taganrog Pedagogical Institute or Rostov-on-Don Pedagogical University (departments of Languages, Arts, History, Social Pedagogics, etc.). Three teachers have a teaching experience in secondary school of more than 10 years, 2 of them – more than 5 years, 4 of them have a teaching experience of 3 to 5 years. Almost all these teachers have been teaching with media for 3-6 years (70%). They mentioned the following reasons for that: because they need modern illustrative material for the lessons (60%), enjoy cinema, TV, arts themselves (20%), because a media text is a very effective model of life (10%) and means of education (10%), because media is part of our life and our home (10%). Teachers define their approach to media education in the following ways:

- media education as a supplementary to traditional literacy (50%);
- media education is an effective means for expanding knowledge and the development of personality (20%);
- media education games and group activities as an instrument to raise pupils' motivation (10%);
- media education to involve pupils into hands-on activities– creating media texts (10%).

Below are some examples of media education lessons that were characterized by the teachers as successful:

1. The game “Who is a media expert?” Two teams of pupils were involved in the competition.
2. “World War II in the Mirror of Russian Cinema”.
3. The mock trial (law and justice theme in feature films).
4. “French painting in the mirror of the French documentary” (based on the television series about the Louvre).
5. “Environmental Problems on the Screen”

It seems that most of the interviewed teachers think that their best lessons were group discussion centered on specific historical, ecological, etc. problems as portrayed in media. Some teachers do not distinguish between media education and using media as a teaching aid. The specifics of media language are seldom a subject of school lessons.

The status of media education is not strong in the Russian national curriculum. Media education elements take place during different lessons: Language Arts, Art, History, etc. (plus extra-curriculum media work – school radio and newspapers). As media education is not an obligatory course in its own right, pupils do not take final exams in it. School inspectors basically seldom talk with Russian teachers about media teaching (because mostly they do not know what media education is about). However, some school principals encourage the integration of media education.

Russian teachers prefer audiovisual to print media, but only few Russian teachers can use Internet because of the scarce financial resources in secondary schools. However many Russian secondary schools have special “computer classes”. But personal computers as a rule are out-dated, and don’t have Internet access. The majority of Russian teachers don’t use the new digital equipment. Only teachers of mathematics or PC education courses use new media systematically. The Internet was used in none of the 10 lessons observed. That’s why the impact of computer-based media on methods and technologies of teaching is very limited. The percentage of current teaching time given to media work is: 15%-20% (30% of teachers), 30% -50% (70% of teachers), including “out-of-class” media work. 10-20% (in 3 observed lessons), 40%-50% (in 3 observed lessons), 60%-70% (in 2 observed lessons) of Russian pupils have recent experience of media education. Russian teachers characterize media education in the following ways: “Media teaching is effective for the development of perception” (20%); “Media teaching is an effective means of communication & information” (10%); “Media teaching is a more effective means of education” (20%); “Media teaching is more informative means of education” (30%); “Media teaching is effective for the development of aesthetic perception” (10%).

Russian teachers see media education long-term aims in the development of their pupils’ personality, critical and aesthetical perception (comments included “I want to develop the critical consciousness of my pupils”, “The pupil must distinguish between true and false information”, “The pupil must learn to use the Internet “, “I want to develop the pupil’s personality, including aesthetic aspects”, “I want my pupils to become more media literate”).

I do not think that case study as a research method is useful for the media education project in Russia. Media Education is not included into the existing state obligatory curriculum in Russia. That is why Russian teachers are still unable to accept media education in secondary school. They are still confused

about the its meaning and value. The old generation of teachers does not want to be observed and interviewed because as a rule they do not include any elements of media education in their lessons. That is why only teachers who are genuinely interested in media agreed to be observed at work and interviewed. Of course, if a teacher agreed she (as I have already said, 90% of teachers are women) prepared for this lesson very carefully, i.e., if a teacher uses elements of media education in her ordinary lessons very seldom, she can create a special media education lesson for research observation only. That is why I have to admit the constraints of the study: lesson observations and interviews of 10 selected teachers are not reliable enough for drawing valid conclusions because these 10 teachers are not typical of the Russian context.

Younger teachers use some elements of media education methods such as discussions with pupils about their experience with media (60%), role games on the media materials (20%), and practical media activities (10%). The methods of media education at the lessons of ten observed teachers depended on their educational background. Unfortunately, only few Russian teachers have special Media Education training. Basically Russian teachers replicate their methods of teaching from other subjects (Languages, Arts, etc.). Teachers reported that TV (50%), press (10%), film (20%), video (20%) are the areas of media work most comfortable for them. Teachers tend to avoid the topic of “Internet” (20%), and the following media education concepts: “Language” (40%), “Semiotics” (10%), “Technology”(10%), and “Agencies”(10%). All 10 teachers believe that media technologies are very important, but they state the medium extent of application of these technologies in their lessons. All of them agree that media education improves the efficacy of a lesson.

Most of the teachers trace a difference in the response of girls and boys to different aspects of media education. For example, they reported that boys are more comfortable with media (20% answers), “boys are more experienced with modern media” (video games, Internet, etc.) (40% answers), and the girls “are more sensitive about aesthetic perception” (20%).

Most useful media resources, in the opinion of the teachers, are: documentaries (60%), feature films (30%), science-fiction films (30%), TV documentaries (40%), and Internet sites (10%).

### **Lesson focus**

The observation showed that the lesson’s objectives were: from 20% to 70% media-based. But all the lessons were specially prepared for observation. The teachers reported that the observed lessons were connected either with previous or future lessons in the fields of “category” (40%), “audience” (20%), “representation” (30%), “information” (20%), “aesthetic values” (10%) and “language” (20%). Teachers think that pupils should learn media terminology like «Category» (40%), «Representation» (30%), «Agency”(20%), «Audience»(20%), «Information»(20%), “Perception”(20%), “Language’

(20%) because “pupils must be familiar with terms, and they must be able to distinguish sources of information (and its quality/ consistency)” (10%), “pupils must know the types of sources of information, they must develop the perception of media information” (10%), “media education helps to “survive” in a media-oriented world” (10%), “pupils must broaden their understanding of media” (10%), “media literacy contributes to the development of personality” (20%).

### **Detailed analysis**

#### **Aims**

All the teachers involved in this study outlined aims of the lesson observed. For example:

- to analyse moral, psychological motivation of characters’ actions in a media text;
- to explain the specifics of audiovisual language (in the documentary and feature films);
- to explain some media education categories (for example, “genre”);
- to discuss the aesthetical value of a media text;
- to discuss the aims of a media agency.

On the whole, teachers explained the aims to her pupils clearly. At the end of every lesson the teacher summed up results and attracted the pupils' attention to the aims achieved, but few teachers didn't allot the time for drawing up conclusions. According to the teaching plan and the program of the course the aims of the lesson were directly connected to the previous learning. As following lessons were based on the previous ones, aims of the lesson (according to the program) became more complicated.

#### **Key concepts**

The observed lessons were focused on the following key concepts: «Media Category» (90%), “Media Representation” (40%), “Media Agency” (30%), “Media Language” (20%). The key concepts “Media Category” (for example, “genre”, “film”, “press”, “documentary”, “video”, “audio” and so on) and “Media Representation” were familiar to 70%-80% of pupils. The key concepts “Media Agency” and “Media Audience” was new for most pupils, and only few pupils knew the concept “Media Language”. The following terminology was used at the lessons to express the key concepts of Media Education: “documentary”, “film”, “character”, “reality”, “industry”, “audience”, “information”, “press”, “agency”, “video”, “audio”, “art”, “aesthetic”, “perception”, “representation”, “category”, “language”.

Most teachers avoided “difficult” themes like “Media Language”, “Media Agency”, “Media Audience”, because they did not have any special Media Education background. The pupils were familiar with the terms like “film”, “press” (100%), “character”(90%), “art”(100%), “documentary”(100%),

“information”(100%), “video”(100%), “audio”(100%). Terms “language”, “perception”, “representation”, “agency”, “audience” are more challenging for them.

Of course, pupils know the concept “language” from the lessons of the Russian language and Literature. But only few if any know the specific of audiovisual media language. Teachers used school-produced (50%), and TV films (40%), excerpts from science-fiction films (20%), feature films (30%), TV commercials (10%) in their lessons (technical equipment included a TV-set, a VCR, and/or magazines). The teacher and the pupils used these sources for 30%-50% (20% of the observed lessons) and 70% (10% of the observed lessons) of the lesson time. Most teachers were familiar with or comfortable with technology.

Typical questions teachers asked were: “What is the category of this film?” or “What is the main idea of the film?”, “What are the main aims of this TV-program?”, “What is the main message of this documentary?”, “What is the main problem of this text?”, “Is this problem important to you?”, “What information was new for you?” etc.

Less frequent questions were: “Who is the main hero?”, “How would you describe his/her motivation.”, “What is the message of the author of a media text?”, “Why was the picture dark (well-lit)?”, “What would happen, if we changed the situation in the picture?” etc.

The teachers combined whole class discussion with group activities: 10-20 minutes in pairs or in larger groups. All teachers thought their goals (or most of them) were achieved.

### **Selected Case study**

A serious problem that I faced when I started my study was that many teachers (including those who integrated some elements of media education at their lessons) did not want their classes to be observed and analyzed. From the 10 classes that I monitored I chose a lesson by the teacher Ludmila G. for the tenth-grade class of a secondary school in Taganrog, on May 17th, 1999. The class consisted of 14 girls and 11 boys of the age 15. The lesson’s length was 40 minutes. I have chosen the teacher Lyudmila G. because she is one of the most experienced teachers at school (14 years of service) and as she said, she had been interested in media education for several years.

No doubt, Lyudmila G. is not a typical Russian teacher. As I have already mentioned, most of the Russian teachers are not excited about integrating innovations, they think that their job is just their subject area. Media education seems like an additional burden for them, which is not obligatory required by the state department of education, moreover that it is difficult to find the media education frameworks, guidelines programs, and teachers’ handbooks. However Lyudmila G. belongs to the few Russian teachers who believe that media are

part of our daily life and therefore media education should become part of the general education of pupils.

### **The Interview**

Lyudmila G. has been working as a teacher for 14 years. Recently she has been teaching History of Art in the 10-11 grades (the senior grades in Russia). Her interest in Media Education dates from the time she realized she needed modern illustrative material for her lessons. But later she understood that media can not only be a kind of teaching aids, an illustration, but an independent means for the development of a pupil's personality. Lyudmila G. thinks that media education should be integrated into the general curriculum. She also believes that media education is most effective in the humanities (whether the subject matter is Literature, History, Arts or etc.).

"I think, - Lyudmila says, - there are several reasons why media education is necessary for modern schoolchildren. First, it develops pupils' critical thinking. Secondly, media education helps students to evaluate the quality of a media text. Thirdly, literature today is not the only form of expression and through media education we can compare an original literary text and its screen adaptation. Ludmila said that one of her best media education lesson was a whole-class game called "Who is a media expert?" The class split into 2 teams. Ludmila was a moderator and asked questions concerning media culture (genres, famous media texts, their authors, etc.). The teams had to answer them. And the second part of the game required expressing creative skills of the pupils (collages, etc.).

Lyudmila says that she uses such technical devices as a TV, a VCR and a projector quite often. She regrets that there is no computer in her classroom, consequently no opportunities to use CD-ROM or Internet.

"It's a great pity because often I see interesting CD-ROMs, for example, interactive picture galleries, art encyclopedias, and others. It would be great if I could use all this at my lessons".

Lyudmila thinks that she and her students use media approximately 15-20% of a lesson's time. She also has an opportunity to conduct extra-curricular media classes with her pupils (usually these are games or competitions on the theme of media culture). She notes that boys are more interested in new media: "Children in my class are from families with a middle or low income. That is why my pupils do not have computers at home. However some of the boys go to computer clubs where you can play a computer game or use Internet for a small fee. Girls visit such clubs very seldom if ever".

Judging by Lyudmila's words, the school principal supports her initiative of Media Education. However school authorities lack equipment and budget, and cannot help her like in many other state Russian schools (the number of private schools is small). Teachers get paid a low salary and cannot buy

equipment themselves. School's budget is insufficient to buy such things as computers, video cameras, etc.

Lyudmila has incorporated media into her course through such activities as discussions of media texts, including films and television programs. She tries to make her students go beyond simply discussing content and themes of a media text; they should learn to consider the aesthetic value of it, its category and language. "As I teach the course of the History of Art" I show films and TV programs about the "greats" of art: paintings and artists, picture galleries and museums, architecture and sculpture. It is a pity that there is no computer in my class and I do not have it at home, so if the school buys it someday, first of all I will have to learn to use it!"

"I believe in media education's future in Russia. For me the main goal of media education today is the development of the students' critical thinking and their aesthetic taste".

### **Overview of Lesson Observed**

Lyudmila began a unit on "The Portrait as a Genre" with some elements of media education. Media itself were used for about 6 minutes. Ludmila started with a few questions related to the previous lesson that was about a landscape genre in Art. She asked her students: "What famous paintings with landscapes do you remember?", "What documentary films, programs or feature films with interesting landscapes do you remember? (meaning landscapes shot by a filmcamera, not painted ones). "How is a painted landscape different from a landscape done by a camera work in a film?"

After that she briefly introduced the plan of the current lesson: she said they were going to learn about the genre of portrait and would see the reproductions of pictures and audiovisual scenes and then they would compare and discuss them. After this work had been done the teacher asked the class: "What is the genre of the film you watched?", "What is the main idea of this scene?"

The question-answer type of work was going on for over 10 minutes. Pupils expressed different opinions. The discussion showed that pupils are aware of such terms as "documentary", "film", "reality", and "genre".

During the last couple of minutes of a lesson the teacher summed up the results and encouraged the pupils to reflect back on what they had learned (concepts like "Category", "Representation").

To my mind, Lyudmila's teaching models is typical for Russian teachers who try to integrate media education into their work. Having subject-based content requirements of what she has to teach she seeks opportunities to devote some time of her classes to elements of media education. But I have to say that she is not familiar with textbooks, guides and other resources specifically on media education, and teaches guided by own intuition and previous background.

Lyudmila G. uses literature and teacher's guides on art & aesthetic education of schoolchildren. It is obvious that teachers who are going to teach media education must themselves develop the competency of pedagogic techniques.

### **Patterns and gaps of teaching**

It seems to me that a good tendency about Russian media education is the willingness of teachers to develop their pupils' critical & creative thinking, their aesthetic appreciation of a media text. They use different forms of work, including role plays, team competitions, etc. The obstacles on the ways of media education are: media has got neither an official status/curriculum foothold, nor financial support. The majority of teachers use media in their classroom just as an audio-visual aid for their subject matter. Most of the teachers did not study modern media culture when they were students, are not familiar with such key concepts as "Media Language", "Audience", "Agency". They are more comfortable with components that the traditional courses contain, such as a genre (category) study, the critical analysis of texts, and the discussion of the plot.

### **Limitations of research**

I have to admit that my part of work in the EuroMedia Project was very limited as far as the representative reflection of the real state of things in Russian media education concerns. It goes without saying that there is a point in comparison of the lesson observation and the results of the analysis of interview. For example, it is possible to find out if there is a difference between the "theory" views of a teacher and their practical implementation. However we must keep in mind that a teacher prepares the lesson to be observed much more carefully than to an ordinary lesson. That is, his/her everyday lessons maybe different. I did not have an opportunity to interview a large number of teachers (if the experiment included more teachers, its results would be more objective).

### **Possibilities for future research**

I suppose that in Russia today it is impossible to hold a large-scale experimental research including teachers from different cities and towns without financial support. To my mind, the research should include teachers of different subjects living in different regions of Russia. It should also include practitioners and researchers from the Russian Academy of Education, the Russian Association for Film & Media Education and a representative from the Ministry of Education. The future research should also contain the analysis of the available school programs, books, and doctors' thesis devoted to media education.

### **References**

**Fedorov, A.** (1989). *It is Hard to be Young: Cinema and School* (in Russian). Moscow: Cinema-Center.



- Fedorov, A.** (1994). *The Training System of the Students of Pedagogical Universities for the Aesthetic Education of Pupils by Means of Screen Arts (Cinema, TV, Video)* (in Russian). Taganrog: Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute Publishing House.
- Fedorov, A.** (1999) *The Cinema Art in the Structure of Modern Russian Education* (in Russian). Taganrog: Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute Publishing House.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001) *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods.* (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR.
- Penzin, S.** (1987) *Cinema and Aesthetic Education: Methodology Problems* (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh University Press.
- Sharikov, A.** (1990) *Media Education: International and Russian Experience* (in Russian). Moscow: Academy of Pedagogic Science.
- Spitchkin, A.** (1999) *What is Media Education* (in Russian). Kurgan: Institute of Teachers Training.
- Usov, Y.** (1993) *The Basics of Screen Cultur* (in Russian). Moscow: New School.

## Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis \*

\* Copyright © 2007 by the RWCT International Consortium. [www.rwct.net](http://www.rwct.net) First publication in *Thinking Classroom. An International Journal of Reading, Writing and Critical Reflection*. 2007. Vol. 8. N 3, pp.15-21.

*Alexander Fedorov*

is Chief Editor of the specialized journal *Mediaobrazovanie* (Media Education, [www.ifap.ru/projects/mediamag.htm](http://www.ifap.ru/projects/mediamag.htm)), President of the Russian Association for Film & Media Education, Pro-Rector and full professor at the Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, Taganrog, Russia.

The article was written with the support of the Analytical Special Purpose Program of the RF Ministry of Education and Science for the “Development of the Scientific Potential of Universities” (2006–2008), Project 21.3.491 “Development of Critical Thinking and Media Competence of Pedagogical University Students within Specialization Media Education.”

“Did you like yesterday’s episode?”

“Yeah.”

“What did you like about it?”

“Everything.”

“What do you mean—everything?”

“Well, just everything...”

“Well I liked it that Maria didn’t desert her friend in need. She supported her, and

looked after her, and helped her recover...

What about you?”

“Me too.”

“Cool, isn’t it?”

“Cool, yeah.”

I don’t know about you, reader, but I’ve often overheard this kind of dull, empty dialogue between young people discussing the media—films, TV shows, newspaper articles... Can we help our students more perceptively analyze media characters and media texts as a whole? This question is the focus of the following article.

The *Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia* defines *media education* as a trend in pedagogy toward teaching students about “the mechanisms of mass communication (print, TV, radio, film, video, etc.). The primary goals of media education are to prepare the new generation for life in the current information age and to teach young people to perceive and understand various forms of information, to become aware of the consequences of its psychological influence, and to master various...nonverbal means of communication through technology”

(*Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia*, 1993, p. 555).

In both high schools and universities, media education can develop students' critical thinking through analysis of the characters featured in various media forms and genres. Various assignments can be effectively used to stimulate students' media awareness, or perception of both (a) the feelings and ideas conveyed and (b) the mechanisms by which they are conveyed.

The method of media character analysis described below was employed in various courses for students of Media Education in the Social Pedagogy Department of the Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute.

However, the suggested approaches can also be effectively used by high school teachers, particularly in literature courses, as a supplement and extension to traditional methods of textual analysis. Our method is designed to develop not only critical and creative thinking as applied to particular media texts, but also media competence in a broader sense (1).

The analysis of media characters is based on a variety of creative assignments outlined here: literary imitation, dramatic roleplaying, and graphic representation (2). For each of these categories, a "bank" of creative assignments is provided from which a teacher can choose activities best fitting the form, genre, and content of a given media text, as well as the age, level, and needs of their students. The three categories of assignments correspond to stages in the process of creating a media text. The literary imitation assignments are related to the script-writing stage (devising a plot, development of characters, writing screenplays for scenes in well-known literary works).

Role-playing assignments, involving games based on plots and characters, help students better understand the processes involved in staging a production. Graphic representation assignments are primarily concerned with the advertising of a media product, its representation in the press, on TV, radio, etc. Based on our experience, we recommend presenting the different types of assignments in the order noted above (although the sequence of particular assignments in each category may vary depending on the given text and students' needs). All of the suggested assignments are intended to develop the students' awareness and understanding of media: They help students delve into the inner world of the characters and better understand their motives, personalities, temperaments, and moral values.

#### **Literary imitation assignments for the analysis of media characters**

- Describe and analyze a particular event in a media text, including a description of the characters and an explanation of their actions and statements.

- Make up a story from the perspective of the main character or a minor character in a media text, maintaining the features of the character's personality and linguistic style.
- Make up a story from the viewpoint of an inanimate object featured in the text, thus shifting the narration towards a paradoxical, imaginary perspective.
- Place a character from a media text in a different situation (by changing the title and genre of the text; the time and setting of the action; composition elements — beginning, climax, denouement, epilogue; or the age, sex, nationality or other characteristics of the hero).
- Invent some original characters. Describe their physical qualities, and create dialogues that reveal their personalities. Incorporate them into a synopsis for an original script (a brief sketch, one or two pages long).
- Think up new physical, emotional, or moral trials that could be encountered by the main character in the text being analyzed.
- Write an original mini-script that demonstrates character development.
- Write an original piece (report or interview) for a newspaper, magazine, or website about a particular character.
- Make up “letters” (to newspapers, magazines, TV, the Ministry of Culture, etc.) from the perspective of readers or viewers of various ages and various social, professional, and educational backgrounds (see the “Monologue by a Woman-Pensioner” below).

Role-playing activities in the classroom can be organized in the form of creative contests, either for individual participants or for groups of two or three. For example, students first become familiar with the characteristics of a particular media text (they may do this at home or, if the text is not too long, during class) and then write a story in the voice of a given character.

After all the students have written and presented their stories, the class engages in discussion about the strengths and shortcomings of each. The winners in this contest would be the stories that, according to the collective judgment, are most faithful to the style and characters of the original text.

Of course, there can be many different approaches to evaluating students' creative products, all of which will at some point involve the evaluator's own taste and subjective preferences. Even professional literary and film critics often disagree in their judgment of the same work. Therefore, when organizing such classroom contests it is important to involve students in establishing the criteria by which their work will be evaluated.

In our opinion, the best criterion of success for assignments such as “create a story from the viewpoint of a particular character” or “make up a scene placing a character in a different situation” is the ability of participants to identify with the character, to understand the character and reveal his or her

psychology through language, and to provide motives for the character's acts and gestures (including those not described in the original text). Especially popular with students are the assignments that require them to make up a story from the perspective of an inanimate object or animal featured in the text.

Possible examples include a bank note being passed from one person to another; a mirror in the main character's room; a car used by the hero to pursue criminals, etc. When working on such assignments, students often find parallels with other art forms (for example, many students remember — and draw inspiration from — a song by Vladimir Vysotsky, "I'm a Fighter," written from the perspective of a fighter plane).

Our students definitely enjoyed composing stories from the viewpoints of inanimate objects such as a revolver in a gangster film, the ocean liner *Titanic*, a feather in the film *Forrest Gump*, Harry Potter's magic wand, etc. An especially successful example is this story written by Yelena C.:

*Hi! First let me introduce myself, I'm the one who played the leading role in the film Perfume. I'm the vial in which my brilliant master first mixed up all the ingredients of the perfume he created. I could feel every drop slowly sliding down my glass sides. Each one was magnificent! When I was filled to the brim I felt very important, I would even say, great! My feelings at that moment were indescribable! At last my master uncorked me at the site where he was to be executed... Well, you know the rest. The effect was amazing! At that moment I realized that I was a real star! But alas, quite soon I had to come back down to earth: I found myself trampled in the mud, empty and deserted... And I played the entire role without a stunt double—I hope the audience appreciates what I had to go through*

(The same student, Yelena C., even contributed some black humor about popular media characters: *Jean-Baptiste from Perfume comes to visit Hannibal Lecter from The Silence of the Lambs. 'Will you dine with me?' Dr. Lecter asks. 'No thanks,' Jean-Baptiste answers, 'I'll just enjoy the smell.'*)

We believe that such assignments are in line with the teaching methods of V.S. Bibler, a Russian philosopher and author of a comprehensive philosophy of culture: "Students in the classroom recreate possible variants of mankind's accomplishments, as well as alternative versions of these accomplishments, and, most important, they arrive at a conscious stopping point [to think] through what has already been accomplished, invented, and created by other people" (Bibler, 1993, pp. 13–14).

In a similar way, we use creative assignments to help students better understand the particulars of audience awareness: Students engage in actions that help them experience other people's reactions through their own. One such assignment is to write letters to various organizations from the viewpoints of filmgoers and TV viewers of various ages, tastes, and education levels. The

criterion of success in this assignment is the writer's ability to identify with the imagined author of the letter or monologue.

