

Alexander Fedorov

**Media Education:
Sociology Surveys**

Fedorov, Alexander. Media Education: Sociology Surveys. Taganrog: Kuchma Publishing House, 2007. 95 p.

ISBN 978-5-98517-054-2.

This book includes the results of sociology surveys about media education and media influence.

© **Alexander Fedorov.**

Creation of this text was supported by:

Russian Foundation for Humanities (RGNF), grant N 01-06-00027a; Council of the President of the Russian Federation for the Leading Research Groups of Russia (the leader of the project is Prof. A.Fedorov, grant NSH-657.2003.6), the Program of Individual Research of The John and Catherine MacArthur Foundation (grant N 03-77894-000-GSS) and 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 Critical Thinking and Media Literacy of Students in a Pedagogical Institute in the Framework of the Specialization “Media Education” (03.13.30).

Content

1.	Media Education/Literacy: The Analyze of Experts' Opinions	
2.	Condition of Media Education Around the World: Analyze of Experts' Opinions	
3.	Condition of Media Education in Russia : Analyze of Experts' Opinions	
4.	The Development of Media Education in Modern Russia: Experts' Discussion	
5.	Russian Teachers' Attitudes to the Problem of Media Education of Pupils and University Students	
6.	Russian Teachers' Attitude Towards the Problem of Screen Violence	

© Alexander Fedorov 2007.

1. Media Education/Literacy: The Analyze of Experts' Opinions *

* Published in: Fedorov, A. (2003). Media Education and Media Literacy: Experts' Opinions. In: *MENTOR. A Media Education Curriculum for Teachers in the Mediterranean*. Paris: UNESCO. Creation of this text was supported by Russian Foundation for Humanities (RGNF), grant N 01-06-00027a.

Actuality, Aims and Methodology of the Survey

The Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia defines media education as the direction in pedagogic, promoting the study of “regularities of mass communications (press, television, radio, cinema, video, etc.). The main goals of media education are: to prepare the new generation for the living in the modern information world, for the perception of different information, to teach a person to understand it, realize the effects of its influence on the psychology, to master means of communication based on the non-verbal forms, with the help of technical means” [3]. Media education today is seen as the process of the personality’s development with the help of and on the material of the means of mass communications (media). It is aimed at the development of the culture of the intercourse with media, creative, communicative abilities, critical thinking, perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, teaching different forms of self expression with media technology. Media literacy, acquired in the result of this process, helps a person to actively use the resources of the information field of TV, radio, video, cinema, press, Internet [1, 8].

The important event in the history of the media education movement in Russia is the registration (by the Educational Methodical Unification of the Ministry of Education of the Russia Federation) of a new university specialization “Media Education” (03.13.30) in June 2002. The initiative came from our research group, supported by the grant of Russian Humanities Scientific Fund (grant N 01-06-00027a). In practice it means that for the first time in its history, media education in Russia gained an official status.

Still, in Russia as well as in foreign countries we can witness sort of the confusion of the terms of “media education” and “media literacy”. There are quite a few differences in theoretical approaches to media education, to distinguishing of the most important aims, objectives, means of introduction into the teaching process, etc. These are the reasons why we addressed to the leading Russian and foreign media educators asking them to answer the special survey aimed at the clearing up of the following questions:

- which of the well known definitions of media education and media literacy are supported the most among the experts;
- what media education aims and theories seem as the most important;
- how these theories and purposes correspond to the modern socio-cultural context of different countries;

-what way of the integration of the media education into schools and universities, supplementary educational and recreational institutions is seen as the most preferable;

-in what countries at the present time the level of the development of media education is the highest?

We are very grateful to all the Russian and foreign experts in the field of media education/literacy, who sent their answers. In the result we've collected data from 26 media educators from 10 countries:

Baranov, Oleg, Ph.D., Assoc.professor, Tver State Pedagogical Institute, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Chelysheva, Irina. Ph.D., Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Clarembeaux, Michel, Director of Liege Audiovisual Center (Belgium);

Cornell, Richard, Ed.D., Professor and Coordinator, College of Education, University of Central Florida), former president of International Council for Educational Media (USA);

Gomes, Jose Ignacio, Ph.D., professor, director of Grupo Comunicar, Universida de Huelva (Spain);

Goodman, Steven, Executive Director of Educational Video Center, New York City (USA);

Gura, Valery. Ph.D., professor, Taganrog State Pedagogical), member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Gutierrez Martin, Alfonso, PhD., University of Valladolid (Spain);

Korochensky, Alexander, Ph.D., professor of Rostov State University), member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Krucsay, Susanne, Head of department Media Pedagogy/Educational Media/Media Service in the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (Austria);

Lemish, Dafna, Ph.D., professor, Chair, Department of Communication, Tel Aviv University (Israel);

McMahon, Barrie, Curriculum Manager Post-compulsory Education, Department of Education and Training, Western Australia;

Monastyrsky, Valery, Ph.D., professor, vice-director of Institute of Social Science, Tambov State Pedagogical University), member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Novikova, Anastassia, Ph.D., member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Penzin, Stal, Ph.D., assoc.professor, Voronezh State University, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Pungente, John, president of CAMEO (Canadian Association of Media Education Organisations), director of Jesuit Communication Project, Toronto (Canada);

Rother, Irving/Lee, Ph.D, president of Association for Media Education in Quebec (AMEQ); Board member Canadian Association for Media Education Organisations (Canada);

Ryzich, Natalia, media educator, Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Shak, Tatiana, Ph.D., assoc. professor, Krasnodar State University of Culture & Arts, Head of the Center of Musical & Information Technologies, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia);

Suess, Daniel, Ph.D., professor, University of Zurich and Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (Switzerland);

Torres, Miguel Reyes, Ph.D., professor, director of CIME - Media Education Investigation Center, coordinator Master Degree in media education, University Playa Ancha (Chili);

Tyner, Kathleen, Lead Researcher, Hi-Beam Consulting (San Francisco), Program Director of the Youth Media Initiative of the National Alliance of Media Arts and Culture (USA);

Usenko, Leonid, Ph.D, professor of Rostov State Pedagogical University, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia).

Wei, Bu, Ph.D., professor of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (China);

Worsnop, Chistopher, one of the North American leader in media education (Canada);

Yakushina, Ekaterina, Ph.D., Russian Academy of Education, member of Russian Association for Film & Media Education (Russia).

The questionnaire combined the questions of the open and closed types. The results show that experts answered the open type questions less willingly than those that required choice among variants, that just corresponds to the general tendency of sociological surveys. Respondents tend to economize their time and as a rule seldom give long answers.