The "Monologue by a Woman-Pensioner about a Soap Opera," by student Irina O. is, in our opinion, a successful example:

*Yesterday I even skipped the laundry to watch the next part. Poor girl, so nice and kind-hearted she is, and so many troubles raining down on her head! And that rascal, Leoncio, how is he even allowed to live? Never in my life have I seen such cruelty! I'd strangle him with my own two hands if I could... Poor girl, she seems so sincere, she does. I can't look at her without starting to cry. And her eyes are so sad that it breaks your heart! You just feel how miserable her life is... I say she should turn round and bash him right on his mean head, and run away with her boyfriend. Though I guess they'll get together all the same! Such a lovely couple... And look at that Rose, so nasty, mean, and greedy! Where did they find such an ugly mug, I wonder? I hated her the minute I saw her. ... But January, she's something else—so fat and so dark, but so warm-hearted. And always willing to help. Oh my, will I live to see the end of the last series? I really hope everything turns out OK. Our TV people need to learn how to make good shows. The kind that when you watch them, you want to watch more and more!*

Creative writing of this type develops students' imaginations, and their ability to identify with the persona of the invented character (the purported author of the letter or monologue). Comparing students' letters and monologues with actual letters from TV viewers and filmgoers in Russian newspapers, we repeatedly observed obvious similarities in both language and ideas. This suggests that the student authors successfully caught certain aspects of the popular perception of the media: an obvious preference for entertaining and "satisfying" media products; a desire on the part of older audience members to return to the ideals of the past; and the desire to find in media texts a rosy view of life.

Our observations have shown, though, that many young people, including the students in Media Education, also tend to favor an idealized reflection of reality in media texts, as shown in the following example:

*This is a story of a juvenile delinquent. Basically his character is clear to me. He grew up without a father so he became hardened and embittered against the whole world... Yes, unfortunately, we often encounter such people in real life. But I don't think we need to show them on the screen. What we should be showing is the accomplishments of the young. We need optimism, and prospects for the future! (Oleg G.)*

As seen from the excerpt above, the writer seems ready to give up truthfulness in representation for the sake of uplifting models and positive examples. In our opinion, Oleg G.'s position reflects the naive hopes of a certain part of the audience who believe that life would change for the better if

only we would ban negativity from the screen and stick to showing ideal heroes.

However, the majority of today's high school and university students are not inclined to demand ideal heroes from the contemporary media. What they are after is high-grade entertainment. They want lavish melodramas and adventure stories set in the past (or, as a variation, in the imaginary future), preferably about the lives of aristocrats or foreigners—fairy tales for grownups, that have nothing to do with the burdens of everyday reality.

Nevertheless, there are some young people who prefer realistic portrayals of characters in media texts:

*The film vividly conveys the heroine's psychology: She lost real contact with her mother long ago; she feels deprived and unhappy, and attempts to express herself through scandalous actions. She is sick and tired of her family's constant reproaches and quarrels. She wants to get away from home, to live her own life. She is excitable, nervous, rude, and often cruel. She may even be capable of murder — say, in a street fight... At the same time she is clever in her own way, and she longs for happiness — which, for her, means sex, dancing, and entertainment. She is sick and tired of living among factory smokestacks and associating with foul-mouthed thugs, and watching her stupefied mother constantly fighting with her drunkard father. It's all a vicious circle for her... I know a lot of girls like this in real life, too. Other girls, their friends, seem to live only for themselves. They are often indifferent to the suffering they cause. (Lyudmila D.)*

Lyudmila D.'s description provides a moral evaluation of the characters' behaviors, although it is lacking in nuance and fails to explore the author's intent. This whole complex of literary imitation assignments expands and supplements the students' available knowledge and skills, at the same time giving them a practical framework: Students have an opportunity to develop their interests, imaginations, associative, creative, critical, and individual thinking, as well as their media competence. Further, the assignments call for the practical application of concepts already familiar to the students from courses in literature (for example, *theme, idea, story*), art (*color, light, composition, perspective*), and music (*tempo, rhythm*).

### **Dramatic role-playing assignments**

- Dramatized interview (or press conference) with various media personalities.
- Dramatized "International Conference of Media Critics" with comprehensive discussion of media figures and their personas.
- "Legal" role-playing sketch, including an investigation of the crimes of a negative protagonist, and his trial.

- Actor sketches: Create and perform a sketch using roles described in the text (e.g., an official and a visitor, children and parents, an investigator and a suspect, a detective and a witness, a teacher and a student, a doctor and a patient). Students work in groups of two or three. Each group prepares and presents a role-playing project, which is recorded on video and shown in class. The teacher acts as an adviser. The projects are discussed and compared. This assignment not only offers the participants an opportunity for creative work, but also provides rich material for discussion. In the course of this discussion students willingly share their viewpoints, explaining how they would behave in a similar situation and why.
- Role-playing game: Create a TV broadcast, working through all the stages of preparation and production, including casting and rehearsals. Many of our students especially enjoyed role-playing games based on popular media characters (Batman, Cheburashka, Shrek, etc.).

Below is the text of “Shrek Visits Radio Station *BLOT*,” a dramatic sketch created by Yekaterina F. and Daria K. (as hosts) and Dmitry S. (as Shrek):

*Hi, dear listeners! Daria and Yekaterina present the weekly program “Guests of the Blot.” Today our guest is the wellknown animated character Shrek.*

*“Tell us please, how did you manage to win the hearts of so many millions of girls?”*

*“First, I don’t bathe like ordinary guys do. I only take a mud bath once a month. Second, I have a beautiful suntan all year round. I also have lots of other virtues of course, but I prefer to let my admirers talk about them, rather than recounting them myself.”*

*“Do you have any bad habits?”*

*“Oh yes! Picking my nose.”*

*“What is your relationship with your friend Donkey off-screen?”*

*“He talks too much, and it gets on my nerves...”*

*“What’s your favorite food?”*

*“I’m fond of slugs in their own juice. My wife Fiona is the best cook when it comes to slugs.”*

*“What are your plans for the upcoming animation season?”*

*“I’d like to star in a good thriller. But mind you, I’d only agree to be a star—supporting roles are out of the question...”*

*“That’s certainly a worthy aspiration. Good luck to you!”*

*“Ciao, babes!”*

*“Today our invited guest has been the big, friendly animated character Shrek, with Yekaterina and Daria as your hosts. See you next week!”*

Creative role-playing assignments enrich and develop the skills acquired by



the students at the previous, literary imitation stage. They also help students become more confident and develop their social and improvisation skills; the actors' speech tends to become more natural and fluent.

### **Graphic representation assignments**

- Designing advertising posters, with a focus on presenting media characters.
- Making collages based on a media text.
- Creating a series of pictures for a comic book based on a media text.
- Taking photos of friends for an imaginary glossy magazine, with a focus on the unique personality of the model.

This series of assignments focuses students' attention on the graphic aspects of media texts and on visual features of the characters. In completing the assignments in all three categories, students learn to perceive and critically analyze the character and actions of media figures, looking at them not only from the detached perspective of a reader or viewer, but also from the artistic perspective of their creators. By learning to perceive, interpret, analyze, and evaluate media texts, and by mastering various forms of self-expression involving technology, young people learn the ways of media culture. In contemporary society, media competence helps a person take full advantage of the opportunities provided by the information resources of TV, radio, video, cinema, Internet, and the press, and better understand the language and techniques of media culture.

#

1. For the statistical analysis of the method's effectiveness see Fedorov, 2005, pp. 150–181.
2. Some of the assignments were described previously in: BFI, 1990; Semali, 2000, pp. 229–231; Berger, 2005, p. 125; Fedorov, 2004, pp. 43–51; however we considerably supplemented and developed the series of assignments.

### **References**

- BFI (British Film Institute). (1990). *Film education* (in Russian). Moscow: Film Educators' Association.
- Semali, L.M. (2000). *Literacy in multimedia America*. London: Falmer.
- Berger, A.A. (2005). *To see means to trust. Introduction to visual communication* (in Russian). Moscow: Williams.
- Bibler, V.S. (1993). The dialogue of cultures and the school of the 21st century. In V.S. Bibler, (Ed.), *School for the dialogue of cultures: Ideas, practices, and problems* (in Russian, pp. 9–106). Kemerovo: ALEF.
- Russian pedagogical encyclopedia* (1993) (Vol. 1, in Russian). Moscow: Big Russian Encyclopedia.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). Specificity of media education in pedagogical universities (in Russian). *Pedagogy* (4), 43–51.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2005). *Media education for future teachers* (in Russian). Taganrog: Kuchma.

### **Concise Media Glossary**

*Media awareness* is the perception by the audience of the authors' attitudes and perspectives, which are conveyed through various expressive means inherent in a particular form or genre of media.

*Media text* is a message expressed in any media form (print, radio, TV, cinematography, video, Internet) or genre (article, broadcast, film, video clip, soundtrack).

*Character analysis* is the analysis of the character, motives, values, and behaviors of media characters.

*Media agencies* are editorial staffs, TV studio heads, etc.

*Media categories* are forms and genres of media.

*Media technologies* are technologies used in creating media texts.

*Media language* is an expressive means used in creating the images.

*Media representation* is concepts of the facts of reality in media texts.

### ***Appendix. Questions for Analysis of Media Characters in the Classroom***

*Questions on how media agencies influence the characteristics of media figures*

- Can characteristics of media figures be defined by the thematic/genre/political and other biases of particular media agencies? In what way?

*Questions on how media categories influence the characteristics of media personages*

- What are the similarities and differences between the characters in a tragedy, drama, and melodrama?

*Questions on how media technologies influence the characteristics of media figures*

- Does a character's appearance depend on the media technologies used? If so, in what ways?

*Questions on how media languages influence the characteristics of media figures*

- How are exaggerated gestures and facial expressions of the actors connected to the genres of comedy, musical, or fantasy?

- How can the authors of a media text demonstrate that a certain character has changed?

- Can you think of a scene where the events are seen through the eyes of one of the characters, or reported by one of the characters? Does this perspective help to create a sensation of danger or surprise at certain moments in the scene?

- Why are certain objects (including the clothing of characters or presenters) depicted in a particular way? What do these objects tell us about the characters, their lifestyles, their attitudes to each other? Does the setting indicate anything about the nature of the people living in it? If so, how? How are personalities revealed through dialogue and language?

*Questions on how media representations influence the characteristics of media personages*

- How are characteristics such as family, social background, gender, and race represented in popular media productions in different genres, and from different countries?

- What political, social, and cultural trends are represented in a given text? Do you see evidence of rebellion, sexism, conformism, anxiety, stereotypical thinking, generational conflict, arrogance, snobbery, isolation, etc.?

- How do the characters in a given text express their viewpoints and ideas?

- What are the relationships between the characters; what are their motives and the consequences of their actions, and how does the media portrayal influence our perception of them?
  - How do the characters develop? Do the protagonists change as a result of the events described in the text? How do they change and why?
  - What did the characters learn in the course of the story?
  - Can you provide examples of texts in which certain characters are portrayed in deliberate contrast to each other?
  - How, and in what scenes, are the conflicts between characters in this text revealed?
  - Who plays the most active role in the given text, a male or a female protagonist? What actions does this character perform?
  - Are there any connections between minor plotlines that help the viewer understand the characters and their ideology, as well as furthering the themes of the text?
  - Should the authors of a media text depict negative characters as the embodiment of evil?
  - Does the ending logically follow from the characters' personalities and philosophies? If not, how should the story end, considering what is known about the characters? What ending would you propose and why?
- Questions on how different characteristics of the media audience — gender, social, psychological and others — influence the perception of media figures*
- What is your opinion of the character N.? Do you approve of his/her behavior? Would you do the same thing as N. in a similar situation?
  - What makes you sympathize with some characters and pass judgment on others?
  - What is the contribution of each character to your understanding of the main protagonist?
  - Can you give an example where your sympathies for a character changed in the course of the plot?
  - Ideally, what qualities and character traits would you like to see in a hero or heroine? Would you characterize your favorite hero as an active and energetic person?
  - Can the reaction of the audience prolong or cut short the lives of characters in media series?

## **Russian Teachers' Attitudes to the Problem of Media Education of Pupils and University Students**

Unlike some other countries (for example, the USA or Canada), the school education is centralized in Russia. The Ministry of Education works out the national basic school program, the one and compulsory for all schools. The number of elective subjects is very small compared to the obligatory ones.

The national educational curriculum does not include media literacy. Some institutions take media literacy initiations: the laboratory of media education of Russian Academy of Education (Moscow) develops experimental educational standards on media education at schools (integrated into the curriculum), the Kurgan Teacher Training Institute uses its own programs of media education (Spitchkin, 1999), etc. However these innovations are realized just in relatively few Russian schools and universities. That is why the development of media literacy in Russia depends on the individual efforts of teachers (relatively young as a rule), who try to integrate media education in different subject areas or conduct extra-curricular classes (or clubs) on media culture.

The Russian Ministry of Education is aware of this problem and in future promises to provide technological resources in the areas of sound, video & Internet equipment (for example with the help of Federation for Internet Education).

One of the institutions that provide assistance for media literacy is Russian Association for Film & Media Education. Teachers and university professors who joined it write doctors' thesis on media & Internet literacy, elaborate models of media education, curriculum materials for schools and universities, publish books (Fedorov, 1989, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2007; Baranov and Penzin, 2005; Sharikov, 1990; Spitchkin, 1999; Usov, 1993 and others), provide workshops and seminars on media education. These efforts are aimed at developing pupils' and students' personality – developing an appreciation and critical thinking and analysis, media creativity, etc.

Teachers that I interviewed define their approach to media literacy in the following way: media education is subsidiary to basic education; media and Internet are effective means for the development of personality; media education is a new possibility for the creative games and collaborative forms of work; media education is the means of active involvement of pupils into the learning process.

Russian teachers report that their long-term media aims are the development of pupils' personality, critical and aesthetical perception with the help of advanced media equipment, including Internet.

I think that modern Russia needs concrete strategies of the development

of media education projects. These strategies must be aimed not only at technical equipment of Russian schools but also on development of the new methodologies. Russian education needs productive cooperation with the Ministry of Education, Association for Media Education, Federation for Internet Education, Educational web-sites' & CD-ROMs' producers. Russian education needs also international cooperation for Media Education.

The year 2002 was marked by the important event in the history of the Russian media education movement. The academic-methodical institution of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation has registered the new university-level specialization (Minor) "Media Education" (03.13.30) within the education area. In other words, for the first time in its history media education in Russia has gained an official status.

However are the Russian teachers ready for the implementation of the media education ideas? What is their general attitude to the problem of media education in school and university? What objectives are the most important for them? To what extent do they use media education elements in their lessons?

These are the questions that we tried to answer by the survey of 57 teachers of secondary schools (schools NN 12, 27, 36, 37, 38 and others) in Taganrog, Russia. The information on age and gender of the teachers is in the Table 1.

***Table 1. The number of teachers, their age and gender***

Age	Number of teachers in this age group	% of teachers	Number of female teachers	Number of male teachers
21-30	10	17,54	7	3
31-40	12	21,05	8	4
41-50	11	19,30	7	4
51-60	12	21,05	7	5
61-70	12	21,05	10	2
Total	57	100	39	18

Undoubtedly, my survey cannot claim for the total representativeness. On the other hand, its results seem to us characteristic of the media education process in general, the more so as many of its issues reecho with the findings of the research of media education tendencies in 12 European countries [Hart & Suss, 2002].

The results of the survey are presented in the Tables 2 - 6.

**Table 2. General attitude of teachers to media education**

Age, Gender of Teachers	Attitudes of Teachers to Media Education of Pupils and Students									
	There is no need in media education of pupils	Media education must be part of the curriculum	Media education should be in an elective or a club in Schools	There is no need in media education of university students	Media education should be part of the curriculum in the pedagogical institutes & universities	Media education should be an elective course for university level students	A new area of qualification (Major) – “Media Education” should be introduced into the pedagogical institutes	Media education of pupils and students should be integrated into traditional obligatory courses	Media education in school and university should be autonomous, as a matter or a course	Media education in school and university must be a synthesis of autonomous and integrated lessons
	Number of teachers (in %) who chose this variant of the answer:									
<b>Age 21-30/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>60,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>80,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>60,00</b>
21-30/men	0,00	66,67	0,00	0,00	100,00	0,00	33,33	33,33	33,33	33,33
21-30 women	0,00	57,14	42,86	0,00	71,43	14,28	42,86	42,86	14,28	71,43
<b>Age 31-40/total</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>
21-30/ men	0,00	50,00	25,00	0,00	50,00	25,00	100,00	50,00	25,00	50,00
21-30/women	25,00	100,00	37,50	0,00	100,00	25,00	75,00	37,50	25,00	50,00
<b>Age 41-50 /total</b>	<b>9,10</b>	<b>72,73</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>54,54</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>72,73</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>63,64</b>
41-50 /men	0,00	50,00	50,00	0,00	75,00	75,00	100,00	50,00	25,00	75,00
41-50 /women	14,28	85,71	28,57	0,00	42,86	28,57	57,14	42,86	28,57	57,14
<b>Age 51-60 /total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>
51-60 /men	20,00	40,00	60,00	0,00	60,00	20,00	100,00	40,00	20,00	40,00
51-60 / women	28,57	42,86	42,86	14,28	42,86	14,28	28,57	57,14	28,57	42,86
<b>Age 61-70 /total</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>50,50</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>
61-70 /men	0,00	100,00	50,00	00,00	50,00	0,00	50,00	50,00	0,00	0,00
61-70 / women	20,00	50,00	30,00	10,00	30,00	10,00	30,00	50,00	30,00	50,00
<b>All age groups/total</b>	<b>14,03</b>	<b>63,16</b>	<b>36,84</b>	<b>3,51</b>	<b>56,14</b>	<b>21,05</b>	<b>57,89</b>	<b>45,61</b>	<b>24,56</b>	<b>50,88</b>
All age groups/men	5,55	55,55	38,89	0,00	66,67	27,78	83,33	44,44	22,22	44,44
All age groups/women	17,95	66,67	35,90	5,13	56,41	17,95	46,15	46,15	25,64	53,85

The analysis of Table 2 shows that the majority of teachers believe in the necessity of media education of pupils in the form of a mandatory subject (63,16%) or as an elective (34,84%). The same is true concerning the obligatory (56,14%) or elective (21,05%) media education for university students. 57,89% of the teachers questioned (83,33% of men and 46,15% of women) have also expressed their support of the introduction of the new pedagogical major

“Media Education” in higher education institutions. In addition, the mandatory media education for pupils/students and the suggestion for a major specialization in “Media Education” have gained the strongest support in the age group of teachers between 31 and 40 years (83,33% of voices in all questions).

The teachers that took part in our project, think that media education of pupils/students should be integrated into the mandatory courses (45,61% without any noticeable gender or age differences), autonomous (24,56% without any major gender or age differences as well), or the combination of both (50,88%).

Only 14,03% of the teachers oppose media education for pupils claiming its uselessness. There are 3 times more women’s voices here than the men’s, and older generation predominates (in the age group between 21 and 30 years there is no single person who is against media education for schoolchildren).

However, even these teachers’ resistance declines when it comes to the status of media education for university-level students. Just 3,51% of the teachers reject it. By the way, this group consists entirely of women older than 50 years, who are probably too conservative to change their traditional opinion about the teaching process.

In general, more than 75% of the teachers in this or another way do support media education for pupils and students, and 58% of them believe that it is high time to introduce the new area of expertise for universities - “Media Education”. It proves the point that the intense development of the media evokes the adequate reaction of Russian pedagogues - they realize that life in the world of IT and mass communication boom is demanding media literacy to the extent not less than it is demanding the traditional literacy.

It seems worthy of comparing several positions of Table 2 with the results of the questionnaire of 26 experts in media education around the world (media educators from 10 different countries participated, such as O.Baranov, R.Cornell, A.Korochensky, B.MacMahon, J.Pungente, S.Penzin, L.Roser, K.Tyner, E.Yakushina, and others) that I conducted for UNESCO in 2003 [Fedorov, 2003]. The difference in the opinions of teachers and experts featured most strongly in their attitude to the autonomous media education. In contrast to 25,64% of Russian schoolteachers, only 7,69% of the experts in the field think that media literacy should be taught in separate courses/lessons. There is no significant difference between the support for the integrated media education: 46,15% of Russian teachers vs. 30,77% of the experts. The number of advocates of the combination of the integrated and autonomous media education in these two groups is even closer: 53,85% of teachers compared to 61,54% of the experts. On the whole, majority of Russian teachers and international experts agree on the point that the most promising way for the development of modern media education is the union of autonomous and integrated lessons with schoolchildren and students.

The results of the teachers' answers to the questions about main aims of media education are systematized in Table 3.

**Table 3. Teachers' Opinions about their Attitude to Main Aims of Media Education**

Age/gender of teachers	Media Educational Aims													
	Encouraging the development of the aesthetic taste, perception, evaluation of the aesthetic value of a media text, <small>encouraging of aestheticization of media</small>	Development of the critical thinking and critical autonomy of the personality towards media texts.	Protection from the harmful influences of media.	Satisfaction of different needs of the audiences	Teaching practical work with media technology	Development of the audiences' skills for political, ideological analysis of different aspects of media.	Development of the skills of perception, understanding and analysis of media language.	Development of the audiences' skills for the analysis of media texts in the broad cultural and social contexts.	Preparing young people for living in the democratic society.	Development of the communicative skills	Development of the ability for self-expression with the help of media technology, creation of media texts.	Teaching and learning the knowledge about the history of media, media culture	Transmittance of the knowledge about the theory of media, media culture	Development of the skills for the analysis of different aspects of media, media culture in terms of moral values, and <small>transmission of moral values</small>
Number of teachers (in %) who chose this variant of an answer														
<b>Age 21-30 total</b>	60,00	100,0	20,00	40,00	30,00	50,00	20,00	60,00	10,00	40,00	0,00	20,00	20,00	30,00
21-30 /men	33,33	100,0	33,33	33,33	0,00	66,67	0,00	66,67	0,00	100,0	0,00	40,00	20,00	60,00
21-30/women	71,43	100,0	14,28	42,86	42,86	42,86	28,57	57,14	14,28	14,28	0,00	28,57	14,28	42,86
<b>Age 31-40 total</b>	58,33	41,67	41,67	33,33	58,33	58,33	41,67	41,67	33,33	25,00	16,67	8,33	8,33	16,67
21-30 /men	50,00	75,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	75,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	0,00	0,00	25,00
21-30 /women	62,50	37,50	50,00	37,50	62,50	50,00	50,00	37,50	37,50	25,00	12,50	12,50	12,50	12,50
<b>Age 41-50 total</b>	45,45	72,73	36,36	27,27	27,27	36,36	63,64	36,36	45,45	18,18	45,45	9,10	0,00	27,27
41-50 /men	25,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	75,00	25,00	75,00	50,00	50,00	25,00	0,00	0,00
41-50/ women	57,14	85,71	42,86	28,57	28,57	42,86	57,14	42,86	28,57	0,00	42,86	0,00	0,00	42,86
<b>Age 51-60 total</b>	66,67	33,33	33,33	33,33	50,00	58,33	25,00	50,00	50,00	33,33	16,67	8,33	8,33	41,67
51-60/men	60,00	40,00	20,00	40,00	40,00	40,00	20,00	60,00	80,00	40,00	20,00	20,00	0,00	40,00
51-60/women	71,43	28,57	42,86	28,57	57,14	71,43	28,57	42,86	28,57	28,57	14,28	0,00	14,28	42,86
<b>Age 61-70 total</b>	58,33	66,67	41,67	33,33	41,67	50,00	33,33	33,33	33,33	25,00	8,33	25,00	0,00	16,67
61-70/men	100,0	50,00	50,00	0,00	50,00	50,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
61-70/women	50,00	70,00	40,00	40,00	40,00	50,00	40,00	40,00	40,00	30,00	10,00	30,00	0,00	20,00
<b>All age groups/total</b>	57,89	63,16	35,09	33,33	43,86	50,88	36,84	43,86	35,09	29,82	17,54	14,03	7,02	26,31
All age groups/ men	50,00	61,11	27,78	27,78	38,89	50,00	27,78	44,44	44,44	50,00	22,22	11,11	5,55	16,67
All age groups/ women	61,54	64,10	38,46	35,90	46,15	51,28	41,02	43,59	30,77	20,51	15,38	15,38	7,69	30,77

The analysis of the data of Table 3 leads us to the conclusion that the teachers support the following theories of media education (in descending order):



1. Development of the critical thinking ( the main aim is to develop the critical thinking, personality's autonomy towards the media/media texts) - 63,16% (without significant gender differentiation, but with the dominance of younger generation of teachers);

2. Aesthetic (the main goals are to develop the “good” aesthetic perception, taste, abilities for the efficient evaluation of the aesthetic quality of a media text, for understanding of media texts; propaganda of the masterpieces of media culture) - 57, 89% (there are about 11% more of women's voices here than men's);

3. Ideological (the main aim is the development of the skills for political, ideological analysis of different aspects of media/media culture) – 50, 88%.

4. Cultural Studies (the main aim is to develop the audiences' skills for the analysis of media texts in the broad cultural, and social context) – 43, 86%;

5. Practical (the main goal is to teach the audience practical skills of operating media technology) – 43, 86%;

6. Semiotic (the main aim is the development of the audiences' skills for perception, understanding and analysis of the media language) – 36, 84% (there are 14% more of female than male voices);

7. Inoculatory/Protectionist (the main aim to protect the audience from the harmful affects of media) - 35, 09% (women's votes dominate by 11%);

8. Development of the democratic thinking ( the main goal is to prepare young people for living in the democratic society with the help of media/ media culture)- 35, 09% (there are 14% of men's voices, than women's);

9. Satisfaction of the audience's needs- 33, 33% (the main aim is to satisfy the needs of the audience in the area of media/ media culture).

Herewith, teachers consider the following to be important: development of the skills for moral, psychological analysis of different aspects of media, media culture (26, 31%, the women's voices are twice as many as the men's); communicative abilities (29, 82%, men's voices are twice as many as the women's); skills to self expression through media, creation of media texts (17, 54%). Such objectives as the knowledge about the history of media/ media culture (14, 03) and theory of media and media culture (7, 02%) got the smallest rating, though in the latter case it is not quite clear how one can develop, for instance, critical thinking of the audience or teach about the media language without reliance on the theories of media.

Comparison of these data and the results of the questionnaire of the international expert group [Fedorov, 2003] shows that the opinions of Russian teachers are close to those of the experts' in many cases: the teachers (though the percentage is smaller) place the aim of the development of critical thinking

on the top, as well as the experts (84, 61% of experts, 63, 16% of teachers). The difference in attitude towards aesthetic (57, 89% of the teachers, 46, 15% of the experts), ideological (50, 88% of the teachers, 38, 46% of the experts), practical (43, 86% of the teachers, 50% of the experts) and “consumerism” (33, 33% of the teachers, 30, 77% of the experts) objectives of media education is not crucial, as you can see from the figures above.

Yet the comparison with the experts’ rating of the objectives reveals that Russian teachers tend to overestimate the role of “protectionist” (35, 09% of the teachers vs. 15, 38 % of the experts) objectives of media education, to the detriment of the semiotic and cultural studies aims, which got 57 to 70 % of the experts’ votes.

Almost twice less rating was made by such a popular with the experts (61, 89%) category as the development of the critical thinking. The same is true for the communicative aim (57, 34% of the experts vs. only 29, 82% of the teachers) and for the development of the skills for self-expression through media (53, 85% of experts, 17, 54% of teachers).

The importance of the knowledge about the history and theory of media/media culture turned out to be also underestimated by the teachers, compared to the expert group. There are 37 to 48% of supporters of these aspects among the experts, while only 7 to 14% among teachers.

All of this leads us to a conclusion that in spite of the general support given by the experts and the teachers to the priority of the development of critical thinking on the material of media culture, there is no sufficient understanding among the in-service Russian teachers of the importance of several other media educational objectives. For example, the potential of the media education lessons aimed at the development of the democratic thinking of the audience are clearly estimated too low, while the weight of the protectionist objectives is exaggerated.

So, the figures of Table 3 offer some idea of the “theoretical” background which influences the teacher’s work. However, we needed to find out to what extent the teachers really implement elements of media education at their classes. The results of the answers are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Integration of media education elements in schools**

Age/gender of teachers	Elements of media education are used during the lessons	No elements of media education are used during lessons	It is hard to answer this question
	Number of teachers (in %) who chose the answer		
<b>Age 21-30 /total</b>	<b>70,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>
21-30/men	100,00	0,00	0,00
21-30 /women	57,14	0,00	42,86
<b>Age 31-40 /total</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>
21-30/men	50,00	0,00	50,00
21-30 /women	37,50	37,50	25,00
<b>Age 41-50/total</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>45,45</b>
41-50/men	25,00	25,00	50,00
41-50 /women	42,86	14,28	42,86
<b>Age 51-60 /total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>
51-60/men	60,00	20,00	20,00
51-60/women	0,00	42,86	57,14
<b>Age 61-70 /total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>
61-70/men	0,00	0,00	100,00
61-70/women	10,00	30,00	60,00
<b>All age groups/total</b>	<b>35,09</b>	<b>21,05</b>	<b>43,86</b>
All age groups/men	50,00	11,11	38,89
All age groups/women	28,20	25,64	46,15

Let's remind ourselves that the analysis of the figures of Table 2 showed that about 75% of the teachers think that media education of the schoolchildren is the essential component of the modern educational process. At the same time figures of Table 4 tell us that in reality only 35, 09% (50% of men and 28,2% of women with the majority under 51 years old) of the questioned teachers were confident to say that they use elements of media education during their lessons.

21, 05% of the teachers (11,11% of men and 25, 64% of women, the majority belongs to the elder generation) confess that they never use media education elements at their classes. The rest of the teachers are not sure what to answer. We can see the reason for that: the analysis of the following tables (Table 5, Table 6) reveals that about half of the teachers use media material during their lessons very seldom, because they feel that they lack knowledge about theory and methods of teaching media (the latter, to our mind, is another serious argument for the introduction of the new university-level major- 'Media Education' in pedagogical institutes).

Data about the frequency of media educational lessons, conducted by the teachers are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Teacher' opinions about frequency of media education elements during their lessons**

Age/gender of teachers	Some elements of media education are used regularly	Media education elements are used occasionally	Media education elements are used seldom or never
	Number of teachers (in %) who chose the answer		
<b>Age 21-30 /total</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>
21-30/men	33,33	33,33	33,33
21-30 /women	14,28	28,57	57,14
<b>Age 31-40 /total</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>
21-30/men	0,00	50,00	50,00
21-30 /women	25,00	25,00	50,00
<b>Age 41-50/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>72,73</b>
41-50/men	0,00	25,00	75,00
41-50 /women	0,00	28,57	71,43
<b>Age 51-60 /total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>66,67</b>
51-60/men	20,00	20,00	60,00
51-60/women	0,00	28,57	71,43
<b>Age 61-70 /total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>75,00</b>
61-70/men	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/women	0,00	10,00	90,00
<b>All age groups/total</b>	<b>8,77</b>	<b>28,07</b>	<b>63,16</b>
All age groups/men	11,11	38,89	50,00
All age groups/women	7,69	23,08	69,23

Figures presented in Table 5 suggest that only 8, 77% (the most active group within it are men teachers aged 21-30) of the teachers use elements of media education on a regular basis. 28, 07% of teachers integrate them from time to time (men are 15% more than women).

Noticeably, 63, 15% of the teachers (there are more women, especially elder ones, about 20% more than men) declared that they seldom if ever use media literacy activities in their lessons. Taking into consideration that 21, 05% of the teachers had previously said that they do not teach about media, this number goes down to 42, 1% of the questioned teachers.

Certainly, I was also interested to know what the hindrances on the way of media education at schools are.

**Table 6. Reasons that prevent teachers from integrating media education elements during their classes**

Age/gender	Obstacles				
	I lack knowledge about theory and practice of teaching media education	I don't want to teach media	I don't have the financial motivation to do additional work	I am not familiar with media technology	I didn't get any guidelines and directives from school authorities
Number of teachers (in %) who chose the answer					
<b>Age 21-30 /total</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>70,00</b>
21-30/men	00,00	0,00	0,00	33,33	100,00
21-30 /women	42,86	0,00	57,14	0,00	57,14
<b>Age 31-40 /total</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>66,67</b>
21-30/men	75,00	0,00	100,00	0,00	100,00
21-30 /women	37,50	12,50	100,00	25,00	50,00
<b>Age 41-50/total</b>	<b>54,54</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>90,91</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>90,91</b>
41-50/men	50,00	25,00	75,00	0,00	100,00
41-50 /women	57,14	14,28	100,00	28,57	85,71
<b>Age 51-60 /total</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>91,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>100,00</b>
51-60/men	80,00	0,00	80,00	0,00	100,00
51-60/women	85,71	14,28	100,00	42,86	100,00
<b>Age 61-70 /total</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>58,33</b>
61-70/men	50,00	50,00	100,00	0,00	100,00
61-70/women	50,00	30,00	60,00	60,00	50,00
<b>All age groups/total</b>	<b>54,38</b>	<b>14,03</b>	<b>89,47</b>	<b>24,56</b>	<b>77,19</b>
All age groups/men	55,55	11,11	72,22	5,55	100,00
All age groups/women	53,84	15,38	97,43	33,33	66,67

As we can see from the Table 6 the majority of teachers point to the lack of financial motivation as the biggest obstacle on their way (89, 47%, teachers over 30 mostly, women outnumber men by 25%). Then follow complains about the corresponding guidelines/ directions from the school authorities (77, 19%, among them there is 35% more of the men teacher, aged 41-50). About half of the teachers (54, 38% aged above 30) realize that they lack knowledge about theory and practice of media education. 24, 56% of the teachers (only 5, 55% of men among them, 33, 33% of elder women) consider the serious impediment is that they are not familiar with media technology. And only 14, 03% (teachers over 60 years old mostly) of teachers do not want to deal with the media during their classes. There is no one in the age group of 21-30 who expressed a hostile attitude to media education.

Hence, the most significant hindrance of the development of media education according to Russian teachers is the low salary, definitely not enough to become enthusiastic about new technologies and re-writing their usual syllabuses. Though further more we find out that another major problem is the lack of the initiative of the teachers, who do not venture upon the innovation without the directives from the authority. With that, the obstacle, not in the least less, is the insufficient media literacy of teachers themselves.

### ***General Conclusions***

The analysis of the conducted questionnaire among teachers of secondary schools showed that realizing the great importance of the media in the contemporary information society, three quarters of them support the idea of media education at schools and 58% believe that a new major for pedagogical institutes needs to be introduced - "Media Education". Most of teachers justly think that the combination of the autonomous and integrated media lessons is the most effective way today for the development of media education in Russia, and therefore - for the increase of media literacy of the young generation.

However, in spite of the fact that majority of teachers define the aim to develop the critical thinking of the audience as one of the most important, they significantly overestimate the weight of "protectionist" approach to media studies today, and on the contrary, undervalue the goals to develop the democratic thinking of the pupils, their knowledge about theory and history of media and media culture.

Moreover, despite of the general support of media education ideas (in theory) expressed by 75% of the teachers, actually only one third of them use some elements of media education at their lessons (in reality), and one fifth of the group does not integrate it at all.

The hardest obstacle on the way of media education into the Russian classrooms is the absence of financial motivation, according to the teachers, though to our point of view, last but not the least is the passive anticipation of the authority's directives and insufficient level of knowledge of today's Russian teachers in terms of the theory and methods of media education.

Thus, the analysis of the teachers' questionnaire has given us additional proof for the necessity of the official introduction of the new university-level Major- "Media Education" (namely, Major, because the homonymous Minor was registered in 2002) and media education courses for the students of all pedagogical institutes. Only when the media literate graduates of universities come to work in schools, we will be able to evaluate the position of media education within the curriculum.

### **References**

**Fedorov A.** (2001) Media Education: History, Theory and Methods. (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.

**Fedorov, A.** Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. (2003). In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO, 2003.

**Hart, A, & Suss, D.** (Eds.) (2002). *Media Education in 12 European Countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology.

**Recommendations** Addressed to the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO. (1999). In: *Education for the Media and the Digital Age*. Vienna: UNESCO, pp.273-274. Reprint in: *Outlooks on Children and Media* (2001). Goteborg: UNESCO & NORDICOM, p.152.

## *Appendix*

### **Questions of the survey “Attitude of the school teachers to media education of pupils and university students”**

1. What is your attitude to media education?

1	There is no need in media education for pupils
2	Media education should become part of the school curriculum
3	Media education should be offered through electives, after- school clubs
4	There is no need in media education for university level students
5	Media education should be mandatory in pedagogical institutes and universities
6	Media education should be elective in universities
7	It is necessary to introduce a new Major - “Media Education”, in order to prepare the qualified media teachers for secondary schools
8	Media education of pupils and students should be integrated into the traditional subjects (literature, history, biology, etc.)
9	Media education in school and university should be an autonomous course
10	Media education in school and university should combine both forms, autonomous and integrated

2. In your opinion, what are the main aims of media education?  
(Check 5 most important for you)

1	Encouraging the development of the aesthetic taste, perception, evaluation of the aesthetic value of a media text, appreciation of masterpieces of media culture
2	Development of critical thinking and critical autonomy of the personality towards media texts.
3	Protection from harmful influences of media.
4	Satisfaction of different needs of the audiences
5	Teaching practical work with media technology
6	Development of the audiences' skills for political, ideological analysis of different aspects of media.
7	Development of the skills of perception, understanding and analysis of media language.
8	Development of the audiences' skills for the analysis of media texts in the broad cultural and social contexts.
9	Preparing young people for living in the democratic society.
10	Development of the communicative skills
11	Development of the ability for self-expression with the help of media technology, creation of media texts.
12	Teaching the history of media and media culture
13	Teaching the theory of media and media culture
14	Development of the skills for the analysis of different aspects of media, media culture in terms of moral values, and psychology.

3. Do you use elements of media education during your lesson?  
(choose one of the following)

1	Yes
2	No
3	Not sure

4. If you use the elements of media education during your classes, then how often?  
(choose one of the following)

1	Regularly
2	Occasionally
3	Seldom or never

5. If you do not use media education elements, what prevents you from doing it?  
(you can choose 1-3 variants among these)

1	I feel I lack knowledge about theory and methods of teaching media
2	I do not want to teach media
3	I'm not financially motivated and consider it as an extra work
4	I am not familiar with technology
5	There are no directives from school authorities
6	Other reason (specify)



## **Classification of the Levels of Professional Development (knowledge and skills) Necessary for Teachers' Media Education Activities**

Researchers and educators in different countries agree on the necessity of teachers' media education. A modern teacher is supposed to:

- encourage and develop their pupils/students desire to search for the answers to questions connected with media;
- use in teaching a research technique, when pupils/students independently can search media texts for the information to answer various questions, to apply the knowledge received in a training course to new areas;
- help schoolpupils/students develop ability to use a variety of media sources, to investigate problems and then draw the generalized conclusions;
- organize discussions of pupils/students of media texts;
- encourage reflection of own media experiences.

Thus, in order to realize the training program for future teachers, we need to develop the classification of the levels of field knowledge and skills necessary for their future media education activity. The corresponding classification was designed by me on the basis of the generalized classifications of levels of professional readiness of teachers for educational activity (Chart 1).

*Chart 1. Classification of the levels of teachers' professional development  
(knowledge and skills) Necessary for media education practice*

<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Motivational</b>	Motives of media education activity: emotional, gnosiological, hedonistic, moral, aesthetic etc.; an ambition to expand one's knowledge and enhance skills in the field of media education
<b>Informational</b>	Level of knowledge in the field of media education
<b>Methodical</b>	Methodical skills in the field of media education, the level of pedagogical talent
<b>Activity</b>	Quality of media education activity during educational practice
<b>Creative</b>	Level of the originality and resourcefulness in media education activities

The given classification to a considerable degree corresponds with readiness of a future teacher for the development of information culture of pupils which is defined by I.A.Donina as "complete integrated reflecting ability of the future teacher to the informational and pedagogical activity, including "motivational, value, cognitive and operational components" [Donina, 1999, p.11], and also with the similar levels developed earlier [Fedorov, 2001, pp.62-63, Legotina, 2004, p.14].

Below are the scales specifying the indicators of each level.

**Chart 2. Motivational level**

<b>Level of development</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>High</b>	Versatile motives of media education activity: emotional, gnosiological, hedonistic, moral, aesthetic etc.; an ambition to expand one's knowledge and enhance skills in the field of media education
<b>Average</b>	Some motives for integrating media work are apparent
<b>Low</b>	Weak motivation, no willingness to enhance one's teaching pattern

In fact, the results of work depend on a level and nature of motivation of media education activity of both future, and in-service teachers. My observation has shown that quite frequently school teachers express an opinion that media education is an additional "work load" for them, hence should be paid extra.

**Chart 3. Informational level**

<b>Level of development</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>High</b>	Deep and extensive knowledge in the field of media education.
<b>Average</b>	Consistent, acceptable theoretical knowledge in the field of media education.
<b>Low</b>	Limited, fragmentary pedagogical knowledge in the field of media education

My earlier researches have revealed that many Russian teachers lack knowledge about media education dramatically. Thus the necessity for setting up special pre- service and in-service courses on media education becomes even more obvious. A teacher should be media literate him/herself to be able to teach media to his/her students.

**Chart 4. Methodical level**

<b>Level of development</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>High</b>	Advanced methodical skills in the field of media education (e.g., skills to develop media perception of pupils/students, to reveal levels of their development in media culture area, to choose optimal methods, means and forms of work, research skills, etc.) and outstanding pedagogical talent (general pedagogical culture, self-presentation, reflection, presence of a feedback with an audience, etc.)
<b>Average</b>	Acceptable methodical skills in the field of media education; teaching strategies meets expectations
<b>Low</b>	The choice of methods is not suitable; no presence of a teaching aptitude

For example, a distinguished Russian teacher E.N.Gorukhina considers that during the process of media education future teachers should take advantage of methods of scientific research, and also techniques of organizing out-of-class work. Among other activities, she challenges her students with the assignment to analyze:

- the standpoint of a media text's author;
- dialogues between media text's characters and the dialogue between the author of a media text and the audience;
- perception as the process and activity [Gorukhina, 1980, pp.4-5].

At the same time, analysing the methodical level, one should keep in mind that pupils and students sometimes "play the game" with their teachers, saying things they are expected to say. For example, a male student can learn to speak "correct things" about sexism in media texts in a classroom, however express sexist attitude to his female classmates outside the classroom [Buckingham, 1990, pp.8-9].

**Chart 5. Activity level**

<b>Level of development</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>High</b>	Regular and various media education activities
<b>Average</b>	Occasional elements of media education
<b>Low</b>	Incidental, ineffective media education activities

Undoubtedly, only recurring media education activities can lead to expected results - increase of media literacy level of pupils/students. However my previous researches have shown that till present the opposite situation is true- incidental, unsystematic integration of media education elements.

**Chart 6. Creative level**

<b>Level of development</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>High</b>	Media education activity of a teacher demonstrates insight, imagination, flexibility, novelty, articism
<b>Average</b>	Teacher's creativity is displayed occasionally or inconsistently
<b>Low</b>	No signs of inspiration or inventiveness

I believe that teacher's creative work should be tied to principles of humanism and democracy. The university in a democratic society aspires to provide students with educational experience of various characteristics and a multicultural basis. University graduates are supposed to become responsible citizens with humanistic values of responsibilities and rights, freedom of expression and access to information and knowledge.

### **Conclusions**

Within the context of growing presense of media in modern societies, school teachers and university educators should be media competent. The scale suggests the classification of levels of the professional development (knowledge and skills) necessary for teachers to integrate media education. Thus, the model degree of development of professional knowledge and skills necessary for successful media education activity, is comprised of the following levels:

- 1) **Motivational:** emotional, gnosiological, hedonistic, moral, aesthetic and other motives; teacher's aspiration to expand one's knowledge and enhance skills in the field of media education.
- 2) **Informational:** comprehensive knowledge in the field of media education (knowledge of the fundamental aims, approaches, and key concepts).
- 3) **Methodical:** advanced methodical skills in the field of a media education and pedagogical talent.
- 4) **Activity:** regular media education activities during educational works of different types.
- 5) **Creative:** media education activity of a teacher demonstrates insight, imagination, flexibility, novelty, articism.

### **References**

- Buckingham, D.** (1990.) Media Education: From Pedagogy to Practice. In: Buckingham, D. (Ed.). *Watching Media Learning. Making Sense of Media Education*. London - New York - Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, pp.3-15.
- Donina, I.** (1999). *Training of the Future Teachers to Develop the Information Culture of Schoolchildren* (in Russian). Novgorod, p.11.
- Fedorov, A.** (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods* (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 2001, pp.62-63.
- Gorukhina, E.** (1980). *Film Club as the Form of Scientific and Cognitive Work of Students* (in Russian). Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk State Pedagogical Institute, 28 p.
- Legotina, N.** (2004). *Pedagogical Condition of the University Students Training for Media Education in Secondary Schools* (in Russian). Kurgan, 24 p.

## **Curricula on Media Education in Russian Universities: Comparative Analysis**

There are two basic varieties of media education programs in Russian universities: one aimed at the future professionals in the field of media, the other is designed for future secondary school teachers. The complex of programs for professional specialization of future journalists in the Moscow State University or other classical universities, future cinematographers (Russian State Institute of Cinematography and other colleges and institutes of screen arts), is designed to give students solid knowledge in media culture, history of journalism, film arts, TV, and to provide a hands-on training for further professional activity in press, on TV and radio, in filmmaking, and Internet. As the typical example of such type of programs, we shall consider the syllabi designed by the faculty of the Journalism Department of the Moscow State University (18).

The syllabus of the course of “The Basics of Television Journalism” (authors R.Boretsky and A.Jurovsky), includes the units related to the history of the Russian and foreign television journalism, public functions of TV, introduction to television occupations, the grammar of television, television genres, etc. The syllabus of the “History of Cinema” (the author - S.Drobashenko) covers the basic historical stages of the Russian film arts (from the birth of cinema to the present). The course “Expressive means of the screen” is focused by G.Brovchenko on the specific language of the filmic of televisual text and is aimed at introducing the variety of expressive means, facilitating students to master the basic techniques of their use for scriptwriting, to demonstrate the way ideas and feelings are represented with the help of these means in media texts of different types.

The course “Technique of Television Journalism” is consistently focused by G.Kuznetsov, S.Muratov on such professional skills of a journalist as interviewing, reporting, holding a conversation, discussion, press conference, etc. Programs for radio journalism (authors of the programs are V.Ruzhnikov, D.Ljubosvetov, I.Thagushev, V.Gasparjan) and press journalism are constructed by the same pattern, targeted at providing training for qualified professionals in the field of mass media.

Now let us proceed to the media education curriculum in Russian pedagogical universities. For instance, the syllabus of a course in film studies developed in Kurgan Pedagogical University by Professor S.Odintsova (7, 113-114) distinctly discloses its integrated approach, motion picture being related to literature. The syllabus of a course developed by the Professor N.Gornitska from Saint Petersburg Institute for Teachers’ Professional Development (Cit. from: 11, 108) is likewise constructed, studying screen media in connection with the development of other arts (literature, theatre, painting, music) as “we notice, similarly to the processes of differentiation in science, correlation in arts” (Cit. from: 11, 108). The syllabi of R.Hallieva for pedagogical universities are designed in the same way, i.e. with no particular attention to teaching the technology of media education) - in the units related to screen arts (22, 146; 22,155-156; 22,158-159; 22,161; 22,167-168; 22, 172-173).

The first media education curriculum for pedagogical universities with the strong “teacher training” emphasis was developed for the special course “Basics of the Film Arts” by E.Gorbulina (4, 196-223). It was developed specifically for future teachers. The main advantage of material for the course is an opportunity to use it at lessons, in school and out-of-class work. The course encompasses not only lectures, but also practical work (seminars, film or film sequence viewings, writing film reviews, the comparative analysis of a script and a film, curriculum design for future work with schoolpupils- lesson outline, discussion, lecture, course work).

The comparative analysis of the program of E.Gorbulina with university syllabi intended for future media professionals, shows, that in many respects they are similar, although the latter require a greater volume of hours, and encompass more issues more thoroughly: “Film Creation as a Creative Process”, “Film Genres”, “Expressive Means of the Cinema Art”, “History of Russian and Foreign Film Art”. But the basic material as a matter of fact is the same, and the purposes of its studying quite often coincide (for example, introduction to the main stages of the development of motion picture arts, analysis of the works of outstanding masters of the screen, aimed at the aesthetic, ethical, sociocultural, critical thinking development of a student).

The distinct difference between the course syllabi intended for prospective media professionals and for the future secondary teachers (as developed by E.V. Gorbulina) is the unit “Cinema and School”. This module includes such key media education issues as “Peculiarities of Film Perception by Pupils of Different Ages”, “Cinema and TV in School”, “Media Education Methods”.

However, a closer look at Gorbulina’s syllabus reveals a noticeable thematic imbalance: there are 4 topics on the theory of screen arts, 9- on history, and only 3 on film pedagogy. Professor O.Nechaj (5) has written the teachers’ manual for pedagogical universities (1989). But only 42 pages (p.238-280) of the total 288 are actually devoted to problems of film education. The larger part of the manual presents the history and theory of screen arts.

The syllabus of a university special course “The Basics of Film Art”, developed by Professor S.Penzin (14, 1-3) is likewise lacking the pedagogical segment. All 12 key themes are devoted to motion picture art, its evolution. Teacher’s notes to the given syllabus (14, 3-46; 15, 3-83) clearly confirm the conclusion that this program represents the abridged modification of university syllabi for future media professionals.