Media education, media literacy, media studies

So, the first point of our questionnaire offered to the experts three variants of the definitions of media education (published during the past years by the authoritative editions), that they were supposed agree or disagree with. As a result it turned out that the majority of experts (96,15%) supported the first definition (Chart 1). Evidently, this definition developed by the UNESCO conference seemed to the experts as the most convincing and complete.

Chart 1. The experts' attitude to variants of definitions of media education

N	Definitions of Media Education :	Numbers of experts, who basically agree with the given definition:	Numbers of experts, who basically disagree with the given definition:
1	<p>“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; -ensure 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. 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].</p>	25 (96,15%)	1 (3,85%)
2	<p>“Media teachers today use the term ‘media education’, ‘media study’ and ‘media literacy’ almost interchangeably. My personal preference is to use the term ‘media education’ as a broad description of all that takes place in media-oriented classroom. ... “Media literacy” is the outcome of work in either media education or media study. The more you learn about or through the media, the more media literacy you have: media literacy is the skills of experiencing, interpreting/analyzing and making media products” [Worsnop, C. Screening Images: Ideas for Media Education (1999). Mississauga, Ontario: Wright Communications, p.x).</p>	17 (65,38%)	7 (26,92%)
3	<p>“Media education” is teaching <i>about</i> media, as distinguished from teaching <i>with</i> media. Ordinarily, media education emphasizes the acquisition both of cognitive knowledge about how media are produced and distributed and of analytic skills for interpreting and valuing media content. In contrast, ‘media studies’ ordinarily emphasize hands-on experiences with media production” [<i>International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 14 / Eds.N.J.Smelser & P.B.Baltes. Oxford, 2001, p.9494</i>].</p>	12 (46,15%)	11(42,31%)

The number of experts, who suggested another definition turned out minimal (2 respondents). However, T.Shak wrote that it’s a “process of media study and study with the help of media, the result of which is the ability to 1) analyze, critically comprehend and create media texts; 2)distinguish the sources of media texts, their political, social, commercial and /or cultural interest, their context; 3) interpret media texts and values spread by media; 4) choose the correspondent

media for the creation and dissemination of one's own media texts and find the target audience; 5) get the opportunity for the free access to media both for perception and for production”.

In his turn, A.Guterrez Martin suggests his definition of multimedia education: “I have referred to multimedia education as that which, making use of prevailing technologies of the day, allows students to achieve those skills, knowledge and attitudes needed to : communicate (interpret and produce messages) utilizing different languages and media; develop personal autonomy and a critical spirit, which gives them the ability to... form a just and multicultural society in which to live side by side with the technological innovations of the day” [2,12].

In our opinion, the definitions by A.Guterrez Martin and T.Shak do not contradict the UNESCO definition, giving some variations and amplifications.

The second point of our questionnaire offered three variants of the definitions of media literacy to choose from or disagree (Chart 2).

Chart 2. The experts' attitude to variants of definitions of media literacy

N	Definitions of Media Literacy:	Numbers of experts, who basically agree with the given definition:	Numbers of experts, who basically disagree with the given definition:
1	“ Media literacy proponents contend that the concept an active, not passive user: The media-literate person is capable recipient and creator of content, understanding sociopolitical context, and using codes and representational systems effectively to live responsibly in society and the world at large” [<i>International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 14 / Eds.N.J.Smelser & P.B.Baltes. Oxford, 2001, p.9494</i>].	17(65,38%)	6(23,08%)
2	“ Media literacy , the movement to expand notions of literacy to include the powerful post-print media that dominate our informational landscape, helps people understand, produce, and negotiate meanings in a culture made up of powerful images, words, and sounds. A media-literate person – everyone should have the opportunity to become one – can decode, evaluate, analyze, and produce both print and electronic media” [<i>Aufderheide, P., Firestone, C. Media Literacy: A Report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy. Queenstown, MD: The Aspen Institute, 1993, p.1.</i>].	16 (61,54%)	6(23,08%)
3	“Definition for media literacy : “the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate messages in a variety of forms” [<i>Kubey, R. Media Education: Portraits of an Evolving Field. In: Kubey, R. (Ed.) Media Literacy in the Information Age. – New Brunswick & London: Transaction Publishers, 1997, p. 2</i>].	12(46,15%)	9(34,61%)

As we can see, there is a rather even distribution of voices between the three definitions of media literacy. Some experts proposed other definitions:

-“media literacy as the result of media education is the ability to adequately percept, interpret, evaluate and create media texts” (V.Monastyrsky);

-“Multimedia literacy. More immediate objectives of multimedia literacy include: to provide knowledge of the languages that shape interactive multimedia documents and the way they are constructed; to provide knowledge and use of the most prevalent devices and techniques for processing information; to provide knowledge and facilitate the assessment of the social and cultural implications of new multimedia technologies; to foster an attitude of critical media reception and responsible behavior in the public sphere” (A.Gutierrez Martin).

-“To be media literate is to have an informed and critical understanding of the nature, techniques and impact of the mass media as well as the ability to create media products” (J.Pungente).

As we see, the boundary between the media education and media literacy sometimes is rather blur both in the definitions included into the chart and in the expanded answers of the experts. Since these terms are often substituted with each other, by our third question we tried to find out if the experts see the difference in such commonly used notions as “media education”, “media literacy” and “media studies”?

As the result it turned out that just 2 respondents (B.McMahon, B.Wei) do not differentiate these terms, while the rest of them think that:

-a matter of context...depends on how the term is used and toward what purposes (R.Cornell);

-Media education is the process of teaching about print, electronic and digital media. Although ‘media studies’ has been used to distinguish itself from ‘media education’, the difference seems doctrinaire, artificial and inconsequential to the understanding of media teaching and learning. Media literacy implies the complex outcome of ‘literacy’. It is an imprecise and confusing term and does little to define the field. I prefer ‘media education’ (K.Tyner);

-‘media education’ is a cross-curricular/trans-curricular approach to be taken up in each subject; ‘media literacy’ refers to an overall ability/competence; ‘media studies’ is a discipline in its own right whose topic are media and all the implications connected to them (S.Krucsay);

-‘media education’ is basically an educational approach to media it is more comprehensive, ‘media literacy’ is basically alphabetization to visual codes. ‘Media studies’ are linked with the knowledge of mass media for technical, political, social, or educational or different purposes (M.Reyes Torres);

-Media education includes media studies and media literacy (N.Ryzhih, I.Chelysheva, J.I.Gomez);

-Media literacy is the result of the process of media education, media literacy is the intended outcome of media education” (S.Penzin, V.Gura, A.Korochenskyi, V.Monastyrsky, T.Shak, Ch.Worsnop, J.Pungente, L.Rother, D.Suess);

-Media studies is the main way to practical mastering of media facilities (V.Monastyrsky);

-‘media studies’ are less normative than ‘media education’, it can be a more descriptive approach to media (D.Suess);

-‘media studies’ is focussed on the acquisition of cognitive knowledge about media. Media education is focussed on the development of attitudes and critical skills about media. Media Literacy includes the basics of Media Studies and Media Education to provide the student with the ability to participate freely in the society (A.Gutierrez Martin);

-‘media literacy’ and ‘media studies’ often implies the critical analysis of media but not the production, whereas ‘media education’ usually embraces both analysis and production (S.Goodman).