Compared to the previous programs, the university level special course “Cinema as Means of Training and Education” developed by S.Penzin (12) has a clear media education dimension. Much attention is given to the theory of screen art and strategies for its use in educational process. Five out of total nine units of a special course are focused on problems of media education (the importance of media culture in the socialization of schoolchildren; educational, aesthetic, ethical functions of the screen; psychological attributes of audiovisual perception; integrated film education; practical exploration of media production and educational methods to teach media).

Professor S.Penzin’s thematic approach in designing media education curriculum is worthy of note. For example, the program “Cinema and School” (10),

developed by him in 1998, is devoted to the representation of school and schoolchildren in screen media. And the course “Cinema and the Person” (9) addresses psychological aspects of screen arts. The course tackles the ways a film reflects processes of the development of a person, psychopathology, moral challenges, family, etc.

The university level curriculum “Introduction to Film Pedagogy. Basics of Film Literacy” developed by G.Polichko (16, 1-23) is based on the earlier special course “Basics of Cinema Knowledge” (17). The program is centered around the key concepts of the theory of a film-image: structure of a film representation (image, word, actor, sound environment), installation as a principle of film-thinking, a director as an author of a film-image, plus such units as technical equipment, types and genres of cinema, problems of an audience and film education (16, 4). Moreover, the course aims to reflect with participants on the connection and distinction of cinema, painting, literature, theatre and music. G.Polichko does not include in his program the history of motion picture art, however, paid special attention to problems of an artistic image, kinds and genres, the language of a motion picture.

The unit *Cinema and Education* (16, 21) raises awareness of the importance of film education, introduces concepts “educational cinema and TV”, “audiovisual literacy”, “film education” and their definitions by Russian and foreign researchers, sample teaching materials and strategies for integration of film education in schools and universities, including after-school programs. This course has been introduced into the curriculum of the two- year Higher Courses of Film Education in Moscow in 1992-1994.

At the turn of the century a new attempt of designing a university curriculum on media education was undertaken by V.Vozchikov (3, 224-246). He introduces the program with a rationale for the necessity of media education, justly stating “the contradiction between organic, natural aspiration of students to dialogue with media (absence of necessary knowledge and experience) and insufficient preparedness of teachers to support the practical fulfillment of students’ intentions (lack of special knowledge), insert school media education at high theoretical and practical levels. That is why it is necessary to offer training in media education for future teachers” (3, 225). However, the syllabus of the course “Media education” (3, 228-229) displays a strong shift to press material. On the whole, the program reminds an adapted, simplified version of the standard curriculum for students of journalism departments.

Good examples of solid courses on media education are those developed by Y.Usov (19) and A.Sharikov (24). They cover the main directions of media education and offer intensive study in different media.

At the turn of the XXI century Russian media educators picked up the pace and more media education programs for universities have appeared: in 2001 the first program on a foreign material (“Media education in the USA”, intended for students of pedagogical universities by A.Novikova (6); in 2002- a course program on the history of media education in Russia by I.Chelysheva (23, 226-233) were published. The latter course also covers theoretical and methodical concepts of Russian media education, focusing on the experience of the leading Russian media educators (L.Bazhenova, O.Baranov, E.Bondarenko, L.Zaznobina, V.Monastyrsky, S.Penzin,

G.Polichko, L.Pressman, J.Rabinovich, A.Spichkin, J.Usov, A.Sharikov, E..Jastrebtseva, etc.).

Today there is a wide range of media education programs for pedagogical universities, covering all spectrum of the development of students' media literacy– from media culture history and media theories up to history of media education and hands-on strategies for teaching media in school, still more important within the framework of new Russian universities specialization 03.13.30 “Media Education” (21).

### *Media education curricula:*

1. **Vlasov M.P.** (1972). Educational-methodical Development of the Course “History of Cinema in the USSR”. (in Russian). Moscow: VGIK, 11 p.
2. **Voschikov V.A.** (2001). Introduction to Media Education. In: Voschikov V.A. Sight. Vol.2. Theoretical and Methodical Problems of Pedagogical Education. (in Russian). - Biisk: Biisk Pedagogical University, pp.162-223.
3. **Voschikov V.A.** (2001). Media Education in Pedagogical University. In: Voschikov V.A. Sight. Vol.2. Theoretical and Methodical Problems of Pedagogical Education. (in Russian). Biisk: Biisk Pedagogical University, pp.224-246.
4. **Gorbulina E.V.** (1984). Basics of Film art. In: Curricula for Pedagogical Institutes (in Russian). Moscow: Education, pp.196-223.
5. **Nechai O.F.** (1989). Basics of Film art: Manual for Students of Pedagogical Institutes. (in Russian). Moscow: Education, 288 p.
6. **Novikova A.A.** (2001). Media Education in the USA. Course Syllabus for Students of Pedagogical Universities. Taganrog: Kuchma, 24 p.
7. **Odintsova S.M.** (1983). Film Education in Pedagogical Institute. In: Problems of Modern Film Education. (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Association for Film Education, pp.113-115.
8. **Penzin S.N.** (2001). The Journey through American Cinema (in Russian). Voronezh: Film & Video Center, 84 p.
9. **Penzin S.N.** (1998). Cinema and the Person. The Thematic Plan of a Special Course for Psychology Department. (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University.
10. **Penzin S.N.** (1998). Cinema and School. The Syllabus of an Elective Course. (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University.
11. **Penzin S.N.** (1987). Cinema and Aesthetic Education: Methodological Problems. (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, p. 108.
12. **Penzin S.N.** (1987). Cinema as Means of Training and Education. (in Russian). A Syllabus for History Departments. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 4 p.
13. **Penzin S.N.** (1973). Cinema as Means of Training and Education. (in Russian). A Syllabus for History Departments. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 4 p.
14. **Penzin S.N.** (2001). The Basics of Film Art. Teacher's Handbook. (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 46 p.
15. **Penzin S.N.** (2000). The Basics of Film Art. (in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, p. 3.
16. **Polichko G.A.** (1990). Introduction to Film Education. Basics of Cinema Literacy. (for universities) (in Russian). Moscow: Russian Association for Film Education, 23 p.
17. **Polichko G.A.** (1980). The Basics of Cinema Knowledge” (for Language Arts Departments) (in Russian). Kurgan: Kurgan State Pedagogical Institute, 17 p.
18. **Curricula** for Specializations «TV and Broadcasting» (for the Departments of Journalism). – Moscow: Publishing House of the Moscow State University, 1999.
19. **Usov Y.N.** (1998). Media Education. In: Screen Culture. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, pp.57-59.
20. **Fedorov A.V.** (2001). Media Education: History, Theory and Methods. (in Russian). Rostov: CVVR, 708 p.



21. **Fedorov A.V.** (2003). Media Education in Pedagogical universities. (in Russian). Taganrog: Kuchma, 124 p.
22. **Khallieva R.M.** (1985). History of Arts for Pedagogical Universities. (in Russian). Moscow: Ministry of Education, 178 p.
23. **Chelysheva I.V.** (2002). History and theory of media education in Russia. In: Fedorov A.V., Chelysheva I.V. Media Education in Russia: Brief History of Development. (in Russian). Taganrog: Kuchma, p. 226-233.
24. **Sharikov A.V., Tcherkashin E.A.** (1991). Experimental Curricula for Media Education. (in Russian) . Moscow: Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, 44 p.

## **Media Education in Kurgan (Russia)**

*(in memory of Prof.Dr. Alexander Spichkin)*

Media education in Kurgan (at Kurgan State Pedagogical University, Kurgan State University, Kurgan Institute of Teachers' Professional Development) has firm traditions due to activity of such educators, as July Rabinovich (1918-1990), Alexander Spichkin (1948-2002), Gennady Polichko, Svetlana Odintsova, Natalia Legotina, and many others.

Along with "Moscow school" of Yury Usov (1936-2000) one of the most important places in history of Russian media education is occupied by the so-called "Kurgan school", headed for a long time by professor Yuly Rabinovich (1918-1990). Rabinovich was one of leaders and pioneers of Russian media education. For about thirty years not only he was actively engaged in film education of schoolpupils and students, but also trained the new generation of media educators, many of whom (S.Odintsova, G.Polichko, A.Spichkin, etc.) successfully defended Ph.D. dissertations on media education.

Since 1961 Y.Rabinovich began to introduce media education on a material of screen arts in Kurgan Pedagogical Institute (within the framework of a student film-club, special courses at History and Philology departments). Communicating with students, Y.Rabinovich saw "the declining interest for books, replaced by cinema, TV, and later - pop music". This process disturbed him as the teacher of Language Arts, and he directed his research towards the integration of film studies with literature courses (14, 6). At the beginning of the sixties Y.Rabinovich published a number of articles on the problems of film education. These and other works became a basis for the serious academic research. In 1966 Y.Rabinovich received his Ph.D. degree in Moscow- his dissertation was the first one in Russia on film education (11). "Kurgan school" of film education began to develop.

In early 60s Russian media educators (in Kurgan, Armavir, Tver and other cities) worked as a matter of fact autonomously; were not aware of the experience of the colleagues. "At the beginning, we had to, - writes Y.Rabinovich, - to act as film critics, sociologists, theorists and practitioners" (14, 58). The magazine "Cinema Art" published the open letter to the President of Russian Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. "The President wrote a response. These materials have caused the wide discussion. The magazine provided the space for "the round table" where teachers, education policy makers, and cinematographers participated. (...) Teachers highlighted the question of teaching materials and strategies for film education, (...) made a sound suggestion to offer a course on theory and history of cinema at pedagogical universities» (13, 7-8). To tell the truth, some participants of the round table objected to proposed innovations, justifying their opposition by the overload school and university curricula, and intensive existing courses of literature.

Y.Rabinovich however argued, and persuasively proved, that studying film art does not hamper educational process, but, on the contrary, facilitates it.

In 1971 Y.M.Rabinovich organized a teacher training course in Kurgan Pedagogical Institute. The course covered correlation of literature and cinema (13, 9). The syllabus included such topics as “Cinema as Art”, “Film Genres”, “Expressive Means of Screen Arts”, “Film Representation”, “Screen Plays”, “War Films”, “School Films”, “Children and Educational Films”, “Moral Values in Films”, “Documentary Films”, “Film Education in School”, etc.

Students learnt to analyze films, to write film reviews. Besides the training got within the classroom, they could expand their knowledge, and practice new skills at the film club. Unlike many Russian media educators (I.Levshina, R.Guzman, etc.), Y.Rabinovich believed that film education of students should begin with the history of motion picture arts as “the historical approach is always important while studying any art, and cinema is not an exception” (14, 78). He also argued that studying film classics assists the better understanding of the film language.

As I.Levshina justly notices, there was no other college of education in Russia that constantly and consistently sent teachers of literature to remote rural schools, offered quality film courses and integrated screen art with literature courses” (1, 14).

By the early 70s Y.Rabinovich developed the following principles for future teachers training: 1) introduction to the basics of motion picture arts, the theory of cinema; 2) application of knowledge related to the theory of literature for studying film; 3) development of a technique of the comparative analysis of a film and a literary work; skills to analyse the screen adaptation; development of the students’ interest in reading through their interest in cinema; and so on (13, 13).

“Kurgan school” of film education affected not only schools and higher education institutions, but also the regional Institute of Teachers’ Professional Development. The seminar on film education gathered the audience of 150-200 people annually, and its modules included lectures on the theory and history of motion picture arts, training in methods of film education, and discussion of films. The similar course “Book and Film” was organized in 1983 by the Kurgan Library Society. The syllabus of the course developed by Y.M.Rabinovich included:

- 1) Birth of cinema. Fiction as one of sources of cinema (a theme, a plot, visual imagery, perception);
- 2) The role of the word;
- 3) The word as the basis of literature;
- 4) The word and the image in a modern film, dominating role of a picture;
- 5) Montage in literature and in motion picture;

- 6) The devices of the cinematic representation of “human soul dialectics”, a concealed world of a person;
- 7) Different means of representation of the same objects or events in film and literature;
- 8) Codes of screen adaptation of literature. Creative interpretation of a novel or a story;
- 9) Teaching strategies for using screen adaptations in school literature courses. Types of essays, film reviews;
- 10) Seminars, practical activities, screenings of some significant films based on the Russian classics;
- 11) Screen adaptation as one of means of modern “reading” a well- known literary work;
- 12) Feature films in class and out of class work. Interaction of literature, cinema and TV in aesthetic education of modern students (14, 96-97).

Pedagogical views of Y.Rabinovich reflected the aesthetic theory of media education based on the synthesis of literature and cinema art. Being a practitioner as well as a researcher, he was aware of the serious problems that Russian film education faced: lack of financial and technical resources in schools, shortage of quality audiovisual material, absence of effective support at the national level of the Ministry of Education, inertness of bureaucratic thinking on the part of policy makers, editors of pedagogical publishing houses or magazines, and so on. In the 80s Y.Rabinovich drew a paradoxical (at first sight) conclusion: mass expansion of film education in Kurgan area did not achieve significant results: “recurrence of the same teaching patterns (lecture, quiz, practice, home assignment) proved to be uncreative. Pupils’ enthusiasm about cinema decreased. The elective classes did not develop the culture of the perception of art. Lessons and assignments replaced the development of a deeply emotional relation to film, aspiration to enjoy it as a work of art (14, 101-102). In fact, extensive film education propaganda in Kurgan area resulted in a sad phenomenon- some teachers engaged in film education under pressure, without enthusiasm and love for cinema art. Thus the created effect was similar to literature courses in schools: teachers and pupils started to treat film in classroom as another boring duty...

Moreover, the social and cultural situation in the country has changed dramatically; since the second half of the 80s films (including foreign production) were no longer deficit. Television, video, Internet delivered households streams of various screen production. The most active part of the audience- schoolpupils and students appeared to be oversaturated with the audiovisual information. Russian media education called for the revision of many firm methodological and methodical approaches.

The most influential representatives of Kurgan school film education, besides Y.Rabinovich are S.Odintsova – professor of Kurgan State Pedagogical

University; G.Polichko - the leader of the Russian Association for Film & Media Education and A.Spichkin - professor of Kurgan Institute for Teachers' Professional Development.

S.M.Odintsova received her Ph.D. degree in 1981, after defending her dissertation "The film analysis as one of improvement factors in education of students - philologists in pedagogical institutes". She successfully developed Rabinovich's ideas of the synthesis of literature and film education. She gives special attention to the problem of the film language knowledge of which "is necessary for a dialogue with the film text since the author's concept of the world and the person is embodied in a film-image that consists of the interacting and tied components: changing camera angles, drama action, the moving image, music and sound, word and speech of the characters, light and color tonality, the rhythm of a single shot and the montage of the whole film" (3, 51). I agree with S.Odintsova's opinion that "the analysis of a film develops a personality and influences the nature of a dialogue with a work of art. It is very important for an audience (...) that the analysis of a film connects and develops figurative and verbal thinking. The film analysis requires and develops imagination because it demands a reconstruction of film image in its tangible sensual form. (...) As for the methodological approach to the analysis of a film we share the opinion of those researchers who consider that the only true principle is the complete analysis of a film - in unity of the form and the content" (3, 52). The moral - aesthetic dimension of S.Odintsova's approach, characteristic of Russian media educators, distinctly stands out: "A modern teacher, - she writes in her article "Film education in a pedagogical institute", - is the defender of moral and aesthetic values. He should resist a powerful stream of pseudo-culture, be open-minded to the new in life and art, clearly differentiate between the good and the bad, the beauty and the ugliness; should contribute to the spiritual revival of the society « (4, 113).

Another distinguished student of Y.Rabinovich, G.Polichko also continuously developed ideas of integrating literature and the basics of motion picture arts in educational process of school and university. He received the Ph.D. degree in 1987 with the dissertation on "Crosscurricula connections of a Literature course and an elective on film education as means of the aesthetic development of senior pupils". Being a teacher and then the principle in a Kurgan school, G.A.Polichko ran one of the Kurgan film clubs for a number of years. In 1988 he was elected the Secretary of Russian Association for Film and Media Education and moved to Moscow. There he created a firm *Viking* (at the end of the 80s) which invested a significant share of its income to various media education projects (conferences, seminars, publications, the Moscow film lyceum, etc.).

One of G.Polichko's successful projects of the time was setting up the two- year Advanced Film Education Course for Teachers. Unfortunately, in the

middle of the 90s the firm *Viking* went bankrupt; subsequently the funding for the film education teachers' courses, conferences and seminars was significantly reduced, many projects were closed.

In his early works G.Polichko used to be a proponent of the system of training traditional for Russian film pedagogy and education, namely, working with art films only. As well as in Y.Rabinovich's works, in G.A.Polichko's programs we can see the clear aesthetical focus of media education. Comparing Russian and foreign media education tradition, G.Polichko wrote that communication with foreign colleagues has shown, "that it is exactly on this borderline - the presence or the absence of art substance in a media text – that a watershed between the western and our concepts of film education is. We begin from the point where our foreign colleagues stop, - approaching aesthetic, evaluating dialogue of the art content of a film text. The language of cinema and the analysis of how this text is constructed, for Russian film education is only the first step to its perception, then the main thing begins (...) – communication about art. Western (in particular British) system of film education is aimed at different thing. As our English colleague, the film educator from Devon Martin Phillips has said during the seminar in Valuevo, "the evaluation of a film is not a pedagogical problem, it is a problem of an individual choice of a person" (...) At the basis of film education of our English colleagues is the concept of a free personality, which foundation is the full sovereignty of an inner life; and any dialogue concerning the evaluation of the content of a text, especially art, is an intrusion into the private world of a person, an attempt to impose the "right" interpretation of a media text on him/her" (6, 17).

I would like to add to these generally true conclusions that American and European media educators did not give up the aesthetical concept of media education at once. In the 60s many of them were also focused on developing the audience's taste for art and to introduce the best examples of cinema. However a different opinion (promoted by its adherent, the British researcher Len Masterman) gradually started to prevail, asserting that the evaluation of a media text's art value is so subjective (and even film experts have contrary judgements sometimes), that education should not deal with problems of "good" or "bad" aesthetic quality of films, as well as, with judging about "good" or "bad" aesthetic tastes.

The influence of Y.Rabinovich school can be seen in works of other Kurgan teachers. I.Zhukova designed the university special course «The Silver Age of the Russian poetry» (10, 32-34) integrating film clips. V.Olejnik integrates film education into the course of *World Literature of the XX century* at the pedagogical university (10, 34-36).

However the most consecutive supporter of modern models of media education, undoubtedly, became Professor Alexander Spichkin (1948-2002). He

got interested in film education while studying in Kurgan Pedagogical Institute, which he graduated from in 1970. After the graduation he continued working in the sphere of his academic interests and in 1986 was awarded the Ph.D. degree. It was he who persuasively rationalized the reasons of fostering the aesthetic approach in Russian film education. He criticized the tendency of many Russian teachers (including Y.Rabinovich) to use in classrooms only art house films, or film classics.

“Film education, - A.Spichkin marked, - was usually part of the general structure of curriculum aimed at the aesthetic development, including other subjects such as Music, Literature, Fine Arts and sometimes (though less often) Drama. The aesthetic approach was, as a matter of fact, the most rewarding under existing conditions because the aesthetic sphere was one of few spheres where, despite of rigid censorship, there was quite substantial degree of intellectual freedom. However very soon some contradictions of the aesthetic approach also came to light. The result was that film education was basically focused on studying film “masterpieces”, (...) and on the expert taste; “introduction to the best samples of world motion picture arts” stepped to the foreground as one of the main aims of film education. In practice this phenomenon reflects in a bit different form (relevant to education) the existence of “scissors” between critical judgments of film experts and mass “bad” taste; interests and aesthetic preferences of students become less important for a teacher than his/her own preferences and an “expert” assessment. (...) Mass media and various forms of mass culture were frequently seen as a threat, as some form of inevitable evil, destroying aesthetic tastes of children and teenagers, distracting them from the “high art” (17, 15).

Having briefly outlined forms and ways of the organization of media education abroad, A.Spichkin reasonably believed that with all the distinctions it is possible to find similarities in theoretical and practical approaches. The significant place in western media education is occupied by “the approach to media texts as to a sign system. Thus the aesthetic quality of a text is as though moved outside the brackets, and the central attention is given to the nature of the audiences’ perception, ways of nonverbal communication of the information in two basic kinds: nonverbal signals (gestures, facial expression, plastique, expressiveness of speech, intonation), and the nonverbal signals transmitted through technical devices (a camera angle, type of a shot, lightening and colour, composition, camera movement, montage)” (17, 17). In opinion of A.Spichkin, studying these signs develops the audiovisual literacy, which in its turn can form a basis for the advanced aesthetic perception. “Thus, rethinking film education in the context of media education does not mean, that the aesthetic approach, traditional for Russia should be rejected as something out-of-date. It is however necessary to recognize that as any other approach to film education

it has some limitations, and that various approaches do not cancel out, but enhance each other « (17, 17-18).

Another important direction in media education according to A.Spichkin is the role and nature of functioning of media in society, development of critical thinking applied to any media text. “The attitude to media education to some extent can serve as an indicator of democratic changes in the country because the transition from passive consumption to the critical analysis of media and, hence, to an active civic stand depends on (...) the understanding of the role of mass media in society” (17, 19).

In 1999 A.Spichkin published the handbook for teachers (21) in which he developed the ideas of his previous works. The book covered the content, the structure and teaching techniques of media education, its integration with the curriculum (within the courses of Fine Arts and Drama, Literature and World Art Culture, social studies).

Having paid attention to the instability and variability of the basic terminology in modern media education, A.Spichkin drew a conclusion that media may be defined as:

- “Technical means of creation and communication of the information (the technological approach);
  - The way of rendition of traditional arts (the aesthetic approach);
  - The way of communication, combining various sign systems (the communicative approach);
  - Means of the critical perception of information about the events in political and social life (the social approach);
  - Teaching and learning material, encouraging the development of the associative, figurative, visual thinking (cognitive approach);
  - The method of the development of creative skills (the creative approach)
- « (21, 6-7).

The analysis of foreign and Russian curricula and handbooks let A.Spichkinu (21, 7-8) distinguish some core units of media education:

- communication of the information in society (concept of communication, sign systems and ways of representation of the information, history of mass media, mass communication and its rules);
- the structure of mass communication (studying of separate types of media and their specific features);
- social functioning of media (control over mass information, media economics, perception of mass information and its influence).

The content of these key units includes:

- the development pupils’ knowledge and understanding of history, structure and the theory of media;
- the development of skills of perception of the information contained in media texts;



- the development of applied creative skills related to media.

British media educators (C.Bazalgette, A.Hart, etc.) agree on a more laconic description of these units (key concepts and signpost questions): “*agencies* (who is communicating a media message and why?), *categories* (what type of text is it?), *technologies* (how is it produced?), *languages* (how do we know what it means?), *audiences* (“who receives it and and what sense do they make from it?”), and *representations* ( how does it present its subject?”) (22, 32). As we see these key concepts may be applied not only to “high art”, but to *any* media text, therefore are universal.

Reflecting on the development of media education in the modern world, A.Spichkin tried to put together a “model” media education curriculum. “In many countries there is a special subject, its name structure may vary, but the content is almost the same. The subject matter are the media. (...) In Russia due to the regular growth of prices on books and periodicals, television becomes not only the the most popular, but frequently the only mass medium which is accessible for teenagers and is an integral part of their daily life. Therefore television can be considered as a nucleus in construction of the autonomous media education system (...). The media studies curriculum should include the following basic units:

- 1) An outline of the history of television. TV and other mass media. Television characteristics – improvisation, documentation, intimacy. Efficiency of the television information, its visual power. The spectator as an eyewitness of events;
- 2) A person on the television screen (gestures, facial expressions, plasticity, expressiveness of speech, intonation and its role; anchor, reporter, etc.);
- 3) The world through the television screen (a television camera: a mirror or a filter?; the language of the television camera: a camera angle, a shot, composition, light exposure and color; movement, montage);
- 4) Television program as complex verbal and visual influence on a spectator (types of television programs, programming);
- 5) Television genres (sitcoms, television series, soap operas, documentary programs, news coverage, educational programs, talk shows, game shows, nature programs, sport programs, advertising, etc.);
- 6) Television production: from a script to broadcast (“behind the camera” occupations: a script writer, an editor, a director, an assistant director, a producer, a cameraman, a sound producer, etc.);
- 7) TV and other media – fine art, literature, music, theatre, cinema. Types of television interpretations of traditional arts” (21, 8-11).

At the same time, A.Spichkin pointed out the disadvantages of media studies as an autonomous subject, namely the inadequate qualification of a teacher, and consequently, the risk of a superficial treatment of the subject. His concerns were that if a teacher does not possess a profound and extensive

knowledge in the field of TV, and does not believe in practical benefit of such course for his/her pupils, then maybe it is not worthy to teach it in his/her class.

The second model of media education proposed by A.Spichkin is media education across the school curriculum, integrated into traditional disciplines, such as Literature, Art, History, Geography, and other subjects. “As against an autonomous approach, the integrated model in the first place presupposes not so much studying media, how much the products of media - media texts.” (21, 13). Yet there is a danger that teachers may reduce media education to the role of media as “teaching aids”, teaching *with* and not *about* media, thus neglecting studying of the key media education concepts (agencies, categories, technologies, languages, audiences, representations).

For all these reasons, A.V.Spichkin offered his model of the “aspect” structure of media education:

- type of coding: verbal / nonverbal; visual / audio/combined;
- type of a text: narration, description, analysis;
- type of an audience: age /gender/social position/ educational level;
- type of values: aesthetic /moral/religious/political;
- social functions of the media text: entertainment/ information/ education/ propaganda (21, 21-24).

A.Spichkin argued that “the aspect approach can be applied to the autonomous model of media education as the pattern of the content arrangement. However its advantages are more obvious in teaching media across the curriculum” (21, 25).

Reasonably believing that efficient media education is only possible with the development of the audiovisual literacy (e.g. skills to decode media texts) of school students, in his book A.Spichkin suggested a number of practical, game activities aimed at the development of skills to see / listen and describe elements of visual and audiovisual texts, to interpret media texts, and to apply the new knowledge and skills to create own media texts (21, 28-34).

Further A.Spichkin described an innovating technique of integration media education into the courses of Art (use of “a shot frame”, montage exercises, “Kuleshov's Effect”, “Comic strip”, “Film Poster”, “Collage”, etc.), Literature (creating a soundtrack for the literary text, a slide-film on a poem, comparing the original book and its screen adaptations, storyboarding, writing a short script, etc.), Drama, World Art Culture, Social Studies.

As far as the Social Studies are concerned, A.Spichkin thought that the significant part of the media education component of the curriculum should be dedicated to the television news coverage analysis, using the following guiding questions:

- 1) What stories frequently become news and what are excluded?
- 2) Why an item is selected for the newscast?
- 3) Who decides what items to include?

- 4) How are the news presented?  
 5) Are newscasts important for the society? (21, 64).

Activities on newspapers include:

- making a radio news coverage based on newspaper articles;
- analysis of several editorial articles printed within a week, separating facts and opinions;
- reading several editorials to define the balance of opinions (What issues does the newspaper support? What issues does it neglect or argues with?);
- evaluating articles using the criteria of balanced reporting (21, 64).

A.Spichkin had many other ideas for media education, but very sadly, a sever illness took away his career and life in 2002...

The experience of Kurgan “media education school” seems quite successful and useful for Russian education. For its forty years of existence Kurgan school has proved - both in theory, and in practice, - that film education and media education on the whole, is an effective means of the development of creative abilities, critical thinking, aesthetic perception of a person.

### **References**

1. **Levshina I.** Who is the Film Audience? *Sov.Ecran.* 1978. № 13, p.14.
2. **Odintsova S.** *Analysis of a Film as one of Factors of the Improvement of Students' Training in Pedagogical Institutes:* Ph.D. Dissertation. Moscow, 1981. 199 p.
3. **Odintsova S.** The Dialogue of Literature and Cinema in Educational Process. In: *Problems of Film Education in High School and University.* Kurgan: Publishing House of the Kurgan Pedagogical University, 1997, p.50-60.
4. **Odintsova S.** Film Education in a Pedagogical Institute. In: *Problems of Modern Film Education.* Moscow: Publishing House of Association for Film Education of the Russian Federation, 1993, p.113-116.
5. **Polichko G.** Was there a word in the beginning?... *Film Art.* 1984. № 4, p.42-47.
6. **Polichko G.** Film Education: Rational... *Specialist.* 1993. № 1, p.16-17.
7. **Polichko G.** *Integration of the Course of Literature and Film Studies as Means of the Aesthetic Development of Senior pupils:* Ph.D. Dissertation. Moscow, 1987. 199 p.
8. **Polichko G.** *Course Syllabus. Introduction to Film Education. Basics of Film Literacy* (For universities). Moscow: Publishing House of the Russian Association for Film Education, 1990, 23 p.
9. **Polichko G.** *Experimental Curriculum for Schools “Literature and cinema”:* For 8-10 grades of secondary school. Moscow: The Ministry of Education, 1978. 88 p.
10. **Odintsova, S.** (Ed.). *Problems of Film Education in School and Univerisity.* Kurgan: Publishing house of Kurgan University, 1997. 64 p.
11. **Rabinovich J.** *Interaction of Literature and Cinema in the Aesthetic Education of Senior Pupils:* Ph.D. Dissertation. Moscow, 1966. .
12. **Rabinovich J.** There is Time. *Film Art.* 1964. N 10.
13. **Rabinovich J.** Foundations: To Prepare the Teacher. In: *Problems of Film Education in School and Univerisity.* Kurgan: Publishing House of Kurgan University, 1997, p.5-13.
14. **Rabinovich J.** *Cinema, Literature and my Life.* Kurgan: Periodics, 1991. 120 p.
15. **Rabinovich J.** After-school Film Club. In: *Art Films in School.* M.: Education, 1964. Vol.2. p. 28-41.
16. **Svobodin A.** From Cards to Discoveries. *Sov.Ecran.* 1962. № 14, p.5.
17. **Spichkin A.** State, Mass Media and Education. In: *Problems of Film Education in School and Univerisity.* Kurgan: Publishing House of Kurgan University, 1997, p.50-60.

18. **Spichkin A.** Mass Culture and Key Problems of Film Education. In: *Problems of Modern Film Education*. Moscow: Publishing House of Association for Film Education of the Russian Federation, 1993, p.85-87.
19. **Spichkin A.** Media and Drama in Culture of Pupils. *Specialist*. 1993. № 5, p.19-20.
20. **Spichkin A.** Content of Media Education: Subject and Aspect Approaches. In: *Science and Education of Zauralye*. 1999. № 3-4, p 121-124.
21. **Spichkin A.** *What is Media Education?* Kurgan: Publishing House Kurgan Institute of Teachers' Professional Development, 1999. 114 p.
22. **Hart A., Hicks, A.** (2002). *Teaching Media in the English Curriculum. Stroke on Trent*, UK: Trentham Books, p.32.
23. **Fedorov A.** *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. Rostov, 2001. 708 p.

## Film Education by S.Penzin

Dr. Stal Penzin has devoted about three decades of his life to film education. He was born in the family of the known Voronezh artist in 1932. After graduating from university (1955) he continued the post-graduate studies in the Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK). He defended the Ph.D. thesis in 1968 and worked in Voronezh State University, Voronezh Institute of Arts and in Voronezh Pedagogical Institute. Still in the 60s he organized a youth film club, and very soon joined the recognized leaders of film education movement in Russia.

Quite naturally Dr.Penzin's pedagogical views changed over the time. The influence of ideological clichés, traditional for the communist epoch could be found in his early books written in the 70s. However later he refused the ideological influence and became an active advocate of film education based on *art house*. "The only way to enter the world of the serious, genuine cinema is to love it - wrote S.Penzin. - But one can only love something real, something familiar. (...) Therefore it is necessary to help students to get to know good films. Those who will grow fond of it, will seek to see more good films, will be interested to learn about their authors, the history of cinema" (6, p. 4).

S.Penzin accumulated his theoretic knowledge and practical film education experience in the text of his monograph "Cinema as a Tool of Education of Youth" (1973), where he asserted that "cinema is a valuable instrument for a teacher not only as one of the best tools of a snapshot and representation of reality, but also as a way to develop understanding of it" (1, p.8), comprehension of the historical development of the world and human consciousness. "The primary factor uniting aims of education and cinema, - wrote S.Penzin, - is the common recipient - personality" (1, p.8), but "the teacher should be careful about self righteous assertion, not to find himself in the position of a "boss", while it is necessary to provide a free space for independent activity of students" (1, p. 19).

In the curriculum of his film course S.Penzin included such themes, as "The process of film creation", "Cinema classification", "Expressive means of cinematograph", "Cinema in education" (2, p.2-4).

However neither the course syllabus nor the monograph contained a coherent and comprehensive system of film education at higher education level. He occasionally expressed severe criticism of entertainment films, so popular with young audiences: "a teacher should encourage students' negative attitude to such film production, declare war and fight to the end") (1, p.70).

S.Penzin considered a students' film club as an effective form of media education in secondary schools and universities. Ideally it should involve producers (film screenings, film festivals, exhibitions, conferences with the director and film crew, field trips, etc.); film critics (newspapers, film reviews, correspondence with film directors and actors, lectures, conversations, museum of cinema, conferences, discussions of films; film-sociologists (surveys, tests); film/TV studio (production of films/ TV programs) (1, p.143).

Soon S.Penzin published his second book, "Cinema – is the educator of youth" that, as a matter of fact, was a concise, clearly written reference book and told pupils

or students about the types, genres and the language of screen arts, “the tenth muse” core terminology. “Our conversations about cinema, - wrote S.Penzin, - try to convince without enforcement. Select any letter, any term depending on your mood. Our objective is not to cover all problems, but to teach how to learn the basics of film art” (3, p.6).

In 1984 S.Penzin offered the readers another monograph- “Cinema in the System of Arts: a Problem of the Author and the Character”, that touched upon the concepts “the author's film world”, “synthetic nature of the film art”, “art and a person”, and others at a more complex level. As a passionate proponent of the *auteur theory*, S.Penzin believed that film education should be based on films by A.Tarkovsky, F.Fellini or I.Bergman. The monograph belonged to Film Studies rather than field of Education. Yet the book “Lessons of Cinema”, published two years later was directly aimed at teachers and parents and explained how films about childhood and youth can help in the difficult process of education.

The arrangement of content of the book was captivating. S.Penzin used contemporary Russian films for youth (“Hundred Days after Childhood”, “Lifeguard”, “Guys”) as “case studies” and convincingly proved that “film authors are the teachers, they teach lessons - lessons of cinema» (5, p.64). Stal Penzin brought readers’ attention to the fact that almost all serious directors one way or another address the theme of childhood in their works– “the morning of life”, as artists feel the strong necessity to return to the starting place of developing the world outlook, to compare the world of one’s own childhood to the world of a new generation, thus assisting the socialization of young people. “Sooner or later a teenager faces a free choice, with neither caring parents nor teachers nearby. Art prepares a person for self-reliant actions.” (5, p.65)

Professor Penzin did not reduce the potential of cinema to education only. He attracted the attention of his readers to other functions of the screen (cognitive, aesthetic, communicative, game etc.). The target audience of the book was not only those who teach, but also those who learn. S.Penzin hoped that a teenager after having read “Lessons of Cinema”, would reflect on life and cinema, would remember that cinema is not only entertaining films about cowboys and spies, pretty girls and comics. They would be aware that there is also the auteur’s world with an open and sincere conversation about history and modern life, difficult fates and interesting personalities. As before S.Penzin was sure that film education should be built on the best examples and film studies should make a wall between “bad films” and the audience

S.Penzin’s pedagogical vision is reflected in his book “Cinema and Aesthetic Education: Methodological Problems” (1987). This was perhaps the first book in Russian academic literature that analyzed the subject, aim and objectives, principles and methods, film education curriculum, organization of a film club. He wrote: “Not everyone recognizes the necessity of film education, the reasons of the opponents being usually one or all of the following: 1. A true work of art is comprehensible for everyone. Therefore a good film does not require any “intermediaries”, anyone can understand it. 2. There is enough film advertising and promotion. 3. A person who studies literature in school will automatically be literate in cinema. 4. Cinema is not a

“true” art yet: its history is not so long, there is no “classical works” which value is proved by centuries, like masterpieces of literature, theatre, and painting. 5. The results of Literature studies do not correspond to the efforts spent; there is no point in repeating this sad experience with another medium. 6. Today there are no conditions (teachers, film libraries, etc.) for introduction of film education at schools and universities. 7. Art creativity belongs to emotional sphere, and knowledge to rational one. The less a person knows about art, the better he is as a viewer- recipient. The conclusion is clear: film education is harmful, not beneficial” (6, p. 31). Further in the book, S.Penzin consistently refuted all of the above arguments and proved that film education is, in the first place, one of the directions of aesthetic education. The subject matter of film education is interpreted as the system of knowledge and skills necessary for the quality perception of screen art, development of audience’s culture, creative abilities (6, p.43).

S.Penzin anticipated the questions that are likely to be asked about film education (6, p. 44): film education – what is it for? To develop the course participants’ knowledge about films? Or to develop audience’s abilities and critical thinking? Should the curriculum include the theory and history of cinema? Or should it be centered on the distinguished works of film art? Last but not least, what should the teaching strategies be? Same as in Film Departments or different?

In Stal Penzin’s opinion, depending on the way a teacher answers these questions, it is possible to divide film education in Russia in two directions “extensive” (covering art culture on the whole, where Film Studies occupy the same volume of space in the curriculum as, for example, Literature) and “intensive” (specifically focused on film and therefore resembling an abridged course of Film Studies for future professionals in media field). Yet S.Penzin emphasized again that film education is part of the aesthetic development of a person, therefore should develop aesthetic feelings, ideals, and viewpoints. “Even the “intensive” film education should not be “narrow” and be reduced to teaching visual literacy; classes should embrace film aesthetics with ethics” (6, p.45).

As stated by S.Penzin, the content of film education should include: “a) the basics of aesthetics, film history and theory, any pictures to develop the quality aesthetic perception of any film; b) the information on main areas of application of theoretical knowledge; c) information on challenging problems in the subject matter; d) assignments that develop students’ skills to analyze film texts” (6, p.46). In this case the immediate objective of film education is to “encourage the aesthetic perception of films”. And the long- term objective is “the development of the personality through film art” (6, p.46). Consequently, a person should have the following general aesthetic qualities (good aesthetic taste; unbiased perception of media; abstract thinking; acknowledgement of cinema as Art, not a mirror reflection of life; awareness of the importance of film education) and special ones (demand for serious art house films, ability to select and understand films, interest in the history of cinema, etc.) (6, p. 46-47).

Further the aim of film education was specified in objectives: 1) *education*, i.e. knowledge development (resulting in the awareness of the importance of film studies; skills to analyze all the elements of a film, to interpret a film message; being

selective about the choice of a film to watch); 2) *learning*, i.e. critical thinking development, etc.; 3) *personal growth*, resulting in the development of such qualities, as good aesthetic taste, desire to communicate with “serious works of art” (6, p. 47-48). According to S.Penzin the development of the latter can and should be fostered through the pre-viewing activities, after-viewing explanations, creative projects, club activities.

Essentially many of the above aims and objectives seem to be disputable especially for media educators in other countries. For example, Len Masterman, as it is well known, absolutely rejects the possibility of the development of aesthetic taste at media lessons, as well as the separation of films into “good” and “bad”, considering that it is virtually impossible to prove to the pupils/students the high or low quality of a film.

Yet S.Penzin is a committed supporter not only of the “aesthetic approach” in media education, but also ethical. “Film education cannot be brought down to specific - aesthetic and film studies objectives, a viewer should be, first of all, a Person, an ethical person (“homo eticus”) (6, p.47). For these reasons, Professor Penzin distinguishes between the following levels of aesthetic culture of a person: 1) high, or optimal, characterized by a wide art erudition, advanced abilities and interests, fundamental knowledge; 2) average, which is characterized by the unbalanced development of main components of the previous level; 3) low: aesthetic illiteracy (6, p. 77).

Adapting traditional didactic tenets, S.Penzin chose the following principles of education: 1) education and all-round development in the learning process; 2) scientific character and intelligibility of teaching; 3) systematic character and link of the theory with practice; 4) active learning; 5) visual expression; 6) transition from education to self- education; 7) connection of learning to life; 8) lasting knowledge; 9) positive emotional background, recognizing interests and characteristics of a class and an individual (6, p. 59). To these nine, S.Penzin added three more principles: 10) film studies as part of the system of arts, 11) the unity of rational and emotional components in aesthetic perception of films; 12) bi-functional aesthetic self-education, when the aesthetic feeling clarifies the ethical (6, p. 71). Consequently teaching the analysis of a film (as a work of art) has three aims. The first one is “the understanding of the author's position, studying everything that is directly connected to the author – the main medium of film aesthetics. The second aim is to comprehend the hero - main medium of an aesthetic beginning. The third task is the junction, synthesis of the previous concepts. (...) All three tasks are indivisible; they arise and demand the solutions simultaneously” (6, p. 56). As for the methods of film education S.Penzin recommended reproductive, heuristic and research methods of teaching and learning.

S.Penzin became one of the first Russian media educators to try to summarize the experience of film education (the analysis of textbooks, curricula, practical approaches) in Russian schools and universities and the film club movement. Being one of the most enthusiastic leaders of film-clubs, S.Penzin considered that the specific feature of a film club is that it performs numerous functions: “the foremost of these interrelated functions are: 1) film education (function: after- school program);



2) propaganda of film art (function: advertising); 3) screening and discussion of “difficult” (art house) films (function: art house film theatre); 4) film reviews (function: film critic); 5) surveys (function: sociologist); 6) communication (function: meeting point and the recreation centre” (6, p.126-127). Taking into account these functions, S.Penzin created several models of film club movement, each focusing on one or several functions – e.g., to provide space for different kinds of audiences, after- school program or a university association of cineastes (6, p.137).

S.Penzin marked the distinction of media education in clubs from media education in school/university: heterogeneity of participants (age, experience, motivation to participate in the club, education, moral values, knowledge in the field of art); and a more specific, compared to schoolpupils, stance of the audience (6, p.135).

S.Penzin met the emergence of video technology with great enthusiasm and took advantage of a rather short interval of time (the end of the 80s – the first half of the 90s), when VCRs did not yet become the common appliance in households of Russia. It was during these years that the audience of video clubs in Russia increased sharply because people wanted to see those films that until then had been banned by the censorship. S.Penzin noted the following benefits for film education: independence from the official film distribution; possibility of recording and non-commercial use of any films, programs or their sequences; using techniques *freeze frame*, *stepframe* and others; video production in school or university; collection of videos (7, p. 95).

Many of S.Penzin’s former students became media educators. For example, Galina Evtushenko is one of his adherents. Having graduated from Voronezh University (1978) she taught in schools, film courses and film clubs. Later she wrote the Ph.D thesis on film education in Moscow Institute of Cinematography (1991) and then taught film education for future professionals. After that she worked as a film director herself. Her very first educational five-minute documentary “I’ve seen you somewhere” got attention of critics and colleagues. Today G.Evtushenko is one of the best known Russian film documentary directors. She is the unique embodiment of successful re- training: from a media teacher to a film director (while the reverse process is more common).

Today S.Penzin continues to teach media education - at Voronezh State University, and Pedagogical University. He is the founder of Voronezh Film and Video Center. S.Penzin developed a number of university curricula (8; 9 etc.) that integrate film education with a major field of study of university students. The contribution of S.Penzin’s pedagogy- both theoretical and practical - is difficult for overestimate. His input in Russian media education is very significant and once again proves that educational innovations are not only the capital’s prerogative.

### References

1. **Penzin, S.** *Cinema as the Tool of Education*. Voronezh, 1973, 152 p.
2. **Penzin, S.** *Screen Art in the Pedagogical University. The Syllabus of the Special course «Cinema as the Training Tool and Education»*. Voronezh, 1973.
3. **Penzin, S.** *Cinema as the Teacher of Youth*. Voronezh, 1975, 128 p.
4. **Penzin, S.** *Cinema in the System of Arts: a Problem of the Author and the Character*. Voronezh, 1984, 188 p.

5. **Penzin, S.** *Lessons of Cinema*. Moscow, 1986, 66 p.
6. **Penzin, S.** *Cinema and Aesthetic Education: Methodological Problems*. Voronezh, 1987, 176 p.
7. **Penzin, S.** My Video is My Friend. In: *Problems of Modern Film Education*. Moscow, 1993, p.93-99.
8. **Penzin, S.** *Cinema and School. The syllabus of an Elective Course*. Voronezh, 1998.
9. **Penzin, S.** *Basics of Film art. The Syllabus of a Special Course*. Voronezh, 2000.

## Media Education Model by Alexander Sharikov

Russian media educator Alexander Sharikov, born in 1951, graduated from the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute and continued postgraduate education in the Russian Academy of Education (his Ph.D. dissertation (1) was defended in 1989). He worked in the academic Laboratory of Screen Arts in the Institute of Art Education and in the Laboratory of Teaching Aids of the Russian Academy of Education, his articles on problems of media and media education were published in Russian, British and French academic journals. He authored several books devoted to media sociology, media education and media culture and a number of course syllabi on media education. Then he supervised the sociological department of the Russian television company (RTR) and conducted several surveys on television preferences of the audience, etc. Now he is...

Perhaps, Alexander Sharikov was the first Russian teacher concerned not only with film and press education, but with the problems of media education on the whole. Fluent in English and French he began to study foreign media education in the second half of the 80s. This research work resulted in the publication “Media Education: International and Russian experience” (2).

In his outline of the main directions of media education Dr. Sharikov explained the reasons of emergence of media education, based on the long standing practice of film education. He noted that the term *media education* became known in the 70s and implied “not only art, culture studies and semantic aspects, but also social, psychological and political features of this phenomenon. It turned out that teaching the language of cinema and learning to appreciate film art without understanding of the whole system of sociocultural relationships in the process of communication was obviously not enough for the development of civil qualities. Media education was envisaged as the way to improve this situation” (2, p. 6). Media education was aimed at preparing the young generation to live in a new information age, be able to interpret different types of information, understand it, “be aware of possible consequences of media’s impact on a person, to learn to communicate on the basis of nonverbal forms of communication with the help of technical devices” (2, p. 6). And the foremost aim of media education became a person’s involvement in mass media system, that is the experience of nonverbal perception, studying the language of media, skills to interpret and evaluate the message, etc. (2, p.10-11).

In the historical outline Alexander Sharikov has shown that many teachers understood media education as “educational technology” – a sort of the traditional course “Technical teaching aids” that has been taught in Russian pedagogical universities for decades. However the focus from teaching and learning *with media* then shifted to *studying media*.

Having analyzed numerous foreign researches, Alexander Sharikov (2, p. 8-10) selected three key concepts of media education: “media literacy” (teaching and learning nonverbal ways of communication, the language of media culture), “information protection” (development of the participants’ critical thinking) and “social – pedagogical” (studying social and political aspects of media influence

including problems of the so-called “cultural discrimination” or “cultural imperialism”). Later Russian researches (7; 8) continued the analysis of key concepts of media education around the world. Yet Dr. Sharikov’s research was actually the first “media education manifesto” in the Russian pedagogical discourse.

The book also covered two main approaches of the implementation of media education in the educational process- integrated (with traditional subjects) and autonomous (a new course, e.g. “Media Culture” either mandatory or elective). He also touched upon the issues of interaction between the teacher and pupils, the changing role of a teacher and characterized the teaching strategies in a media classroom:

- “setting up the free, friendly, trustful atmosphere of psychological comfort;
- inherent use of the polysemic character of the information; rejection of the strictly programmed schemes of classes (principle of improvisation);
- legitimacy of multiple variants of interpretation of the information; the recognition of the equality related to the information and its evaluation of all participants of the class, including a teacher;
- focus on issues related to pupils’ immediate social and cultural environment, their interests and life experience” (2, p.19).

Alexander Sharikov identified the following methods of media education abroad: “deconstruction” (content-analysis) of media texts, creative activity of pupils (collages, posters, slide/video films, radio/ TV broadcasting, school press, etc.), discussions, simulating games and so on (2, p. 19-20).

Recognizing the importance of the critical thinking development, A.Sharikov, nevertheless, is not inclined to consider this process as the central objective of media education. In his opinion, the development of communicative, creative skills of students, the abilities to interpret, create and communicate media messages is no less important (2, p. 46).

In July 1990 during the academic conference on media education in Toulouse Alexander Sharikov surveyed 23 international educators and experts in the fields of media literacy and mass communications. The objectives of survey were to learn the number of experts believing in the connection between media education and the development of media (60 % answered that media education promotes the development of media), to specify the main objectives of media education, to verify the definitions of “critical thinking” and “communicative abilities” (2, p.48).

As for the opinions of the experts about the objectives of media education, they, according to Sharikov’s data, ranged in the priority order as follows: the development of communicative abilities, critical thinking and interpretation, the development of skills “to decode” media texts, to create own media texts, to evaluate media texts, to reflect on media in the system of sociocultural associations. The development of technical skills to use media technology was ranked as the last one (2, p. 50). Reflecting on the conducted survey A.Sharikov came to conclusion that critical thinking in media education context usually stands for the process of the analysis of a media text, which “is aimed at the interpreting the underlying message and results in three options – interpretation of the latent message, its evaluation and expression of one own’s attitude to it. This process is both of individual and creative

nature. Creativity in this case is exhibited through generating new meanings of a message” (2, p. 58). The advantage of the given definition is its universal character thus it may be applied depending on the referent system (i.e. orientation of a teacher towards a particular key concept of media education). If a media educator is predisposed towards teaching social or political aspects of media, the correspondent type of information will be evaluated and interpreted. If a teacher bases his teaching on the aesthetic concept, then the analysis of art aspects of media texts will take place in his/ her classroom. If a teacher is interested in semiotics, then sign systems of a media text will be analyzed. However, Sharikov remarks that disagreement between personal referent systems of a teacher and students may cause problems.