There are both the common stands and certain disagreement, blending of the essence of the terms media education, media literacy and media studies in the answers of the experts. In this sense the most expanded answer to the problem was given by the Canadian media educator I.Rother: “Over the last decade the terms Media Education, Media Studies and Media Literacy have been used almost interchangeably by media educators in North America, Britain and Australia. The following distinctions have been adapted from Silverblatt (1995); Masterman (1985); Worsnop (1994); Buckingham (1993); Lusted (1991); Moore (1991); Media Education in Britain: An Outline (1989):

Media Education includes:

- using media across the curriculum application;
- a topic within another subject;
- develops critical understanding of media through analytical and practical work
- includes teaching about the forms, conventions and technologies;
- includes teaching about media institutions, and their social, political and cultural roles;
- places emphasis upon student's experience of the media and their relevance to their own lives;
- themes and project work;
- borrows from audio-visual literacy and English Language/Arts North American influence.

Media Studies includes:

- a cross-media application;
- a theoretical application of the media;
- a conceptual framework;
- incorporates analysis of a message delivered by the media and the techniques used to create that message;
- borrows from communication, film and cultural studies;
- British, Australian and European influence.

Media Literacy builds on the following outcomes of Media Education and media studies:

- an awareness of the impact of media on the individual and society;
- an understanding of the process of mass communication;
- the ability to analyse and discuss media messages;
- an awareness of media context as a text that provides recognition of culture;
- production and analysis skills;
- traditional and non-traditional literacy skills;
- an enriched enjoyment, understanding and appreciation of media content.

Media Literacy: Teaching Through/About Media. There has also been confusion about teaching through media and teaching about media. Duncan (1993) states that teaching through the media, while concerned with the language of media, primarily focuses on using media as a vehicle to initiate discussion or as a motivator for Language Arts classes. In other words, in teaching through the media, teachers use the media as a delivery system for subject content. No attempt to examine the delivery system itself is made.

In teaching about the media, the delivery system, i.e. the medium and the message, are examined. Teaching about the media stems from the notion that media shape the world in which we live and therefore it is becoming increasingly important for students to understand the infrastructures of society. Media Education explores the media within a sociopolitical framework through analysis and production. This includes preparing students to understand the production and dissemination of information, the growth of media industry, the development of commercially based media, the role of advertising, and audience negotiation of print and non-print text“(I.Rother).

We share the opinion of Ch.Worsnop, V.Gura, V.Monastyrsky, A.Korochensky, J.Pungente, S.Penzin, I.Rother, D.Suess, T.Shak and others who consider that media literacy is the intended outcome of media education. However, we also pay attention to the opinion of D.Lemish who says that “originally there was a difference, with media education being more a wider concept and media literacy perceived as being more a specific translation of critical analysis of media. Media studies was more an academic term for theoretical studies. I think today it is almost impossible and unnecessary to separate between them. Therefore in my mind today they are interchangeable, and it is not beneficial to try to theoretically make a distinction. This is also the reason why I accepted all of the above definitions of media education and media literacy because I think they are either complementary or saying the same thing in different ways. It does not seem to me to be critical to agree on a very specific definition of such a wide field” (D.Lemish).

The Main Media Educational Purposes

Our next question dealt with the rating of the main media educational purposes. Undoubtedly, the wording of the question itself made it somewhat vulnerable. For example, one of the leading British media educators Cary Bazalgette in her letter concerning our survey expressed her doubts in the rightfulness of the attempt to single out the most important aim of media education: “But surely different priorities apply in different contexts? Designing an examination course for 16-18 year olds with a strong practical element in an 'arts' context to be taught by specialised teachers, will be quite different from designing a media education module for non-specialist teachers to use with 7-11 year olds in the context of traditional literacy teaching (both of these are real examples, from amongst many others, in the UK). In other words, what matters in media (or indeed any other sort) education is not the theory and the endless comparison of different policy documents, but the practical realities of developing accessible and teachable frameworks and resources for real learners and real teachers in real classrooms subject to real legislation and (probably) unreal political priorities. What media education theorists like to convince each other that they are doing is a lot less interesting than what - if anything - anyone actually learns” (C.Bazalgette).

Certainly, media educational goals can vary depending on the specific theme and objectives of a lesson, age of the students, theoretical basis, etc. However life shows that one way or another, many media educators can rather distinctly choose the most important aims for them. We offered them to give each of the 11 goals in

the chart below its place (with 1 - being the most important, 11 - the least important). Then each of the number was given the corresponding amount of points: 11 points for each first place, 10 points – for each second, and so on. The calculation of the average number of points let us define the final “score”. The results are presented in the Chart 3.

Chart 3. The experts’ attitude to the main purposes of media education/media literacy

<i>N</i>	The main purposes of media education/media literacy:	Average of the points given by experts for this purpose:
1	to develop person’s critical thinking/autonomy	241(84,27%)
2	to develop an appreciation, perception and understanding & analysis of media texts	197(68,88%)
3	to prepare people for the life in the democratic society	177(61,89%)
4	to develop an awareness of social, cultural, political and economic implications of media texts (as constructions of media agencies)	176(61,54%)
5	to decode media texts/messages	170(59,44%)
6	to develop person’s communicative abilities	164(57,34%)
7	to develop an appreciation and aesthetic perception, understanding of media texts, estimation of aesthetical quality of media texts	157(54,90%)
8	to teach a person to express him/herself with the help of media	154(53,85%)
9	to teach a person to identify, interpret, and experience a variety of techniques used to create media products/texts	143(50,00%)
10	to learn about the theory of media and media culture	137 (47,90%)
11	to learn about the history of media and media culture	108(37,76%)

The analysis of the data of the Chart 3 shows that media education experts consider all the above mentioned aims important, but mostly distinguishing the development of critical thinking/critical autonomy (84,27%), the development of appreciation, perception and understanding & analysis of media texts (68,88%) and the preparation of a student for living in the democratic society(61,89%). The outsiders of the rating became such goals as to learn about the theory and history of media and media culture (from 37,76% to 47,90%).

Just the two experts expressed the wish to add to the list of media educational goals. Thus, the Russian media educator A.Korochenskyi thinks that another main purpose is the development of creative skills of students (with the development of critical thinking and critical autonomy) and the American R.Cornell adds to the list the goal “to prepare media practitioners for a career in our field”.

It should be noted that the foreign experts on the whole gave a higher rating for the goal of preparing students for the life in the democratic society, while their Russian colleagues paid more attention to the goal of developing skills of perception (including the aesthetics), evaluation, understanding of media texts. Besides, experts from all the countries placed the aim of the development of critical thinking and critical autonomy in the first place.

Comparing our results with the results of the similar survey, conducted by A.Sharikov in 1990 (23 experts took part in it) [4, 50-51], we encounter the coincidence of the opinions concerning the importance of developing critical thinking abilities. But the high rating of the aim of the communicative abilities’ development, shown by the survey in 1990, didn’t repeat itself in our case.

The main theories of media education

The next question concerns what media education theories are considered most important by the experts. The results are present in Chart 4.

Chart 4. The experts' attitude to the main theories of media education/media literacy

N	The main theories of media education/media literacy	The number of the experts, preferring to base on the given theory:
1	Critical Thinking/Critical Autonomy/Critical Democratic Approach	22(84,61%)
2	Cultural Studies Approach	18(69,23%)
3	Sociocultural Approach	17(65,38%)
4	Semiotic Approach	15(57,69%)
5	Practical/Hands-On Production Approach	13(50,00%)
6	Aesthetical/Media as Popular Arts Approach	12(46,15%)
7	Ideological Approach	10(38,46%)
8	Uses an Gratifications Approach	8(30,77%)
9	Inoculatory/Protectionist/Hypodermic Needle/Civil Defense Approach	4(15,38%)

Besides the theories given in the chart, some experts added other approaches that could be the basis for the media educational process: ethical, religious (S.Penzin), instructional systems design (R.Cornell).

The overwhelming majority (84,61%) singled out the approach of critical thinking as the leading one (that totally correspond to the leadership of the analogous aim in the previous question). Then quite evenly follow the cultural studies (69,23%), sociocultural (65,39%) and semiotic (57,69%) approaches. Predictably, the least popular among the experts (15,38%) is the protectionist approach (that is concentrating on the protection of the audience from the harmful influence of media). Besides, foreign experts support the practical approach, uses as gratifications approach and ideological theory, while the Russian-give preference to the aesthetical approach. The aesthetical orientation of the Russian media education has a long time tradition, so the results just confirmed a well-known fact. In our opinion, the non-popularity of the ideological approach among the Russian experts is quite comprehensible too: Russian pedagogic, having experienced the strict ideological pressing, today is very negative about the ideology in the educational process, although, ideology still (in an obvious or concealed manner) remains the influential power in any society, and therefore cannot but be reflected in any educational processes.

Sociocultural situation

The question about the degree and the way of the influence of the social and cultural situation in the country of their residence on the aims and approaches of media education, was answered by the few experts. Ideally, we expected a developed answer, which of course requires more time and effort to give. So many experts confined themselves to general remarks, that did not clarify the correlation of the social and cultural situation and the media education goals and approaches (This is example of the typical answer: "Both social and cultural influences are inextricably linked to media education – they cannot (or should not) be studied in

isolation. High correlation between media education and sociology and culture, for sure!”).

Among the obtained answers the following factors of the social and cultural impact on the media education were mentioned:

-“Russia is on the threshold of the transition to the information society, that is why people must be prepared to actively participate in it” (V.Gura);

-“The spontaneous introduction to the media is fraught with the deformations in the sociocultural development of a personality (deformations of the values’ hierarchy in the cultural sphere, decrease of the cultural needs of the people, scarcity of the spiritual life, etc.) (V.Monastyrsky);

-“Commercialism of mass media, the strong State and corporative control of main media resources, the lack of public broadcasting, the lack of democratic civil pressures to mass media – it provokes (in Russia) the interest to Civil Defense Approach, Critical Thinking/Critical Autonomy/Critical Democratic Approach” (A.Korochensky).

-“Considering the abundance of foreign media in Russia and the globalisation of the teenage culture teachers can use the media education for the study of a native and a foreign culture, comparison, and appreciation”(A.Novikova);

“the authority of scientific knowledge is reduced, but we have the very much remembered information from mass-media (including advertising & Internet). Therefore on the first places I have put those moments which are connected to perception and a critical estimation of the information” (E.Yakushina);

-“sociocultural situation in Russia is connected to a muddy stream commercial media texts (first of all – American), that considerably complicates process of a media education” (L.Usenko);

-“In Switzerland we have a high degree of prosperity. Private homes, schools and firms are highly equipped with media. Therefore young people have to become media literate, to be able to participate in a postmodern media society and as citizens in a direct democracy. This democracy does only work if the citizens are able to evaluate media information appropriately and if they know where to find reliable knowledge. This is influenced by the scientific approaches which are dominant in our universities. Media Education as I understand it, is part of a social science. Media and communication research works with surveys and qualitative studies on media exposure, reception and on media effects. Media education is based on a democratic parenting style and tries to take into account the needs and educational tasks of young people in our pluralistic society” (D.Suess);

-“In the United States, content analysis takes precedent over the analysis of historical, economic, social and cultural contexts that shape the meaning of texts. Increasingly, media educators are expanding their analysis of media content to include these contexts. Because of the high integration and access to digital technology, as well as the American penchant for individualism, hands-on media production is a natural entry point for media education in the United States. In addition, cultural and social values related to equity and fairness make the issue of representation in media a priority for many media educators. Conversely, geographic pockets of political conservatism as well as ideological extremism of

both ends of the political spectrum, as well as the historical significance and tenacity of Puritanical social trends also favor widespread association of media education with inoculatory approaches to media” (K.Tyner);

-“Basically, Chinese culture doesn’t encourage person’s critical thinking, especially in children’s education. But in the information society, the critical thinking is very significant ability for every person. Actually, these theories have been not adopted into media education in China. Moreover, there is not formal media education in schools in China. So it is difficult to estimate social and cultural influence” (B.Weii).

As we can see, some media education specialists tried to bind the approaches and aims of media education with the social and cultural context of their countries, find grounds for the priorities. However in order to get a more complete and deep picture of this problem, no doubt, a long and substantial research, based on the comparative analysis, is necessary.