A.Sharikov has also defined the term “media communicative competence”, as “the proficiency in perception, creation and communication of message through technical and semiotic systems taking into account their limitations, based on critical thinking, and also on the ability to media dialogue with other people” (2, p. 64).

The book “Media Education: International and Russian experience” also included a brief historical and pedagogical outline of the development of media education in Russia. A.Sharikov proved the legitimacy of Russian media education in the context of interrelations between education and culture. “There are two main functions of education related to culture. The first function is to maintain culture with the help of the mechanism of reproduction of culture at individual level. In other words culture can only be preserved through education. Without education, culture runs the risk of being destroyed. I will call this function of education as “reproductive”. The second function is that education is an essential prerequisite for the development of culture. In other words education provides that foundation for the development of culture. I will label this function as “productive”. The latter function is connected, first of all, to the creative structures of human activity. So, education in a broad sense is the condition, both for maintaining, and advancing culture. (...) If one accepts such point of view, then media education is a prerequisite of both maintaining, and developing media culture» (2, p. 25-26).

Besides A.Sharikov drew the attention of readers that any new emerging mass medium gives rise to a corresponding field of education: first, at the level of professional training, and then - in secondary schools and departments of education. Thus, as Sharikov emphasized, it is the professionals in media sphere (film critics, journalists etc.), sensing problems of the dialogue between an author of a media text and audience, tend to share their knowledge with students and teachers.

Further A.Sharikov conventionally divided media education in Russia in two main directions: education on the material of newspapers, magazines and radio (“journalistic” direction) and education on the material of cinematograph (“aesthetic” direction) and described landmarks in the development of these directions from the 1920s to the 1980s pointing out their dramatic dependence on Marxist ideology (2, p. 29-38).

In 1991 A.Sharikov (together with T.Stroganova) compiled the bibliographic catalogue of books and theses on media education (4). The other collaborative work (with E.Cherkashin) resulted in the publication of an experimental media education curriculum prototype for school pupils (6).

Alexander Sharikov highlighted a number of problems connected to the intensive development of media in Russia (media as a “parallel school”, media and the system of traditional education, the necessity of “protection” of children from negative influence of media in an information society. In particular, he emphasized a serious problem of media influence on the development of values and norms of behaviour of children and teenagers. “While in totalitarian period this problem was solved by censorship control, that is by limitation of the accessible information, now its solution is impossible without the development of a referent system of values and critical attitude to media messages” (6, p.1-2).

In 1991 A.Sharikov elaborated an experimental syllabus of the course “Mass Communications” (6, p.5-25) for secondary schools. It included the following issues:

- main concepts and laws of the communication theory
- semiotic systems, their structure and properties;
- perception and interpretation of messages based on the development of skills of analysis, interpretation, evaluation and expression of own attitude;
- mass media (structural, functional, social and other aspects) (6, 6).

It was stressed that the above-stated issues should preferably be introduced not only through lectures, but mainly through hands-on activities, where pupils could be involved in creative work related to different types of media - print press, cinematograph, photo, sound recording, television, computer communications, etc.

The second experimental syllabus by Sharikov and Cherkashin, “Mass Media and Education” (for classes with pedagogical emphasis, i.e. in special schools whose graduates as a rule enter university Departments of Education) (6, p.26-36) is constructed by the similar pattern. However a significant place is given to matters of teaching methods of media education. Recommended activities included: production of model dustcovers for children's books, photo montage, slide/video films, audio recordings (radio programs, educational programs etc.), school papers, television programs, holding seminars, discussions related to media texts analysis and more. (6, p.29). These activities were supposed to result in the development of skills of perception, understanding, evaluation, interpretation of various media texts, and the development of communicative abilities of pupils.

In the second half of the 90s Alexander Sharikov changed the sphere of his academic interests due to another job position. He became the supervisor of the sociology office of the Russian television and radio company RTR (Moscow). His research during those years was centered on the influences of television on society and the problems of monitoring. The data of the research included also TV-preferences of children and youth.

Currently Dr. Alexander Sharikov is the Professor of the State University *Higher School of Economics*, Department of Media Management and Media Business (Moscow) and the Head of the Laboratory for Media Sociology in Samara.

### **References**

1. **Sharikov, A.** *Age Peculiarities of Television Preferences of Schoolpupils*. Ph.D. thesis. Moscow, 1989.
2. **Sharikov, A.** *Media Education: International and Russian Experience*. Moscow. Academy of Education, 1990, 66 p.

3. **Sharikov, A.** *Rhythms of an Urban Television Audience*. Moscow, VGTRK, 1997.
4. **Sharikov, A. Stroganova, T. A.** *Content, Forms and Methods of Media Education in the USSR (Bibliographic Catalogue)*. Moscow, Academy of Education, 1991, 92 p.
5. **Tsimbalenko, S., Sharikov, A. Scheglova, S.** *Russian Teenagers in the Information World*. Moscow, UNPRESS, 1998, 47 p.
6. **Sharikov, A., Cherkashin E.** *Experimental Curriculum of Media Education*. Moscow, Academy of Education, 1991, 44 p.
7. **Fedorov, A.** *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. Rostov: CVVR, 2001, 708 p.
8. **Spitchkin, A.** *What is Media Education?* Kurgan: Kurgan Institute of Teacher Training, 1999, 114 p.

## Russian Teachers' Attitude Towards the Problem of Screen Violence

The author would like to thank Dr. Irina Chelysheva, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education for her help in the organization of teachers' survey.

The problem of the screen violence has attracted more and more attention during the recent years. While many of my previous researches and articles were dedicated to the effects of violence scenes on the screen on the young audiences, this time my objective was to learn the teachers' attitude to this problem. 57 secondary school teachers took part in the survey. The gender and age differentiation is shown in Table 1.

*Table 1. The number of the teachers questioned, their age and gender*

Age groups:	Number of teachers	Number of teachers (%)	Number of women teachers:	Number of men teachers:
21-30	10	17,54	7	3
31-40	12	21,05	8	4
41-50	11	19,30	7	4
51-60	12	21,05	7	5
61-70	12	21,05	10	2
<b>Total:</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 2 gives us a general idea of the teachers' attitude towards violence in media.

*Table 2. The teachers' attitude towards screen violence*

Teachers' age/gender	Number of teachers( in %) who find themselves drawn to the scenes of violence on the screen	Number of teachers (in %) who are repelled by the scenes of violence	Number of teachers (in %) whose opinion is ambiguous
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>
21-30 /male	0,00	33,33	66,67
21-30 /female	14,28	57,14	28,57
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>
21-30/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
21-30/female	25,00	62,50	12,50
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>81,82</b>	<b>18,18</b>
41-50/male	0,00	75,00	25,00
41-50/female	0,00	85,71	14,28
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>75,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>
51-60/male	20,00	60,00	20,00
51-60/female	0,00	85,71	14,28
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>
61-70/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	10,00	80,00	10,00
<b>All age groups/Total</b>	<b>10,17</b>	<b>70,17</b>	<b>19,30</b>
All age	11,11	61,11	27,78



groups/male			
All age groups/female	10,26	74,36	15,38

If we take a look at the total numbers, according to them, the number of teachers who are fascinated by the scenes of violence on the screen, is slightly over 10 per cent, while the number of those who are repelled by the screen violence is seven times more - 74%.

However, the analysis of the age groups of the teachers reveals that there are twice as many teachers who accept violence on the screen in the age group of 31-40 (25%), and accordingly, less people who are against it (58%). In the age group of 21-30 the voices are divided evenly- 50% to 50%.

The gender analysis of the Table 2 data shows that on the whole, women teachers are less inclined to watch violent scenes, although in some age groups (e.g. from 21 to 30 years old) the number goes up to 14%. So, the “pros” of the screen violence are more often to be found under the age of 40, and their number is slightly more among men (although to my mind, the difference in 1% cannot be considered as a significant).

Compare to the similar study among teenagers: there were 17% of the violent programs fans, 49% of the adversaries of it. Thus, although the teachers in general turned out to be more “peaceful” compared to their pupils, the gap between their preferences is not that big, as it seems and is proclaimed by some teachers. It is in fact just 7% (17% for students and 10% for teachers). However there are much more people who resent screen violence among teachers (by 25% more than among students), which sounds rather optimistic.

**Table 3. Factors attracting teachers to screen violence**

Age/gender	Entertainment	Identification	Information	Compensatory	Recreation	Dynamics/speed of action	Professional directing	Outstanding acting	Outstanding special effects
Number of teachers (%) who have chosen this answer									
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>60,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	66,67	0,00	0,00	0,00	33,33	33,33	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	42,86	57,14	28,57	0,00	28,57	14,28	14,28	0,00	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>1,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>
21-30/male	5,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	25,00
21-30/female	5,00	12,50	12,50	37,50	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>3,64</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>54,55</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>9,10</b>
41-50/male	0,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	75,00	25,00	25,00	0,00
41-50/female	1,43	42,86	28,57	28,57	14,28	42,86	28,57	28,57	14,28
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>3,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>
51-60/male	0,00	20,00	40,00	20,00	20,00	60,00	40,00	40,00	20,00

51-60/female	2,86	28,57	14,28	14,28	28,57	14,28	42,86	42,86	14,28
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>3,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>
61-70/male	,00	50,00	50,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	50,00	50,00	50,00
61-70/female	0,00	30,00	40,00	20,00	10,00	20,00	30,00	20,00	20,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>0,35</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>26,31</b>	<b>19,30</b>	<b>21,05</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>29,82</b>	<b>22,81</b>	<b>15,79</b>
All age groups/male	3,33	33,33	27,78	16,67	22,22	55,55	33,33	27,78	16,67
All age groups/female	5,59	33,33	25,64	20,51	20,51	23,08	28,20	23,08	15,38

These data show that the main appealing factor is entertainment (40%). Other factors (Identification Factor; Information Factor; Recreation Factor; Dynamics of Action; Professional Directing; Outstanding Acting; Special Effects) got the ratings from 20 to 33%. Gender differences on this level of general results are not significant, the main one being the bigger percentage of men teachers (55%) compared to women teachers (28%) who lay emphasis on the dynamics of action. There are some differentiations of opinions inside the age groups; however the small number of teachers within one age group (10-12 people) does not allow us to draw any justifiable conclusions.

Entertainment was the leading factor in students' motives for watching violence, too. But in contradistinction to teachers, pupils did not attribute much importance to the skills of the director (2%), information factor (7%) and compensatory (7%) factor of screen texts. Both groups- teachers and students agree on the main point- that entertainment is still the leading factor drawing people to media violence.

**Table 4. Reasons for resentment against screen violence**

age/ gender	Aversion to violence of any kind	Disgust towards seeing blood and tortured/ injured people	Avoiding to experience negative emotions	Belief that violence on the screen increases violence in real life	Fear of violence of any kind
Number of teachers (in %)					
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>70,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	100,00	0,00
21-30/female	28,57	71,43	42,86	57,14	14,28
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>
21-30/male	25,00	50,00	75,00	100,00	0,00
21-30/female	37,50	62,50	50,00	75,00	25,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>54,55</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>81,82</b>	<b>27,27</b>
41-50/male	25,00	50,00	25,00	100,00	0,00
41-50/female	71,43	42,86	57,14	71,43	42,86
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>
51-60/male	20,00	60,00	60,00	100,00	0,00
51-60/female	28,57	47,14	71,43	100,00	28,57
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>
61-70/male	50,00	50,00	0,00	100,00	50,00

61-70/female	40,00	60,00	70,00	100,00	20,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>35,09</b>	<b>54,38</b>	<b>56,14</b>	<b>80,70</b>	<b>19,30</b>
All age groups/male	22,22	44,44	50,00	88,89	5,55
All age groups/female	41,02	58,97	58,97	82,05	25,64

The analysis of Table 4 gives a rather clear vision of what is the most repulsive about scenes of violence for teachers. First of all, it's the conviction that screen violence does effect the growth of crimes in society (80%). Further on there are such factors as the aversion to images of blood, gore, graphic images of violence; unwillingness to experience disturbing emotions, and fear.

Maximum gender differences emerge in the question of fear of violence (25% of women and 5% of men), and resentment of any kind of violence (41% of women and 22% of men).

Teachers from 41 to 70 most strongly oppose media violence. There are more people within the same age group who are convinced that screen violence contributes to the growth of violence in real life.

The comparison of the teachers' and students' opinions shows that the latter are more tolerable towards screen violence. Only 20% of students (compared to 80% of teachers) think that it affects the violence in society. Gore disgusts 25% of the students (54% of teachers). Unwillingness to experience unpleasant emotions is the reason for not-watching violent scenes for 18% of the students (56 % teachers), and resentment of any violence - 21% (35% of the teachers). The teachers' and students' percentage in the question of fear is about the same.

**Table 5. Whom do the teachers usually watch violent content programs with?**

Teachers' age/gender	with						
	Alone	Friends	Girlfriend/Boyfriend/Spouse	Parents	Students	Children/Grandchildren	Others
Number of teachers (in %)							
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>60,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	66,67	66,67	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	28,57	57,14	57,14	14,28	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>75,00</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	50,00	100,00	50,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	0,00
21-30/female	12,50	62,50	75,00	25,00	12,50	12,50	0,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>72,73</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>18,18</b>
41-50/male	50,00	50,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	50,00
41-50/female	28,57	85,71	42,86	14,28	42,86	28,57	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>75,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>
51-60/male	60,00	80,00	100,00	0,00	20,00	40,00	0,00
51-60/female	28,57	42,86	47,14	0,00	28,57	42,86	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
61-70/male	50,00	100,00	100,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	0,00
61-70/female	30,00	80,00	80,00	0,00	20,00	50,00	0,00
<b>All age groups</b>	<b>35,09</b>	<b>70,17</b>	<b>64,91</b>	<b>10,53</b>	<b>21,05</b>	<b>29,82</b>	<b>3,51</b>

<b>/Total</b>							
All age groups/male	55,55	77,78	66,67	11,11	22,22	33,33	11,11
All age groups/female	25,64	66,67	64,10	10,26	20,51	28,20	0,00

The data of Table 5 tell us that generally teachers watch programs/movies with violent content in the company of their partners/spouses (65-70%). Then in descending order follow: watching alone (35%), with children/grandchildren (30%), with students (21%), with parents (10%) and with other people (e.g. in a movie theater) (3%). Noticeably, men tend to watch violent programs by themselves twice more often as women. Not a single woman teacher reported unfamiliar people (e.g. in a cinema) as companions to watch movies with violent content.

Younger teachers in the age range of 21 to 30 do not watch scenes of violence with their children (logically considering their age) or students (0%). Elder teachers (61-70), on the contrary, are more oriented on watching them together with their children (the latter being adults of 30-40 years old).

Comparing students' answers with teachers' answers, we can notice the common grounds between these two groups: the most frequent company for watching violent programs are friends, both for the students and for the teachers. Moreover, only 10-12% of students watch them with parents, and 3-5% -with strangers.

Further answers differ a lot. In contradistinction to teachers, students do not like watching media containing violence being alone (5% of students vs. 35% of teachers, 7 times less). But the most significant point is that only 4% of the students (compared to 21% of teachers) are ready to watch it together with their teachers. Even in the age group of 7-8 year-olds, only 12% are eager to share this experience with their teacher.

**Table 6. Typical mood before watching violent programs/ films:**

Teachers' age/gender	high spirits	low spirits	irritated	normal mood	other reasons
	Number of teachers in % who gave this reason:				
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	66,67	33,33
21-30/female	0,00	14,28	0,00	57,14	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	25,00	25,00	0,00	50,00	0,00
21-30/female	0,00	25,00	0,00	75,00	00,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>0,00</b>
41-50/male	25,00	25,00	0,00	50,00	0,00
41-50/female	14,28	57,14	0,00	28,57	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
51-60/male	20,00	40,00	0,00	40,00	0,00
51-60/female	0,00	47,14	0,00	42,86	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
61-70/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	10,00	30,00	0,00	60,00	0,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>8,77</b>	<b>31,58</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>54,38</b>	<b>1,75</b>

All age groups/male	16,67	22,22	0,00	55,55	5,55
All age groups/female	5,13	35,90	0,00	53,85	0,00

The analysis of data of Table 6 shows that teachers usually watch scenes of violence in a normal psychological state (54%). Low spirits follow with 31%, and good mood with 9%. It is worth mentioning that the gender difference is first of all revealed in the fact that men teachers more often watch media violence being in the good mood, while women teachers - in the bad mood.

The same tendency is seen in the students' answers: normal mood (50%), low spirit (27%). However, there are three times as many pupils (compared to teachers) who prefer to watch violent scenes in good mood (20%), that probably is not surprisingly on account of young people tending to be in high spirits overall more frequently than adults.

**Table 7. How do they feel after watching violent scenes?**

Teachers' age/gender	Number of teachers (in %) who described their psychological state as:									
	Aggression	Joy	Isolation	Depression	Excitement	Disorder	Agitation	Indifference	Desensitization	Psychological state doesn't change
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00	33,33	33,33	0,00	33,33
21-30/female	14,28	0,00	0,00	14,28	14,28	28,57	0,00	14,28	0,00	14,28
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	25,00	25,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00
21-30/female	0,00	0,00	12,50	25,00	12,50	25,00	0,00	0,00	12,50	12,50
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>27,27</b>
41-50/male	0,00	0,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
41-50/female	0,00	0,00	14,28	14,28	14,28	14,28	0,00	0,00	0,00	42,86
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
51-60/male	20,00	0,00	40,00	20,00	20,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
51-60/female	0,00	0,00	28,57	28,57	28,57	14,28	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>
61-70/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00
61-70/female	0,00	0,00	20,00	10,00	20,00	30,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	20,00
<b>All age groups/Total</b>	<b>3,51</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>19,30</b>	<b>17,54</b>	<b>15,79</b>	<b>19,30</b>	<b>1,75</b>	<b>3,51</b>	<b>1,75</b>	<b>19,30</b>
All age groups/male	5,55	0,00	27,78	16,67	11,11	11,11	5,55	5,55	0,00	22,22
All age groups/female	2,56	0,00	15,38	17,95	17,95	23,08	0,00	2,56	2,56	17,95

Watching violence on the screen does not evoke joyful feelings in anyone (compared to 4% of students). Most frequent answers were "isolation" (19% of teachers and 9% of students), Then follow "depression" (17% of teachers and 13% of pupils), "excitement" (15% of teachers and 13% of students), "aggression" (3% of

teachers and 8% of students), “desensitization” (about 2% of teachers and 8% of students). 19% of teachers reported that their psychological state was not affected.

In other words, almost three times more of the questioned students than the teachers confessed the rise of aggressiveness, and four times more - the desensitization reaction. Although the reaction of isolation and unaffected psychological state is twice less frequent among the students. Thus, the students are more apt to changes in emotional state in response to screen violence.

It is worth noticing that men teachers admitted that they were likely to feel aggressive or indifferent more often than women, while women teachers were most inclined to feel sad or agitated.

**Table 8. The teachers’ reflection on screen violence**

Teachers’ age/gender	On-screen violence is forgotten immediately	Violent images seen are remembered for a short time period only	On-screen violence lingers in memory for a long time
	Number of teachers (in %) for whom this tendency is true		
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>
21-30/male	33,33	66,67	0,00
21-30/female	14,28	28,57	57,14
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>41,67</b>
21-30/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
21-30/female	12,50	37,50	50,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>36,36</b>
41-50/male	25,00	25,00	50,00
41-50/female	28,57	42,86	28,57
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>58,33</b>
51-60/male	20,00	40,00	40,00
51-60/female	0,00	28,57	71,43
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>50,00</b>
61-70/male	0,00	50,00	50,00
61-70/female	10,00	40,00	50,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>15,79</b>	<b>38,60</b>	<b>45,61</b>
All age groups/male	22,22	44,44	33,33
All age groups/female	12,82	35,90	51,28

As we can see from Table 8, almost half of the teachers remember the violent scenes for a long time, and only 16% (men twice as many as women) forget them right after the program is over.

There is a striking similarity in the answers of teachers and students here. 54% of students remember screen violence for a long term period, and only 16% are able to forget them soon. The difference between boys/girls and men/women answers are analogous, too.

These results led us to the following conclusion: 1) the time duration of the violent images lingering in one’s mind is determined by gender, not by the age; 2) almost half of the surveyed teachers and students remember the scenes of violence

they saw on the screen for a long time and only 16% of both of the groups do not recall them afterwards.

**Table 9. The attitude of teachers towards discussing scenes of violence on the screen**

Teachers' age/gender	screen violence is never discussed	screen violence is discussed occasionally	screen violence is discussed regularly
	Number of teachers in %:		
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>80,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
21-30/female	28,57	71,43	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>
21-30/male	0,00	50,00	50,00
21-30/female	12,50	50,00	37,50
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>54,54</b>	<b>18,18</b>
41-50/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
41-50/female	28,57	57,14	14,28
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>
51-60/male	0,00	80,00	20,00
51-60/female	0,00	42,86	57,14
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>
61-70/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	20,00	60,00	20,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>14,03</b>	<b>61,40</b>	<b>24,56</b>
All age groups/male	5,55	72,22	22,22
All age groups/female	17,95	56,41	25,64

Only 14% of the teachers never talk about the violent scenes they have seen (women outnumber men by three times). And the quarter of the surveyed teachers discuss these episodes regularly. The age ranges of teachers who are most likely to discuss the screen violence (42%) are 31-40 and 51-60. Less likely - 21-30 years old.

Thus in general teachers talk about the screen violence less frequently than their students (25% of teachers vs. 46% of students). Moreover, in comparison with the students, the number of teachers who totally ignore the issue is twice more.

**Table 10. Typical interlocutors of the teachers for discussion of the on-screen violence**

Teachers' age/gender	Number of teachers in % who discuss screen violence with:				
	Friends/Spouses	Parents	Students	Children/Grandchildren	Others
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>70,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	100,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	57,14	28,57	28,57	0,00	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>91,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>
21-30/male	100,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	0,00
21-30/female	87,50	37,50	50,00	37,50	12,50
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>72,73</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>54,54</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>27,27</b>
41-50/male	75,00	50,00	50,00	50,00	25,00

41-50/female	71,43	14,28	57,14	42,86	28,57
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>
51-60/male	60,00	0,00	40,00	80,00	40,00
51-60/female	28,57	0,00	14,28	57,14	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>
61-70/male	100,00	0,00	50,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	50,00	0,00	30,00	60,00	20,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>66,67</b>	<b>15,79</b>	<b>36,84</b>	<b>43,86</b>	<b>14,03</b>
All age groups/male	83,33	16,67	38,89	50,00	16,67
All age groups/female	58,97	15,38	35,90	41,02	12,82

Comparative analysis of Table 5 and Table 6 asserts that on the whole teachers tend to watch and discuss scenes of violence in the company of their spouses or friends (65 to 70%). In descending order follow: children/grandchildren as the possible interlocutors (30% - to watch together, and 44% to talk about it afterwards), students (21% for watching, 37 % for discussion), parents (10% for watching and 16 for discussion) and strangers (3% for watching and 14 for discussion). There are 30% more men than women who are eager to discuss the screen violence with their spouses or friends.

Teachers between the age of 31 and 50 are more likely to discuss this issue with their students and those between the age of 51 and 70- with their children/grandchildren.

Comparing the answers of pupils and teachers, we can note the evident similarity in the leading type of the company for the discussion of scenes of violence on the screen – friends (57% of pupils). While only 12% of the pupils are eager to discuss them with their teachers.

**Table 11. Teachers’ opinions about the reasons of violence and aggression in society**

Teachers’ age/gender	Teachers’ opinions about the reasons for violence and aggressions in society:				
	Number of teachers in % who agree with the option:				
	Psychological deviations	Screen violence	Inherent to the human nature	Social and financial inequality	Other reasons
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>70,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	66,67	0,00	33,33	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	71,43	28,57	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>00,00</b>
21-30/male	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	0,00
21-30/female	50,00	37,50	25,00	12,50	0,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>36,36</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>0,00</b>
41-50/male	25,00	50,00	25,00	0,00	0,00
41-50/female	28,57	28,57	14,28	28,57	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
51-60/male	20,00	40,00	20,00	60,00	0,00



51-60/female	28,57	42,86	0,00	28,57	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>
61-70/male	0,00	50,00	0,00	50,00	0,00
61-70/female	30,00	40,00	0,00	30,00	0,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>35,09</b>	<b>35,09</b>	<b>12,28</b>	<b>22,81</b>	<b>0,00</b>
All age groups/male	27,78	33,33	22,22	27,78	0,00
All age groups/female	38,46	35,90	7,69	20,51	0,00

In the teachers' opinion, main reasons for the aggression and violence in society are the psychopathologies (35% - 27% of women and 38% of men) and "screen violence" (35%). 23% (men outnumber women by 7% here) prone to think that the main reason is the financial inequality of people. And only 12% (3 times more men than women) say that violence is in human nature.