The Main Ways of the Introduction of Media Education

Further on the experts were asked to mark which way of the introduction of media education seemed more preferable – autonomous (for example, special courses, optional classes), integrated (into the traditional required school and university courses) or the synthetic (synthesis of the autonomous and integrated ways) (Chart 5).

Chart 5. The experts’ attitude to the main media education/media literacy’s introduction

N	The kinds of main media education/literacy’s introduction (in schools, universities, culture & entertainment centers, etc.):	<i>The number of the experts, preferring this kind of introduction:</i>
1	-synthetic way (autonomous + integrated ways);	16 (61,54%)
2	-integrated way (as part of ordinary education in the schools & universities);	8(30,77%)
3	-separate, autonomous way (as special courses, for examples);	2(7,69%)

As a result it turned out that the majority of experts (61,54%) consider the synthetic as the most acceptable way, combining the integration of media education into the obligatory courses with the autonomous special courses, electives, or clubs. For example, A.Korochenskyi is an active supporter of “synthetic, different forms (the part of formal education + special courses + media criticism as special field of journalism and civil activities). The education, including media education, must be a permanent part of the socialization and the life of a modern man in the condition of changing “information society” - from childhood to the old age” (A.Korochensky).

About twice as less are the advocates of just the integrated approach and completely little few (7,69%) supports an autonomous way only.

Media Education Today: The Leading Countries

In the upshot of the survey experts were asked to name the countries, where in their opinion the media education was developed on the highest level (Chart 6).

Chart 6. The list of the countries in which, in opinion of experts, the media education is on the highest level of development

N	The name of the country:	Number of experts in whose opinion the development of education in the given country is today at the highest level:
1	Canada	17(65,38%)
2	UK	16(61,54%)
3	Australia	11(42,31%)
4	France	7(26,92%)
5	USA	6(23,07%)
6	Russia	5(19,23%)

The answers did not show unexpected results. Canada, Great Britain, Australia, France and the USA are recognized leaders in media education. The rest of the voices divided (11, 54% for each); themselves more or less equally between some Western Europe countries (Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland) and Japan; Mexico, Taiwan & South Africa (7,69% for each), Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, Venezuela (3,85% for each).

In fact, achievements of Canada and Australia, where media education gained an official status at every secondary school, are known to media educators all over the world. The popularity of theoretical and practical ideas of the leading British, French and American media education professionals is also great. Media education in Scandinavia have traditionally strong positions. As for the Eastern European countries, the media education experience of Russia and Hungary is better known, while media educators from other countries know very little (partly because of the language barrier) about media education in Poland, Romania, the Czech Republic.

For many decades Russian media education enthusiasts were isolated from the world process of media education. Positive change in this direction began just 10-15 years ago. That is why we would like to hope that the results of our small research to some extent will help Russian media education practitioners and researchers think about the problems of the comparative analysis of media educational approaches in different countries.

Reference

1. Fedorov (2001) Media Education: History, Theory and Methods. Rostov: CVVR, 2001, 708 p.
2. Gutierrez Martin, A. (1996) Educacion Multimedia y Nuevas Tecnologias. Madrid. Ediciones de la Torre, p. 12.
3. Media Education (1993). In: Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia. Vol.1. Moscow: Big Russian Encyclopedia., p. 555.
4. Sharikov, A. (1990). Media Education: World and Russian Experience. Moscow: Academy of Education, p.50-51.

2. Condition of Media Education Around the World: Experts' Opinions*

* The article is written with support of 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 Critical Thinking and Media Literacy of Students in a Pedagogical Institute in the Framework of the Specialization "Media Education" (03.13.30). The research supervisor of the project is Dr.Prof. Alexander Fedorov.

The beginning of the XXI century marked the rise of the interest to media education in many countries. The last edition of Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia defines media education as the area in pedagogic, encouraging the study of "the mechanism and laws of mass communication (press, television, radio, cinema, video, etc.). The main objectives of media education are: to prepare the new generation for the modern information age, teach to perceive different kinds of information; to teach a child/ student to understand it, and realize the consequences of its impact on human mentality, to master different forms of communication including the nonverbal communication with the help of technical means" (1).

However the development of media education around the world is going on unevenly and faces all kinds of problems. Having this in mind, we asked the leading Russian and foreign media educations to answer the questionnaire in order to clarify the following questions:

1. What is the present condition of media education/literacy development in your country? What are the main achievements, failures, and problems?
2. Have any new tendencies in media education appeared in your country in the 21st century?
3. Could evidence from foreign experience help the development of media education in your country? If yes, which country's experiences would be useful? And how might it help?
4. Can modern media criticism become the ally of movement of media education? If yes, how?
5. Is it essential to introduce compulsory integrated or specialist media education courses in curricula of mainstream schools? Or would it be better to set up informal courses for general audiences?
6. Are there specialist "Media educator" courses in higher education in your country? If not, why? If yes, what kind(s) of courses are there and how were they set up?
7. What prospects are there for the development of media education/literacy in your country in the foreseeable future? What, in your opinion, are the essential first steps?

We are deeply thankful to all the experts in media education/literacy, who promptly wrote back. In the result our questions were answered by 25 specialists from 9 countries (note that the experts chose which questions to answer):

Frank Baker, Media Education Consultant, Webmaster for Media Literacy Clearinghouse (<http://medialit.med.sc.edu>). Columbia, USA

M.Ph. Cary Bazalgette, Education Policy Adviser, British Film Institute(<http://www.bfi.org.uk>). London, UK.

Dr. Elena Bondarenko, head of Media Education Laboratory, Russian Academy of Education (<http://www.mediaeducation.ru>), member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education. Moscow, Russia.

Prof.Dr. Richard Cornell, Emeritus Professor of Instructional Technology at the University of Central Florida in Orlando after having taught there for 35 years. Former President of the International Council for Educational Media (ICEM <http://www.icem-cime.org>), a NGO of UNESCO for five years and continues to serve the ICEM Executive in an advisory capacity. In 2006 he will complete three years as a member of the Board of Directors of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (<http://www.aect.org>). Orlando, USA.

Dr.Harald Gapski, Head of Project Development ECMC (European Centre for Media Competence (<http://www.ecmc.de>), Secretary of EENet, European Experts' Network for Education and Technology (<http://www.eenet.org>), Marl, Germany

Prof.Dr. Valery Gura, Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (<http://tgpi.ttn.ru>), Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>), member of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (<http://www.aect.org>).

Dr. Nikolai Hilko, Siberian Office of Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education(<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). Omsk, Russia.