I would like to point out that according to the students' survey, psychopathologies are the main reason for violence, too (37%). There were 28% (less than the teachers by 8%) of those who blamed violence in media. However students who thought that it's in human nature outnumber the teachers by 7%.

Agreeing on the main reason for violence in society being the psychopathologies (which is to my mind rather exaggerated), teachers and pupils disagree on the other issues. Teachers pay more attention to the economic factor. Their concern about the spread of violence on the screen is also greater.

**Table 12. Teachers' opinion about the influence of scenes of violence on the screen and the increase of crime in society**

Teachers' age/gender	Number of teachers in % who think that:				
	On-screen violence undoubtedly leads to the increase of crime rate	On-screen violence leads to a small increase of crime	On-screen violence does not affect the crime rate because crimes existed before the invention of cinema and television	On-screen violence leads to increase of crimes committed by people with psychological deviations	On-screen violence does not lead to the increase of crimes because it disgusts/ diverts people
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	33,33	33,33	0,00	33,33	0,00
21-30/female	57,14	14,28	0,00	28,57	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>58,33</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	50,00	25,00	25,00	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	62,50	12,50	12,50	12,50	0,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>81,82</b>	<b>9,10</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>9,10</b>	<b>0,00</b>
41-50/male	100,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
41-50/female	71,43	14,28	0,00	14,28	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>75,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
51-60/male	60,00	20,00	0,00	20,00	0,00

51-60/female	85,71	0,00	00,00	14,28	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>83,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>
61-70/male	100,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
61-70/female	80,00	0,00	0,00	20,00	0,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>70,17</b>	<b>10,53</b>	<b>3,51</b>	<b>15,79</b>	<b>0,00</b>
All age groups/male	66,67	16,67	5,55	11,11	0,00
All age groups/female	71,79	7,69	2,56	17,95	0,00

70% of the teachers that took part in the survey believe that violence on the screen does lead to the increase of crimes in society. Only 10% (men teachers under 40 mostly) think that screen violence influences the crime rate to a small degree, and 16% (more women than men, and more teachers under 30) think that it impacts just the increase of crimes committed by psychos. 3% deny any affect of screen violence (twice as many men than women). Not a single teacher said that violence on the screen makes audience be disgusted at violence.

The majority of students also believed that the violence on the screen leads to the increase of violence in society (though comparing to teachers, there were twice less students). 22% of pupils are sure that screen violence affects crime rate to an insignificant degree. But the question about the reverse effect of the screen violence provoked the most serious difference in opinions. 11% of students think that it does make people disgust any violence, though there were no teachers who agree on that.

The conclusion is that, with the dominating opinion among both students and teachers that screen violence increases real violence in society, there are twice as many teachers than students who believe that.

**Table 13. Teachers' attitude towards the problem of regulating violence on the screen**

Teachers' age/gender	Number of teachers in % who agree that:						
	Screen violence should be prohibited because it makes people aggressive	The current amount of screen violence is acceptable	Only the most violent and graphic scenes should be banned	There may be violent scenes on the screen, but they should be inaccessible for small children	There may be violent scenes on the screen but broadcasted only after midnight	The current amount of screen violence is not critical, there can be even more	Other opinion
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	33,33	0,00	66,67	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	28,57	0,00	57,14	0,00	14,28	0,00	0,00
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>8,33</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
21-30/female	12,50	0,00	37,50	25,00	25,00	0,00	0,00
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>18,18</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>9,10</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
41-50/male	0,00	0,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	0,00	0,00

41-50/female	28,57	0,00	42,86	28,57	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
51-60/male	20,00	0,00	40,00	40,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
51-60/female	28,57	0,00	42,86	28,57	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>16,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
61-70/male	100,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
61-70/female	40,00	0,00	20,00	40,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>24,56</b>	<b>1,75</b>	<b>38,60</b>	<b>24,56</b>	<b>10,53</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>
All age groups/male	16,67	5,55	38,89	22,22	22,22	0,00	0,00
All age groups/female	28,20	0,00	38,46	25,64	7,69	0,00	0,00

The analysis of Table 13 shows that the majority of teachers (38% without significant gender differences) think that only the most violent programs should be banned. 24% of the teachers (twice more women than men) oppose any violence on the screen. The same number of people does not oppose violence on the screen but on condition that children could not see it. 10% (men under 50 mostly) suggest that violent movies/programs should appear after midnight only and for adults only. Just 2% of the teachers (men from 31 to 40) say that things should not be changed. And nobody agreed to the argument that it would not harm if the amount of violence on the screen increased.

As for the students, majority of them also thought that only the most violent programs, films, computer games should be prohibited/ censored. Their opinion almost coincides with the teachers' in percentage (32% of pupils and 38% of teachers). The number of the advocates of the total prohibition of screen violence (24%), and those who think it may be shown late at night only, is also about the same as within the teachers' group. However there is 8% less of students who think it would be better to isolate children from the screen violence. But the greatest difference is that there are 5 times more students who believe things can remain as they are, and what is even more striking- almost every tenth pupil thinks that it will not hurt to have more violence on the Russian screen.

**Table 14. Age that teachers find it acceptable for their children/ grandchildren to watch programs with violent content**

Teachers' age/gender	Age that teachers find it acceptable for their children/ grandchildren to watch programs with violent content				
	Any age	From the age of 10	From the age of 15	From the age of 18	It is inappropriate to watch violent programs/films no matter how old he/she is
<b>21-30 /total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>30,00</b>	<b>10,00</b>	<b>20,00</b>	<b>40,00</b>
21-30/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	33,33	66,67
21-30/female	0,00	42,86	14,28	14,28	28,57
<b>31-40/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>8,33</b>
21-30/male	0,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	0,00

21-30/female	0,00	25,00	50,00	12,50	12,50
<b>41-50/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>45,45</b>	<b>27,27</b>	<b>0,00</b>
41-50/male	0,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	0,00
41-50/female	0,00	14,28	57,14	28,57	0,00
<b>51-60/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>25,00</b>	<b>41,67</b>	<b>33,33</b>
51-60/male	0,00	0,00	20,00	40,00	40,00
51-60/female	0,00	0,00	28,57	42,86	28,57
<b>61-70/total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>	<b>50,00</b>
61-70/male	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	50,00
61-70/female	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	50,00
<b>All age groups /Total</b>	<b>0,00</b>	<b>15,79</b>	<b>24,56</b>	<b>33,33</b>	<b>29,82</b>
All age groups/male	0,00	16,67	16,67	38,89	27,78
All age groups/female	0,00	15,38	28,20	30,77	30,77

It is obvious that no parent wishes his or her children/grandchildren to watch violence from an early age. Moreover, 30% would like to forbid their children to watch this kind of production at all. At the same time many teachers agree to let their children watch violent scenes from the age of 18 (33%), 15 (24%), and 10 (16%). The older the teachers are, the firmer they become about age restrictions. Students were more liberal in this question (concerning their future children). Thus, there were 12% of those who would prohibit for their future children to see violence, and 10% of those who would let them watch any programs from an early age.

Hence, in conclusion, let's summarize the findings:

- on the whole students are more tolerant than the teachers to screen violence (men outnumber women);
- entertainment is the leading factor attracting audiences to violent scenes in both groups;
- watching violent programs in high spirits is for students three times oftener than for teachers;
- both students and teachers are most likely to watch and discuss violent scenes together with friends;
- students do not like watching violent programs alone;
- 1 out of 5 teachers is eager to watch violent content media with their students, 1 out of 3 teachers is ready to discuss it with the students;
- on the average, 1 in 10 students would like to share this activity with the teacher;
- students talk about violence on the screen twice as much as teachers;
- 3 times more students than teachers reported that their aggressiveness increases after the violence seen on the screen;
- images of the screen violence linger in girls'/women' mind longer than in boys'/men';
- about half of the respondents reported that they remember scenes of violence for a long time;
- both the majority of students and teachers tend to believe that screen violence affects the increase of crime in society;

- one third of teachers and students agree that most violent media texts should be banned;
- quarter of teachers and students think it is necessary to prohibit all violence on the screen;
- 5 times more students (vs. teachers) think things should remain like they are now, and 1 in 10 pupils consider that even more violence can be shown.

## Electronic/Digital Media and Russian Children: The Problem of Law Regulation

In March 2001 the Russian Ministry of Culture published “Guidelines on Age Classification of Audiovisual Products” [1, pp.2-3] in which the main principles of regulation, demonstration and distribution of audiovisual products have been designated.

According to this document Russian agencies and distributors of audiovisual media texts must use the following age ratings system:

- *For general audience* (audiovisual media text does not contain violence and cruelty, profanity and expressions offending morals);
- *Parental guidance for children under 12 years* (parents can consider some audiovisual materials improper for children; media text may contain profanity, mild violence without demonstration of bloodshed, the brief image of accidents, naked bodies, mild scenes of mysticism and horror);
- *No children under 16 years* (audiovisual media text may include a verbal mention or the evident image of suicides, death, crimes, violence, cruelty, mild sex, drug addiction, alcoholism and other «adult» plots, strong language);
- *No audience under 18 years* (media texts for adult audience only; the obvious and realistic image of violence, drug addiction, alcoholism, sex, coarse language).

In the opinion of the Russian Ministry of Culture, the given classification is intended “to protect children and teenagers from audiovisual products that can harm their health, emotional and intellectual development, and to respect the opinion of an adult audience disturbed by cruelty and violence and its influence on society members against their will” [1, p.2].

The general principles of application of the given document include full freedom of choice and media viewing for an adult audience under the condition of sufficient protection of children and teenagers, and also prohibition of products promoting “war, violence and cruelty, racial, national, religious, class and other exclusiveness, pornography – according to the Clause 29 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation and Clause 31 of the Bases of the Legislation of the Russian Federation about Culture” [1, p.2]. For example, “Guidelines on Age Classification of Audiovisual Products” [1, p.3] forbids public distribution and demonstration of scenes of:

- sexual violence over children;
- unjustified details of sadism and excessive violence and cruelty, especially concerning children and animals, episodes of partition of victims, tortures, murder in especially fanatic ways; including close-ups of tormented people and animals;
- violence over corpses;
- methods of manufacturing and application of weapons and devices for tortures;
- glorifying chauvinism and national exclusiveness, racism, propagandizing wars and conflicts, appeals for the violent overthrow of existing political regime;

- pornographic contents, namely – naturalistic, detailed sequence of the sexual intercourse and the graphic demonstration of naked genitals during sexual contact only for excitation of sexual instincts of spectators, not for artistic or educational purpose; the naturalistic image of group sex;
- detailed instructions or encouragements to commit a crime, acts of violence, and drug abuse.

Apparently, many definitions of the quoted document are rather vague, indistinct, that in practice complicates the specific classification of media texts and legal regulation in the media sphere. However worst of all is that the requirements of the given document are simply not observed in practice in the majority of Russian regions. The prospering piracy market of audiovisual production makes it possible for a child or a minor teenager to buy or rent a videocassette, computer game, or a DVD with an «adult» age rating. Moreover, media texts not intended for children's audience media texts, are shown on many Russian TV channels in a day time and early evening without any restrictions.

Of course, some Deputies of the Russian Parliament (State Duma) have been concerned about the situation for a long time. From time to time they try to introduce bills regulating contacts of children's audience with media. However none of these attempts have yet led to the passing of the law. In opinion of the Deputy of the Russian State Parliament V.Galchenko, negative influence of modern Russian TV on children may result in antisocial behaviour and conflicts with law. In order to change this situation V.Galchenko offered the following:

- to introduce the public control of television, that is to assign supervising and monitoring functions to public councils;
- to use such measures as self-restriction, that is to let the television agency to define if a media text is appropriate for a family audience and the time of broadcasting [2].

In my opinion, the regulation of the time of a program's or a film's broadcasting is crucial for Russian TV. By analogy with international practice, it is possible to suggest for the Russian TV-agencies to abstain from the display of intense violence from 6 in the morning till 10 in the evening. Besides, to use system of age rating signs, both - in press publications of TV-guides, TV program, and before the actual television broadcasting.

In the places of sale and rent of videocassettes, DVD, Video CD, CD-ROMs it is also necessary to observe similar rules of age restrictions: the customers must have the chance to read the specified age restrictions or the intended audience of a media product. In a word, there is an urgent need for the effective system of regulation of media production in Russia.

### References

1. Guidelines on Age Classification of Audiovisual products. The Appendix N 1 for the Order of the Russian Ministry of Culture N 392 (March, 5 2001). In: *Video Satellite: 2002*. Editor S.V.Barkanov. Moscow: Third Rome, 2002, pp.2-3.
2. *Will TV be Responsible?* The Transcript of the Round Table on Television and Law. [http://www.narod-party.ru/news.asp?news\\_id=2167](http://www.narod-party.ru/news.asp?news_id=2167) [07.04.2003. 18:37].

# **Lists of Russian Media Education Literature and Webs**

## **The selected list of Russian Ph.D. dissertations on media education**

### **1960-1969:**

- Karasik, A.** (1966). Artistically-pedagogical analysis of films for students of the 5-6<sup>th</sup> grades. Moscow.
- Rabinovich, Y.** (1966). Interaction of literature and cinema in aesthetic education of high school students. Moscow.
- Rabinovich, R.** (1966). Cinema art in the artistic education of high school students, Moscow.
- Baranov, O.** (1968). School film-clubs and their Role in film education of high school students. Moscow.

### **1970-1979:**

- Goncharova, N.** (1970). Teaching skills of feature film assesment (5-6 grade pupils). Irkutsk.
- Tikhomirova, K.** (1970). Conditions of effective use of slides in educational process of secondary school. Moscow.
- Stepanov, A.** (1973). Psychological bases of using television in education. Leningrad.
- Levshina, I.** (1974). Education of schoolpupils by means of cinema. Moscow.
- Usov, U.** (1974). The analysis of a film in aesthetic education of high school students. Moscow.
- Polevoy, V.** (1975). Research of the effectiveness of methods of production and application of educational films. Moscow.
- Labkovska, G.** (1976). The construction of moral ideals of high school students by means of cinema art. Moscow.
- Ivanova, S.** (1978). The development of minor adolescents' comprehensive perception of cinema art. Moscow.
- Malobitska, Z.** (1979). Cinema art as means of moral and aesthetic development of high school students. Irkutsk.
- Monastyrsky, V.** (1979). Artistic education of high school students by means of television in after-school programs. Moscow.

### **1980-1989:**

- Poltorak, L.** (1980). Literature studies with the help of cinema experience of pupils. Leningrad.
- Pressman, L.** (1981). Pedagogical basis of creation and application of audiovisual media in secondary school. Moscow.
- Odintsova, S.** (1981). The film analysis as one of the factors of professional development of Philology students in pedagogical institutes. Moscow.
- Usova, G.** (1981). Radio and television as factors of teenagers' values formation. Moscow.
- Bulavko, V.** (1982). Screen media in Art lessons in secondary school. Moscow.
- Serezhenkova, L.** (1982). Speaking practice of foreign students with the help of feature films (advanced level). Moscow.
- Shejin, S.** (1982). Psychological peculiarities of high school students' attitude to film characters. Moscow.
- Bojkov, I.** (1983). Amateur film production as a pedagogical problem. Moscow.
- Kirillova, N.** (1983). Social and aesthetic effectiveness of cinema art as a factor of education. Moscow.
- Kholmov M.** (1985). Construction of Soviet journalism for children. Leningrad.
- Shakeeva, Ch.** (1983). Social and psychological aspects of influence of the modern cinema on young people's values. Leningrad.
- Yanelyauskas, E.** (1983). Development of social and artistic activity of a personality in the process of film production. Leningrad.
- Genkin, R.** (1985). The development of the interest in film making in an amateur film-studio. Leningrad.



- Saidashev, A.** (1985). Stimulation of the cognitive activity of pupils by means of cinema and demonstrational experiment. Kazan.
- Trofimova, L.** (1985). Application of video in extra-curricular classes. Moscow.
- Vlaskina, G.** (1985). Aesthetic education of high school students by means of television and radio. Moscow.
- Fedorov, A.** (1986). The critical analysis of foreign film in education of high school pupils. Moscow.
- Polichko, G.** (1987). Interdisciplinary ties of Literature and Film as means of aesthetic development of high school students. Moscow.
- Cherkahin, E.** (1989). Popular science films about Art as means the development of artistic interests of high school students. Moscow.
- Sharikov, A.** (1989). Age peculiarities of television preferences of pupils. Moscow.
- Usov, Y.** (1989). Film education as means of the aesthetic and artistic development of pupils. Moscow.
- 1990-1999:**
- Evtushenko, G.** (1991). School film education as a film studies problem. Moscow.
- Fedorov, A.** (1993). The training system of students of pedagogical institutes for aesthetic education of pupils with screen arts (cinema, television, video). Moscow.
- Bukharkina, M.** (1994). Computer telecommunications in teaching foreign languages. Moscow.
- Petrova, N.** (1995). Development of education technology 'PC Animation in Media Education'. Moscow.
- Platunova, L.** (1995). The development of film literacy of a teacher during the professional growth course. St-Petersburg.
- Bondarenko E.** (1997). The system of audiovisual education in 5-7 grades of high school. Moscow.
- Gavrichenkov, A.** (1997). Production and application of educational videos for teachers' professional development. Moscow.
- Ivanova L.** (1999). Formation of media communicative culture of senior pupils (on the base of French language lessons). Irkutsk.
- Monastyrsky, D.** (1999). Interaction of culture and film distribution institutions in organizing the leisure time of the youth. Moscow.
- Shkolnik, A.** (1999). Children Amatory Press as the factor of social education of adolescents. Kostroma.
- 2000-2007**
- Dejkina, A.** (2000). The development of cognitive interests of pre-schoolers through media education. Barnaul.
- Novikova, A.** (2000). The theory and history of the development of media education in the U.S.A.: 1960-2000. Taganrog.
- Fominova, M.** (2001). Media education in context of *World Arts Culture* course in secondary school. Moscow.
- Chelysheva, I.** (2002). Main stages of the development of media education in Russia. Voronezh.
- Korochensky, A.** (2003). Media Criticism in theory and practice of journalism. St-Petersburg.
- Shipnyagova, E.** (2003). Development of future teachers for integrative media education in the schools. Orenburg.
- Konovalova, N.** (2004). Development of pedagogical university students' media culture. Vologda.
- Legotina, N.** (2004). Pedagogical conditions for preparation of university students' for media education of pupils. Kurgan.
- Zhurin, A.** (2004). Integration of media education with the course of *Chemistry* in secondary school, Moscow.
- Zmanovskaya, N.** (2004). Development of future teachers' media literacy. Krasnoyarsk.
- Murukina, E.** (2005). Development of senior pupils' media culture (on the base of press). Belgorod.

- Stolbnikova, E.** (2005). Development of the pedagogical university students' critical thinking in the process of media education (on the media advertisements' base). Rostov.
- Khudoleeva, E.** (2006). Pedagogical problems of media education in Germany and Russia on the modern time. Vladivostok.
- Kovsharova, T.** (2006). Development of senior pupils' media literacy in the ecological & information space of lesson. Chita.
- Kutkina, O.** (2006). Pedagogical conditions of media literacy developments for future library and information specialists. Barnaul.
- Ryshikh, N.** (2006). Media education of pedagogical university students on the base of English World Screen Arts. Rostov.
- Hilko, N.** (2007). Education for audiovisual creativeness in social and cultural sphere. Moscow.
- Kolesnichenko, V.** (2007). Development of media education in Canada. Rostov.

### **The brief list of Russian books on media education**

- Baranov, Oleg & Penzin, Stal** (2005). Film in education of young students. Tver: Tver State University, 188 p.
- Baranov, Oleg** (1979). The screen becomes a friend. Moscow: Prosveshenie, 96 p.
- Baranov, Oleg** (1980). Film in extra-curricular classes. Moscow: VBPK, 48 p.
- Baranov, Oleg** (2002). Media education in school and university. Tver: Tver State University, 87 p.
- Bazhenova, Larissa** (1992). In the world of screen arts. Moscow: VIPK, 74 p.
- Bazhenova, Larissa** (2004). Media education of pupil. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 55 p.
- Bondarenko, Elena** (1994). A guided tour into the screen world. Moscow: SVR-Argus.
- Bondarenko, Elena** (1994). The dialogue with the screen. Moscow: SVR-Argus, 96 p.
- Bondarenko, Elena** (2000). Theory and methods of social and art rehabilitation based on media culture. Omsk, 2000, 91 p.
- Breitman, Alexander** (1999). The basics of the film art. Khabarovsk, 112 p.
- Chelysheva, Irina** (2006). Theory and history of Russian media education. Taganrog: Kuchma, 206 p.
- Fedorov Alexander, and all.** (2005). Media Education. Media Literacy. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia). CD.
- Fedorov, Alexander** (2001). Media Education: History, Theory and Methods. Rostov: CVVR. 708 p.
- Fedorov, Alexander** (2007). Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 616 p.
- Hilko, Nikolai** (2001). Role of audiovisual culture in the creative realization of a personality. Omsk: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 446 p.
- Hilko, Nikolai** (2004). Social and cultural aspects of screen creativeness. Moscow: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 96 p.
- Kirillova, Natalia** (1992). Theory and practice of film art. Ekaterinburg: Ekaterinburg State Theatre Institute, 48 p.
- Korkonosenko, Sergei** (2004). Education of future journalists: Professional media education. St-Petersburg: Mikhailov, 240 p.
- Korochensky, Alexander** (2003). Media criticism in the theory and practice of journalism. St-Petersburg: St-Petersburg State University.
- Legotina, Natalia** (2004). Pedagogical conditions of university students' training for introduction of media education in secondary schools. Kurgan: Kurgan State University, 24 p.
- Levshina, Inna** (1978). Do you like cinema? Moscow: Iskusstvo, 254 p.
- Levshina, Inna** (1986). How are the works of Art perceived? Moscow: Znanie, 96 p.
- Levshina, Inna** (1989). Adolescent and screen, Moscow: Pedagogica, 176 p.
- Murukina, Elena** (2006). Media education of senior pupils' on the base of press. Taganrog: Kuchma, 200 p.

- Nechai, Olga** (1989). Base of the film art, Moscow: Prosvechenie, 288 p.
- Novikova, Anastasia** (2004). Teaching Media in the English Language Classroom. Activities for Media Education. Taganrog: Kuchma, 52 p.
- Penzin, Stal** (1987). Cinema and aesthetic education: Methodological problems. Voronezh: Voronezh University, 176 p.
- Polichko, Gennady** (2006). Film language for university students. Moscow: Russian Word, 201 p.
- Rabinovich, Uly** (1991). Cinema, literature and my life. Kurgan: Periodika, 120 p.
- Ryshykh, Natalia** (2007). Media education of pedagogical university students on the base of English World Screen Arts. Taganrog: Kuchma, 188 p.
- Sharikov, Alexander** (1990). Media education: International and Russian experience, Moscow: Academy of Education, 65 p.
- Sharikov, Alexander** (1991). The concept of media education in school. Moscow: Academy of Education, 23 p.
- Spitchkin, Alexander** (1999). What is media education? Kurgan: Kurgan Teacher Training Institute, 114 p.
- Stolbnikova, Elena** (2006). Development of the pedagogical university students' critical thinking in the process of media education (on the media advertisements' base). Tagarog: Kuchma, 160 p.
- Usov, Ury** (1993). The bases of screen culture. Moscow: Nova Shkola, 90 p.
- Usov, Ury** (1995). In the world of screen arts. Student book. Moscow: SVR-Argus, 224 p.
- Waitsfield, Ilya** (1988). Development of film education in the epoch of "Perestroika". Moscow: Russian Association for Film & Media Education, 21 p.
- Zaznobina, Ludmila** and others (1999). Media education: Integration into secondary school curriculum. Moscow: Institute of Secondary Education, Russian Academy of Education.