Dr. Katia Hristova, University of National and World Economy, Sofia, Bulgaria.

Dr.Jenny Johnson, member of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (<http://www.aect.org>). USA.

Prof.Dr. David Klooster, Chair of Department of English, Hope College, Holland, one of the main authors of pedagogical journal 'Thinking Classroom' (<http://www.rwct.net>). Michigan, USA.

Victoria Kolesnichenko, Taganrog Radio-technical University, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). Taganrog, Russia.

Prof.Dr. Sergei Korkonosenko, professor of Faculty of Journalism, St-Petersburg State University, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). St.-Petersburg, Russia.

Prof.Dr. Alexander Korochensky, Dean of Faculty of Journalism, Belgorod State University (<http://www.bsu.edu.ru/Struktura/Fakultet/ZhurFak/>), Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). Belgorod, Russia

Susanne Krucsay, Head of Department, Ministry of Education, Vienna, Austria

Prof.Dr.Robert Kubey, director of the Center for Media Studies at Rutgers University, USA.

Dr.Geoff Lealand, professor of Screen and Media Studies, University of Waikato, New Zealand

Dr.Elena Murukina, Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education(<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>), Russia.

Dr. Anastasia Novikova, Taganrog Management and Economics Institute, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). Russia.

Prof.Dr. Konstantin Ognev, vice-rector of VGIK- All-Russian Institute of Cinematography, Moscow, Russia

Zurab Oshxneli, Director of the College of Media, Advertising and TV Arts, Tbilisi, Georgia.

Trygve Panhoff, former President of the Norwegian Media Education Association, editor of 'Tilt' a mediapedagogical magazine, Oslo, Norway.

Dr. Stal Penzin, professor of film studies at Voronezh State University, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). Voronezh, Russia.

Prof. Valery Prozorov, Dean of Faculty of Literature and Journalism, Saratov State University, Russia, member of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>), Saratov, Russia

Dr.Faith Rogow, the founding president of the Alliance for a Media Literate America (AMLA, <http://www.amlainfo.org>), on whose board she still serves. USA.

Dr.Elena Yastrebtseva, executive director and head of scientific development of Intel Program 'Education for Future' (<http://www.iteach.ru>), Moscow, Russia.

The answers to the first question: *What is the present condition of media education/literacy development in your country? What are the main achievements, failures, and problems?*

Frank Baker:

Media literacy education in the US is still very much fragmented: there are elements of media literacy in each of the 50 state's teaching standards, but media is not tested and so teachers don't teach it.

Cary Bazalgette:

I will interpret “your country” as England: you need to contact others in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, where conditions are different. In England (school population 9 million) some 70,000 young people take specialist, accredited media courses at General Certificate of Education (GCSE) at age 16, and in media or film study at Advanced Level General Certificate of Education at age 18. There are minor references to media education in the National Curriculum for 11-16 year olds, in subject English and in Citizenship. The National Literacy Strategy for 3-14 year olds makes some references to film and media, and an increasing amount of media is now taught in this context, though with variable quality. The main brake on development is Government fear that to endorse media education for everyone would be attacked by the rightwing press as lowering standards of education. It is thus difficult to get funding for research into media education, to set up initial teacher training for media teaching, and for teachers to get funding for professional development.

Elena Bondarenko:

The current state of media education in our country can be characterized in a nutshell as *formation*. The condition of media education is the consequence of the general condition of the information environment. By now the new information priorities and stable information communities have been formed. We can distinguish the leading areas of research-forms and types of media education, areas of development of the information culture, values and motivation in the sphere of media culture. A lot of things have changed since the mid 1990s, and it is only today that the process is becoming stabilized and foreseeable to some extent.

Richard Cornell:

Alex Fedorov, when asked to define “media education,” in a 2006 interview in the publication *Thinking Classroom*, “Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum”¹, he quotes the work of a number of educators around the world when answering the question: the UNESCO definition (1):

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;

¹ Published in the international journal *Thinking Classroom*, 2006. Vol.7, Number 3, pp. 25-30.

- 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.

The answer to Question 1, above, must reference which of the plethora of UNESCO definitions best applies. The short answer is that all of the above elements are deemed critical by some educators at all levels of education and training in the United States. Note the operative descriptor is “some.”

Americans, like many of their counterparts around the world, are increasingly subjected (bombarded?) to numerous media messages daily, with relatively few of them being directed at education. Those that are, especially those that are acted upon, increasingly are employing a variety of strategies that depend on sound instructional design so the accuracy of meaning and intent is maximized. The reality, however, is that far too few American educators are conversant with instructional design and its role in crafting accurate messages.

Instructional design principles evolved through systems theory, most likely first employed by engineers but soon picked up by teacher educators as being precisely what was needed to take teacher training out of the realm of vague goal setting and into the reality of concrete outcomes based on analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation.

To assume that teacher educators warmly embraced this systems approach would be inaccurate – teacher trainers resisted adoption of such a mechanistic approach to curriculum design and subsequent implementation of teaching strategies in their classrooms. This situation, however, is changing.

The point here is that media education depends on sound instructional design if it is to prove effective. This soundness must permeate all levels of the communication process and all levels of the above items depicted as being defined outcomes of media education.

While instructional design may, at least on the surface, appear to be mechanical, impersonal, and lock-step, just the opposite marks its characteristics; good instructional design starts with focus on the students, rather than the teacher, and everything that follows builds upon that premise.

So, if we were to assess the present condition of media education in the United States, it might best be described as being in process.

The good news about achieving sound media education practices is that Americans are now very critical of what is being written, heard, viewed, and experienced in the name of education. Such criticism is also spilling over to address inequities in the public, military, and corporate sectors as well. The rampant dependence upon annual mandated performance-based testing that sweeps across America, encouraged and abated by practices mandated through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), (always enthusiastically promoted by government

education bureaucrats but mainly and seriously under-funded by same) has left teachers in the public schools shell shocked and paralyzed as they scramble to teach to the test!

The resulting criticism about the rigidity of curriculum that is force-fed via teachers to students to meet the NCLB standards is now being resisted by many state governments. This resistance has encouraged a national dialogue related to national testing based on a “one-size-fits-all” model and gradually state legislators and departments of education are adopting evaluation methods that are, at least on the surface, more humane to both teachers and students.

The failure related to media education amidst all of this national testing frenzy is that few cogent media principles are addressed, not because teachers are unwilling to include them in their classes but because teaching to the test leaves little if any room for anything other than reading, science and mathematics. Art, music, vocational education, social sciences, and media analysis have been left hanging by tenuous threads that are continually unraveling to the breaking point. The mass media has reverted to being the media sans the masses, reflecting what those owning the major media conglomerates most want publicized and downplaying any news that might upset those in power.

With all such trends, there exist exceptions, not always held by the total news organization but increasingly by those within it who share different opinions. There is still freedom of the press but such freedom tends to feature media resources that are favored by either the economic or political elite. That America is fast becoming a divided nation of the rich and all the others is increasing apparent to growing numbers of commentators and analysts.

Harald Gapski:

Media education has been discussed in the context of education for decades (of course one can trace back reflections on the role of media (written word vs. spoken word) back to ancient philosophers). Recently, second half of last century, an important shift took place from "protection" to "empowerment". Producing, reflecting and creating different media formats can create media literate media consumers and users.

All states in Germany have developed concepts for media education in schools:

<http://www.bildungserver.de/zeigen.html?seite=2884>

During the last ten years the discussion on media was very much dominated by new, digital media: computer and Internet (ICT). The key word and the demand for "Medienkompetenz" marked the broad diffusion of ICT in society and in the educational sector in Germany. The problem is that whenever a new media appears in society there will be a demand for a new media education. We need a holistic approach which takes into account that every educational process always refers to media, be that books, films or computers. And we need to link media education to the concept of "life long learning" and "organizational learning".

Valery Gura:

In my opinion media education in Russia is on the upgrade. The Association for Film and Media Education is working purposefully. Thanks to the efforts of enthusiasts, and above all, Prof. Fedorov, the academic journal “Media Education”

has been set up, the specialization Media Education (03.13.30) is opened in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute. Media pedagogy is actively developing in the Urals and Siberia. However the role of media education as it had previously happened to computerization is underestimated. The problem hindering the spread of media education is to my mind the illiteracy and/or resistance of school teachers in this field, their inability to differentiate between using media as technical teaching aids and teaching about media.

Nikolai Hilko:

The current condition of media education can be assessed as less than satisfactory, even depressing. The major problem here is the misunderstanding of some part of young people, administration bodies, and some academicians of the essence of media education, the importance to establish the rational balance between the production and consumption of information.

Katia Hristova:

The term media literacy is still not widespread in Bulgaria. Only a few media scientists in their publications use it. Media literacy is not included as a subject in Bulgarian schools curriculum, nor it is recognized as an important mechanism for child prevention against the harmful influences of the TV content. According to the research “TV and the 6-10 years children” (Katia Hristova, dissertation, 2006) there are some serious gaps in the Bulgarian children media literacy.

Jenny Johnson:

Problems are financial.

David Klooster:

In my view, media education in the United States is sophisticated at the upper levels of graduate and undergraduate education in the universities, but it is not widely disseminated in primary and secondary schools. Thus, a small number of well educated specialists have deep and important knowledge, but this knowledge and critical ability are not widely shared by the general public. The media, especially television, film, and music, are very widely influential in American culture, but the general media education of our citizens is not especially sophisticated.

Victoria Kolesnichenko:

It is difficult to characterize the modern condition of media education objectively; nevertheless on the whole I believe it is worth positive evaluation.

Among the definite achievements are:

- launching web sites for media education since 2000 (<http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>, <http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru>, <http://www.mediaeducation.boom.ru>);
- getting an official status as a specialization in pedagogical institutes (since 2002);
- establishment and regular distribution of the new academic magazine *Media Education* (since 2005);
- growing number of monographs, teaching manuals, articles, dissertations related to ME;

-support of ME in Russia (since 2004) by the Russian Committee of the UNESCO program “Information for All” (<http://www.ifap.ru>) and the Moscow UNESCO Office.

The main challenge to my mind is that the society at large (including many official educational structures) is still not aware of the tangible necessity for the active integration of ME on a large scale.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

If we mean media education for masses, at least on the basic level of media literacy, then it is represented by the poorly coordinated actions of enthusiasts. There are plenty of examples of integration of media related courses into the school curriculum (the country is indeed very big). But by no means have they produced a system. The same is true for the higher education. Most typical here are the attempts to establish the societies or clubs of student journalists. Modern computer equipment of some schools let students publish a school newspaper. But the samples I see look too amateur. The situation is slightly better in children’ out-of-school centers of young journalists, where instructors are often experienced journalists or university professors. That’s the case with St. Petersburg. For several decades has been functioning the department of photo correspondents headed by the excellent specialist in press photography P.Markin. Still the specialists in the field of journalism remain the main “resource” for media education, although we cannot consider this practice to be *the* media education in its broad context. Unfortunately the information about ME is disseminated among the teachers of journalism only fragmentary, patchy; moreover the majority of them know almost nothing about it. I can state it with all the responsibility due to my contacts with colleagues. However the reports on key ideas and foundations of media education and media criticism are always arousing great interest among them.

Alexander Korochensky:

The scattered efforts of media educators-enthusiasts are replaced by the all-Russian movement of media education proponents- the representatives of education, journalism, sociology, etc. Important role in its promotion was played by the Association of Film and Media Education of Russia and personally by its president Alexander Fedorov. The resulting union of teachers and researchers, constant discussion of media education problems on the pages of the magazine and Internet sites, dissertations and organization of conferences- all these factors contributed to the greater consolidation of the theoretical framework of ME. These are the main achievements of the recent years. In our opinion, misfortunes, problems of Russian ME first of all result from the absence of systematic media education in secondary schools, legitimacy of media education major in pedagogical institutes (although students can choose ME as their minor since 2002), which is absolutely necessary for the pre-service teacher training. Today there’s much discourse around “information society”, “mediated society”. But we do not see the adequate reaction of the education system to the need of the preparation of new generations of citizens for life and activities in information saturated society. This training can be realized through mass ME, starting with secondary school level.

Susanne Krucsay:

Achievements: increasing awareness of the importance of media education; more courses for teacher training; Failures, problems: the worldwide consent of “quality” in education which is purely based on the notion of evaluation/assessment/ranking takes a reductionistic view of what education is/should be. This is why approaches which cannot be measured in all their aspects are neglected in school teaching.

Robert Kubey:

Improving in the U.S. Better national organization than in the past.

Geoff Lealand:

In New Zealand, media teaching is generally in good health and in a state of continuous growth, both at the secondary school level, and in the tertiary sector. It has official recognition and support, in the former sector, through being included as the subject area Media Studies in the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), as well as Scholarship. NCEA is the major educational framework across the country, and in 2005 nearly 10,000 students were studying NCEA Media Studies. Media also remains as a major strand (Visual Language) in the national English curriculum.

The major achievements have been this official recognition, whereby Media Studies beside more traditional subjects such as English and History. There has also been strong growth in the tertiary sector, with a wide range of media-related teaching.