### ***Russian media education web resources:***

**Russian Association for Film & Media Education:**

<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>

<http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru>

<http://www.mediaeducation.boom.ru>

**ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia)**

<http://www.ifap.ru>

**Media Education on the UNESCO Bureau in Moscow website:**

<http://www.unesco.ru/rus/pages/bythemes/stasya29062005124316.php>

**The UNESCO Institute for IT in Education, Moscow**

<http://www.iite.ru/iite/index>

**ICT Technologies in Education**

<http://ict.edu.ru/>

**Media Education Laboratory of Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).**

<http://www.mediaeducation.ru>

**Media Library of School Sector**

<http://school-sector.relarn.ru/efim/mainframe.html>

**Art & Education (Moscow)**

<http://www.art.ioso.ru>

<http://som.fio.ru/subject.asp?id=10001575>

**Federation for Internet Education (Russia)**

<http://www.fio.ru>

<http://center.fio.ru>

**Research Group “School Media Library” (Moscow)**

<http://www.ioso.ru/scmedia>

**YNPRESS Agency (Agency of Young People, Children & Press, Moscow)**

<http://www.ynpress.ru>

**Russian Media Education Journals**

*Media Education* Journal (print and web)

<http://www.ifap.ru/projects/mediamag.htm>

*Media Center* (Internet Journal)

<http://edu.km.ru/mcenter>

*Media Library* Journal (print)

<http://www.mediagnosis.ru/mshsen/8/4/1/index.htm>

*Media Review* (Internet Journal of Media Criticism & Media Education)

<http://mediareview.by.ru>

*Journalism and Media Market* Journal (print and web)

<http://www.library.cjes.ru/online/?s=4&tp=16&st=1>

*Information and Education* Journal (print and web)

<http://www.infojournal.ru/journal.htm>

## **Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov: Brief CV**

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov completed his Ph.D. thesis at the Russian Academy of Education (Moscow) in the field of media education (1993). Currently he is the president of Russian Association for Film & Media Education, an expert of ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), Russian Foundation for Basic Research Sciences (RFFI) and pro-rector of Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute. He is also a member of Russian Academy of Film Arts & Science, Russian Union of Filmmakers, CIFEJ & FIPRECI.

Prof. Alexander Fedorov is the author of 16 books on media education and literacy and more than 400 articles (in Russian, American, Canadian, French, German, and Norwegian media studies and media literacy journals). Since 1997 he has received scientific research grants on media culture and media education topics from the President of the Russian Federation, Russian Foundation for Humanities, Russian Ministry of Education, Kennan Institute (USA), IREX (USA), MacArthur Foundation (USA), Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation, USA), DAAD (Germany), and other. He was a guest professor and research fellow in Norway Association for Media Education, Oslo (1995), Central European University (Budapest, 1998, 2006), Kassel University (2000), Maison des sciences des homme, Paris (2002), Kennan Institute, Washington D.C. (2003), Humboldt University, Berlin (2005).

e-mails: [fedor@pbox.ttn.ru](mailto:fedor@pbox.ttn.ru) [tgpi@mail.ru](mailto:tgpi@mail.ru)

<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>

### ***List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov***

#### ***Books, Monographs:***

Fedorov, A. (2007). *Development of the Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Pedagogical University's Students*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 616 p.

Fedorov, A. (2007). *Media Education: Sociology Surveys*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 228 p.

Fedorov, A. and all. (2007). *Aesthetical Conception in Russian Media Education and Scientific Heritage of Y.Usov*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 183 p.

Fedorov, A. and all. (2007). *Media Education in the U.S., Canada and UK*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 256 p.

Fedorov, A. and all. (2007). *Problems of Media Education*. Taganrog: Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, 212 p.

Fedorov, A. (2005). *Media Education of Future Teachers*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 314 p.

Fedorov A., and all. (2005). *Media Education. Media Pedagogic. Media Journalism*. Moscow: ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia). CD. 1400 p.

Fedorov, A., Novikova A. (2005). *Media Education in the Leading Western Countries*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 270 p.

- Fedorov, A. and all. (2004). *Media Literacy for Future Teachers and Modernization of Educational Process in Russia*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 188 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). *Children's Rights and the Problem of Violence on the Russian Screen*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 414 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). *Media Education and Media Literacy*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 340 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). *Media Education in Pedagogical Universities*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 124 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). *Media Education in the Western World*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 238 p.
- Fedorov, A. & Chelysheva I. (2002). *Media Education in Russia: Short History of Development*. Taganrog: Poznanie, 265 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). *Media Education: History, Theory and Methods*. Rostov: CVVR. 708 p.
- Brochures:**
- Fedorov, A. (2003). *Violence on the Russian & American Media Screen and Youth Audience*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 88 p.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). *Ecological Theme in the Russian Feature Film Art of Sound Period: Problems and Tendencies*. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 48 p.
- Fedorov, A. (Ed.) (2002). *Modern Media Education Content & Management*. Moscow: State University of Management, 80 p.
- Fedorov, A. (1990). *Video Discussion: Cinema – Video – Youth*. Rostov: Rostov State Books' Publishing House, 80 p.
- Fedorov, A. (1989). *It Does Hard to Be Young: Cinema & School*. Moscow: Cinema Center, 64 p.
- Fedorov, A. (1987). "For" & "Against": *Movies & School*. Moscow: VBPK, 64 p.
- Articles:**
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Conditions of Media Education in the World: Experts' Opinions. In: *Media education*, N 1, 44-82.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Hermeneutical Analysis in the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Innovational Educational Technologies*, N 3,
- Fedorov, A. (2007). History of the Russian Cinema: a Sight from America. In: *Media education*, N 1, 98-99.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Identification Analysis on Media Education Lessons in Student's Audience. In *Media education*, N 1, 36-43.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media as One of Opposition Ways Against Negative Influence of Screen Violence on the Minor Audience. In: *Youth and Society*, N 1, 110-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Minor Audience and Violence on the Screen. In: *Pedagogical Diagnostics*, N 1, 141-151.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Phenomen of Media Success. In: *Bulletin of Electronic and Printed Mass-media*. N 1.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Aesthetical Analysis of Media Texts in University Students' Classroom. *Innovations' Technologies in Education*. 2007. N 2.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Attitude's of School Teachers to a Problem of Violence on the Screen. In: *Youth and Society*, N 1, 90-109.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Critical Thinking Development in the Media Education: Basic Conceptions. *Innovations in Education*. 2007. N 4, pp.30-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Cultivation Analysis in the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 6, C.64-77.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Development of Media Education in the Modern Time. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 3, 40-51.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Identification Analysis in University Students' Classroom. In: *Media Education*. 2007 N 1, pp.36-43.

- Fedorov, A. (2007). Journal Questionnaires and Real Box Office. In: *Journal of Electronic and Print Media*. 2007 № 3.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Education in the World: Expert's Opinions. In: *Mediatheque*. 2006. N 3, 27-33. 2007. N 1, 26-33.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Violence and Young Audience (NGO Russian Association for Film and Media Education Survey). In: *International NGO Journal*. Vol. 2 (3), 041-050.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Model of Pedagogical University Students' Media Competence and Critical Thinking Development on the Media Education Lessons. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 7, 107-116.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). NGO – Russian Association for Film and Media Education: Experts' Discussion. In: *International NGO Journal*. Vol. 2 (1), 012-026.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Russian Teachers' Attitudes to the Problem of Media Education of Pupils and University Students. In: *The Good, the Bad and Anexpected: The User and the future of Information and Communication Technologies*. Moscow: Cost and European Science Foundation, 2007.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Teachers' Attitude to Screen Violence. In: *Pedagogical Diagnostic*. 2007. N 2, pp.129-139.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Technology Development of University Students' Media Competence and Critical & Creative Thinking in the Media Education Process. In: *Young and Society*. 2007. N 2, 112-135.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). The Comparative Analysis of levels of the Development Levels of Media Literacy of Students. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 1, 43-75.
- Fedorov, A., Chelysheva, I. (2007). Comparative Analysis of Media Education Models. *Media Education*. 2007 N 2, pp.52-86.
- Fedorov, A. (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.
- Fedorov A.V. (2006). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *Mediateka*. 2006. N 1, 40-41.
- Fedorov A.V., Novikova A.A. (2006). Media Education in the USA: Methodical Approaches. In: *USA and Canada: Economy – Policy – Culture*. N 1, 110-119.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Analys of Media Stereotypes on Media Education Lessons in Student's Audience. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 6, 24-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Brief Dictionary of Media Education. In: *Mediatheque*, N 2, 33-37. N 3, 27-30.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Classification Levels of Development of the Professional Knowledge and the Skills Necessary for Teachers' Media Education Activity. In: *Innovational Educational Technologies*, N 4, 44-50.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Media Education of Schoolboys and Students: What Teachers Think about his Problem? In: *Innovational Educational Technologies*. N 3, 3-12.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). The Integrated Media Education at the Russian School: Analysis of the Obligatory Content's Minimum. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2006. N 2, 5-13.
- Fedorov, A. (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, pp.25-30.
- Fedorov, A. V. (2006). Media Education: Creative Tasks for Students and Pupils. In: *Innovative Educational Technologies*. N 4, 175-228.
- Fedorov, A. V. (2006). School Teachers and the Problem of Violence on the Screen. In: *Innovative Educational Technologies*. N 1, 35-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). A.V.Sharikov – The Pioneer of Russian Media Education. In: *Art and Education*. N 6, 67-79.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Audiovisual Creativity and Screen Culture: Media Education Aspects. In: *Media Education*, N 1, 117-120.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Audiovisual Media and Protection of Child's Rights (Media Education as One of Ways of the Opposition to Negative Influence of Screen Violence on a Minor Audience). In: *Innovational Educational Technologies* . 2005. N 4, 46-51.

- Fedorov, A. (2005). From Reading Books - to Reading of Media Texts. In: *School Library*, N 4, 30-33.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education in Australia. In: *Media Education*, N 1, 103-106.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. In: *Media Education*, N 2, 97-106.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education in Scandinavia. In: *Media Education*, N 3, 96-101.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education, Chemistry and ... In: *Media Education*, N 2, 109-111.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education, Media Literacy, Media Criticism and Media Culture. In: *Higher Education in Russia*, N 6, 134-138.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Pilot Volume of «Screen»: Opinions of the Russian students. In: *Media Education*, N 2, 87-96.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. In: *Media Education Journal*. (Scotland). N 37, 20-21.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Russian Teachers' Attitude to the Problem of Media Education of Pupils and University Students. In: *AAN Quaterly*. 2005. N 2, pp.3, 11-14. <http://www.aeroforum.org>
- Fedorov, A. (2005). School Students and Computer Games with Screen Violence. In: *Russian Education and Society*. (USA). Vol. 47. N 11, 88-96.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). The Basic Tendencies of Western Media Education Development in 70s-80s of XX Century. In: *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, 1, 180-191.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). In: *Mediaenimpulse* (Austria), N 12, 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). I.S.Levshina: Film Critic and Educator. In: *Art & Education*. N 6, 75-79.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Kurgan's School: From film Education to Media Education. In: *Art & Education*. N 4, 52-70.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Media Education on S.N.Penzin. In: *Art & Education*. N 3, 64-74.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). O.A.Baranov: From Film-club to University. In: *Art & Education*. N 2, 58-66.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Revolutionary & Class Violence on the Screen. In: *Kino-kolo* (Ukraine). N 22, 40-45.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Russian Children and the Problem of Media Regulation. In: *News from ICCVOS*, N 1, 11-13.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Students and Computer Games with "Screen Violence". In: *Pedagogica*, N 6, 45-49.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Influence of TV & Screen Violence on the American Children Audience. In: *U.S. and Canada: Economics, Policy and Culture*, N 1, 77-93.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Right of the Child and Violence on the Screen. In: *Monitoring*, N 2, 87-93.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). The Specific Nature of Media Education for Students of Teachers Training Institutes. In: *Pedagogica*, N 4, 43-51.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Violence on the Screen. In: *Chelovek*, N 5.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Violence on the Screen. In: *Media Critic*. N 6, 28-32.
- Fedorov, A., and Chelysheva, I. (2004). Media Education in the Modern Russia: the Basic Models. In: *High Education in Russia*, N 8, 34-39.
- Fedorov, A., Novikova, A. (2004). Media Education in the USA and Canada. In: *U.S. and Canada: Economics, Policy and Culture*, N 9, 96-104.
- Gilbert, L., Fedorov, A. (2004). A Model for Media Education Research in Russia and the US. In: *Educational Media International*, Vol. 41, N 2, 157-162.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Comparative Pedagogic: Media Education in France. In: *Pedagogica*, N 5, 90-96.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. In: *Tilt* (Norway), N 4, 22-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Criticism in Russia: Problems and Prospects. In: *Philological Review of Rostov State University*, N 1, 69-70.



- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education in the Context of Dialogue of Cultures' Theory. In: *School Technologies*. N 3, 212-126.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education of Y.N.Usov. In: *Art & Education*, N 3, 65-74. & N 4, 78-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Mediebegivenheter I Washington. In: *Tilt* (Norway), N 3, 27-28.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). The Practice of Restrictions of Violence on the American Screen. In: *Kino-Kolo*. N 20, 103-105.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Youth Audience and Problem of Screen Violence. In: *Kino-Kolo*. N 20, 86-103.
- Kubyshevskiy, A. & Fedorov, A. (2003). Kennan Institute – The Bridge between Russia and America. In: *Kennan Institute's Vestnik in Russia*, N 4, 17-20.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Film Art and Art Education. In: *Pedagogica*, N 2, 21-26.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Belgium. In: *Distance & Virtual Education*, N 6, 53-56.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Belgium. In: *Pedagogica*, N 1, 97-99.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Canada. In: *Higher Education in Russia*, N 1, 116-118.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Russia. In: *Alma Mater*. N 7, 29-32.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Problems of Media Perception and Audience's Development in the Area of Media Culture. In: *Practical Psychology*, N 2, 84-89.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Russian Cinema: Very Short History. In: *Total DVD*, N 5, 38-45.
- Fedorov, A. & Novikova, A. (2002). Basic Theoretical Conceptions of Media Education. In: *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, 149-158.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). A Russian Perspective. In: *Educommunication* (Belgium), N 55, 92-95.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Data/Videospill: Medievold og Tenaringer. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 2, p.41.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media and Media Education. In: *Alma Mater*, N 11, 15-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Media Education in France. In: *Alma Mater*, N 3, 46-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Problems of Audiovisual Perception. In: *Art & Education*, N 2, 57-64.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Russisk Medieundervisning I Informasjons-Alderen. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 1, 36-37.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. In: *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, 1, 131-145.
- Fedorov, A. (2001). Von der Filmpadagogie zur Medienpädagogik. In: *MERZ: Medien + Merziehung* (Germany), N 4, 256-261.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Cinema & Education. In: *Vstrecha*, N 1, p.20.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Cinema-Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Arts Education. In: *International Research Forum on Children and Media* (Australia), N9, p.5.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 4, 38-41.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Media Education in Russia: Past and Present. In: *International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen* (UNESCO), N 2, p.7.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen: Social Influence of Screen Violence for the Russian Young People. In: *International Research Forum on Children and Media* (Australia), N 9, p.5.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Students' Perception of Media Screen Arts. In: *Science & Education of Trans-Ural*, N 1, 190-193.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Summit 2000: Children, Youth, and the Media Beyond the Millennium. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 2, 6-8.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. In: *Art & Education*, N 2, 33-38.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Ungdom og Russisk Filmvold. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 1, 16-23.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Violence in Russian Films and Programs. In: *International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen* (UNESCO), N 2, p.5.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). Violence on the Screen. In: *Vstrecha*, N 9, p.16.

- Fedorov, A. (1999). Advanced Course for Final Year Undergraduate Students – The Mass and Individual Terror in the Mirror of the Russian Cinema-Art. In: *International Research Forum on Children and Media* (Australia), N 8, p.16.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Russian Teenagers and Violence on the Screen. In: *International Research Forum on Children and Media* (Australia), N 8, p.10.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? In: *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, 141-142.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Creative Tasks in the System of Education of Future Teachers on the Material of Screen Arts. In: *Science and Education of Transural*, N 3-4, 124-127.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). The Rights of the Child and Problem of Violence on the Russian Screen. In: *International Research Forum on Children and Media* (Australia), N8, p.16.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Vold pa Skjermen: Social Paverkning pa Russisk Ungdom. In: *Media I Skole og Samfunn* (Norway), N 5, 37-39.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). From Boarding School to Nuthouse. In: *Audience* (USA), N 199, 19-21.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). Kanadisk Medie-Kunnskapsbok. In: *Media I Skolen* (Norway), N 4, p.39.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). Medieundervising for Russiske Studenter. In: *Media I Skolen* (Norway), N 3, p.40.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). Montreal Festival of Telescience. In: *Audience* (USA), N 199, p.21.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). Screening Images. In: *Media I Skolen* (Norway), N 5, 58-59.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). The Youth Cinema-Wave: High Tides & Low Tides. In: *Vstrecha*, N 1, p.26.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). TV-Cinema: The Score 10: 0 ?. In: *Vstrecha*, N 5, p.13.
- Fedorov, A. (1997). America, America. In: *Cineaste*, XXII, N 4, p.62.
- Fedorov, A. (1997). The UN's New Media Movement. In: *Audience* (USA), N 196, p.40.
- Fedorov, A. (1997). Ungdom og Mediaer I Morgen: Problemer og Fremtidsutsikter. In: *Media I Skolen* (Norway), N 3, 12-13.
- Fedorov, A. (1997). Young People and Media: Problems and Perspectives. In: *Vstrecha*, N11, p.44.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. In: *Audience* (USA), N 186, 14-16.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Festival of Geneva. In: *Audience* (USA), N 192, p.9.
- Fedorov, A. (1996). Videopirates. In: *Audience* (USA), N 187, 2-4.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). A Nightmares on Fridays and the Other Days. In: *Video Ace Premiere*, N 26, 142-143.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. In: *Audience* (USA), N 184, 40-41.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. In: *Audience* (USA), N 183, 15-17.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). Russiske Studenter Kino og TV Preferanser. In: *Media I Skolen*, N 4, 54-56.
- Fedorov, A. (1995). The Road is Everywhere for Youth. In: *Video Ace Premiere*, N 25, 90-91. N 26, p.58. N 27, 104-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1994). Oberhausen: The Experimental Cinema Live. In: *Video Ace Express*, N 28, 4-5.
- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. In: *Audience* (USA), N 179, 20-22.
- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Training of Students of the Pedagogical Institutes for Aesthetic Education of Students Youth. In: *Specialist*, N 1, 15-19.
- Fedorov, A. (1993). Les Dernieres-nees. In: *Les Revues de Cinema dans le monde*. Paris: Cinemaction-Corlet-Telerama, p.136.
- Fedorov, A. (1992). C'est pas du cinema. In: *Panoramiques* (France), N 6, p.118.
- Fedorov, A. (1992). Les Gaietes mortelles de l'armee rouge. In: *Panoramiques* (France), N 6, 116-117.
- Fedorov, A. (1992). Red Alert. In: *Film Threat* (USA), N 6, p.13.
- Fedorov, A. (1990). The Cinema-pedagogues, and not the Cinema- dilettantes. In: *Kinomechanic*, 12, 7-8.
- Fedorov, A. (1989). Can it Really Been Amusement Only? In: *Kinomechanic*, N 12, 5-6.
- Fedorov, A. (1989). There is Not Only the Cinema in Life. In: *Kinomechanic*, N 3, 12-15.
- Fedorov, A. (1988). And the Problems are the Same. In: *Kinomechanic*, N 7, 2-4.

- Fedorov, A. (1988). Film Education: Yesterday, Today and... In: *Kinomechanic*, N 2, p.18.
- Fedorov, A. (1988). Help the Pedagogues. In: *Sov.Ecran*, N 15, p.17.
- Fedorov, A. (1988). I can Talk. *Kino*, N 8, 12-13.
- Fedorov, A. (1988). The Video Hall or Video-Club? In: *Kinomechanic*, N 10, pp.6-7.
- Fedorov, A. (1987). The Unseen Masterpieces: Still or Yet? In: *Cinema Art*, N 3, 87-89.

**Books Chapters:**

- Fedorov A. (2007). Content Analysis on the Media Education Lessons. In: Gudilina, S.I., Tikhomirova, K.M. and Rudakova T.D. (Eds.). *Educational Technologies of XXI*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 163-165.
- Fedorov A. (2006). Classification of Development Levels of the Professional Knowledge & Skills Necessary for Teachers' Media Education Activities. In: A.P.Trjapitsyna, N.A.Labunskaja, I.V.Gladkaja (Eds.). *Social Importance of Pedagogical Departments in the Preparation of Specialists of the Education System of Changed Russia* S-Peterburg: Edition of S-Petersburg State Pedagogical University, 323-332.
- Fedorov A. (2006). Classification of Media Literacy Development Levels of Pedagogical University Students. In: *Journalism in 2005: Transformation of Media Models in the Post-Soviet Space*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 2006, 549-551.
- Fedorov A.V. (2006). Classification of Development Levels of the Professional Knowledge & Skills Necessary for Teachers' Media Education Activities. In: *E-Citizen: The Electronic Citizen*. CD. Moscow: ECDL. ICOS UNESCO IFAP (Russia), 2006.
- Fedorov, A. University Media Education Programs: Comparative Analysis. In: Akperov, I. (Ed.). *Education and Science – the Basic Resource of XXI*. Rostov: Institute of Management, Business and Law, 558-562.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Classification of Audience's Media Literacy Levels. In: Gudilina, S.I., Tikhomirova, K.M. and Rudakova T.D. (Eds.). *Educational Technologies of XXI*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 18-26.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Media Education Technologies in the Modern University. In: Razlogov, K., Kirillova, N. (Eds.). *Screen Culture in Modern Media Space*. Moscow, 2006, 182-198.
- Fedorov, A. (2006). Substantiation of Media Education Model for the Future Teachers//*The Educational Environment Today and Tomorrow*. Moscow, 2006.
- Fedorov, A.,Novikova, A. (2006). Key Theories of Media Education. In: S.Korkonosenko (Ed.). *Teaching Journalism: Opinions and Experience*. St-Petersburg, 51-84.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Media Education and Media Literacy in Knowledge Societies. In: *UNESCO Between Two Phases of World Summit on the Information Society*. Moscow: Institute of Information Society, 2005, 273-283.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Teachers' Attitude to the Problem of Students' Media Education. In: *Education in the Culture Space*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, 259-277.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). Teachers' Attitude to the Problem of Students' Media Education. In: Gudilina, S.I., Tikhomirova, K.M. and Rudakova T.D. (Eds.). *Educational Technologies of XXI*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Education, 84-97.
- Fedorov, A. (2005). The Possibilities of Limitation and Control of Screen Violence. In: *Journalism 2004: Media in the Multi-polarity World*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 61-63.
- Fedorov, A. (2004). Media Education and Media Criticism in the Russian Modern Society. In: *Journalism in 2003: Findings and Losses, Strategy of Development*. Moscow: Moscow State University, 38-39.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2004). Violence Problem on the American and Russian Screen. In: *Americana*. Vol.6. Volgograd: Volgograd State University, 292-305.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Canadian Media Education: Yesterday and Now. In: Kubyshkin, A. (Ed.) (2003). *Representation of Canada*. Vol.2. Volgograd: Volgograd State University, 143-153.
- Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO.

- Fedorov, A. (2002). Film Art in the Structure of Modern Russian Education. In: *University Science in the Begin of XXI Century: Humanity Vector*. Ekaterinburg: Ural University, 212-214.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Modern Russia. In: Habor, N. (Ed.). *Media-Attack*. Lviv (Ukraine): Media Center 'New Journalism, 41-47.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Opinion of S.Penzin. In: *Penzin Stal Nikanorovich*. Voronezh: Voronezh State University, 21-30.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Education in Secondary School in Russia. In: Hart, A, & Suss, D. (Eds.) *Media Education in 12 European Countries*. Zurich: The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 100-110.
- Fedorov, A. (2002). Media Literacy in Modern Russia. In: Fedorov, A. (Ed.). *Modern Media Education Content & Management*. Moscow: State University of Management, 50-56.
- Fedorov, A. (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, 21.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Cinema Art in the Structure of Russian Modern Media Education. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, 100-105.
- Fedorov, A. (1999). Media Education in Russia. In: *Educating for the Media and Digital Age*. Vienna: Austrian Federal Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs & UNESCO, 93-95.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). Media Education of Russian Students on the Material of the Media-Screen Arts. In: *Revista de Ciencia e Tecnologia: International Congress on Communication and Education* (Brazil, Sao Paulo), n 2, file 003.
- Fedorov, A. (1998). The Problem of Aesthetic Education of Students' Youth on the Screen Arts' Material. In: *Psychological & Pedagogical Problems of the Personality's Formation in the Education Systems*. Moscow: International Academy of Education, 129-138.
- Fedorov, A. (1997). The Cinema and TV Preferences of Russian Students. In: *Les jeune et les medias demain: Problematiques et perspectives*. Paris: UNESCO-GRREM, 16.
- Fedorov, A. (1994). The Screen Arts and Young Spectators. In: *The Means of Communication and the Problems of development Child's Personality*. Moscow: UNPRESS, 55-57.
- Fedorov, A. (1993). The Screen Arts and the Students Youth. In: *The Problems of Film Education Now*. Moscow: Association for Media Education, 100-104.