The media teachers' organisation (National Association of Media Educators) continues to take a leading role in promoting the subject, resourcing, and having direct input into assessment and moderation of NCEA Media Studies.

Some problems remain -- some universal, some particular to New Zealand circumstances. Teacher training institutions continue to ignore media training (despite its strong presence in NZ education) but graduates from tertiary courses are beginning to make an impact. Easy access to up-to-date resources is a problem but this is improving, through resource-sharing, NAME-sponsored workshops and bi-annual conferences, and Ministry of Education support (e.g. in developing web-based resources).

There is a need to develop closer co-operation between secondary and tertiary media teaching (the focus of my current research project). Debate continues about the desirability (pros and cons) of a national curriculum/framework. In the meantime, NCEA Media Studies provides a 'proxy' curriculum.

Elena Murukina:

I evaluate the current state of ME in Russia as stabilized. Among the achievements one could note the activities of ME centers in universities, and research laboratories (e.g. Belgorod, Voronezh, Ekaterinburg, Irkutsk, Kurgan, Moscow, Omsk, Perm, St. Petersburg, Samara, Taganrog, Tambov, Tver, Tolyatti, Tomsk, Chelyabinsk).

Anastasia Novikova:

I think that ME in Russia has gotten some official recognition recently, and this time not only due to the individual efforts of its advocates, but also due to the support of UNESCO program “Information for all”, research grants of the Russian Foundation for Humanities, Program of the President of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Education and Science, etc. However it should be noted that the definition of the key concept of media education discourse- media literacy- still provokes heated discussions among colleagues from adjoining academic subjects.

Konstantin Ognev:

Before answering the questions, I would like to say that I am not in position to judge the media education state in the whole country; I am going to speak only about some problems that according to my pedagogical and administrative experience are critical. This local objective to some degree I think will let as well highlight some common problems of my colleagues from the Association for Film and Media Education in Russia.

Film education in All-Russian State Institute of Cinematography (VGIK) is going through a very difficult time period again. The history of the first Film Institute in the world, beginning from its foundation, knows a lot of examples when so-called well-wishers talked about the crisis of the system of education there and the need for its reconstruction. Fortunately every time when such campaigns emerged (from back in the 1920s till some recent publications), the state policy relied on the sound decisions and promoted the preservation and development of the Institute’s school, which traditions became the basis of the world cinematography education.

Today unfortunately, the crisis is experienced in all main components of the educational process.

First, since 1990s- due to the extremely low level of the wages, - the renewal of the faculty has almost ceased. Intergenerational continuity was disrupted. The old generation goes away. The middle one, unfortunately, does not become younger. And the representatives of the young generation of the faculty (many of whom are in their forties) do not see any prospect in their professional activity, therefore teaching becomes a second, part-time job, and sometimes they abandon it at all.

Secondly, during the last decade the general level of education in this country has “crashed”. A school-leaver of the 21st century doesn’t know what an encyclopedia is, can’t use the original sources. I am not an opponent of new technologies, but when from serving as up-to-date tools they turn into the foundation of a human’s development, the process of the development of the Humankind stops. A considerable part of the young, aspiring to a cinematography education can’t *think*, but believe that trade skills are the foundation stone of a cinema profession.

And finally, thirdly, the gap between the modern film, television, video production and the technological basis of the training film studio of VGIK has widened. If in the 1980s, in spite of some underrun its condition allowed graduates to feel confidently at the production set, then now, after 20 years, the VGIK graduate as a rule has to study the technical basis of his affiliation from scratch.

However we do encounter the reverse process, when production companies direct their employees to study in VGIK. It is also problematic because the production studio can't afford "losing" an employee for a long time, and VGIK in its turn can't be responsible for the quality of educational programs if they are too limited in time.

This leads to the unfair criticism of VGIK for alleged unwillingness to account the production interests on the one hand, and on the other hand- the emergence of the numerous educational structures, referring to the faculty and teaching programs of VGIK, but in fact having the agenda of giving out higher education diplomas, often illegitimate "on the conveyor line". It is not accidentally that these structures come and go, because in their majority they are built on the principle of a financial pyramid, where there's no place for real knowledge.

Zurab Oshxneli:

In Georgia, there is no media education literature. So, in our country, there are no achievements, no failures and problems. Georgian office of Inter-news has translated in Georgian and published some educational books and brochures in the last 6 years, but this is nothing compared to the amount of literature in other countries. The College of Media, Advertising and TV Arts buys some media education books in Moscow, with the help of individual persons. After 15 years less and less people speak Russian. It is the opposite situation with the English language - 99% of youth know it, but teachers do not.

Trygve Panhoff:

In Norway media education is fairly good. Best results are achieved in secondary school and high schools/universities. The subjects "media education" and "media and communication" exist in several gymnasiums, the latter of a more practical character, where production is mostly involved. These are among our most popular subjects. The main drawback is that media education, which is thematically obligatory in many subjects down to primary school, is still not obligatory for future teachers. Some schools also lack necessary equipment.

Stal Penzin:

The main event of the recent years- is the opening of the journal "*Media Education*", established by the Russian Committee of the UNESCO program "Information For All", the Moscow Office of UNESCO and Russian Association for Film and Media Education. This publication has already begun implementing its main function: to unite individual enthusiasts of media education around the country. Unfortunately, we are still on our own. All vertical connections have collapsed. State organizations as well as public (including the Union of Cinematography of the Russian Federation, that earlier provided substantial support) do not show any interest to ME.

Under these circumstances horizontal connections became common, that is contacts directly between cities, schools, institutes, colleagues. As an example, I'd refer to the union of two universities - Tver and Voronezh, resulting in publications, summarizing the experience of media educators in both institutions: articles, and the textbook "Film in Education of Youth" (Tver, 2005, 188p.). This

book is unique because it presents the cinema art peculiarities, basics of methods of using film in education to teachers and parents in a concise form. But the edition is tiny - 100 copies, for a huge Russian territory, its schools and universities remain unavailable. Academic magazines (including 'Media Education') published enthusiastic reviews, but the authors could not find the supportive government or public organization to publish the sufficient edition of copies. This example proves the fact that ME in this country is still at its initial stage of development; the state system of ME has not been created yet.

Valery Prozorov:

We are still at the initial stage of development of ME, although enthusiasts (to name the foremost in our country - definitely Alexander Fedorov, his team and followers) have already initiated and implemented a lot. Way to go!

Faith Rogow:

Media literacy education in the U.S. is in its early childhood and growing. AMLA the Alliance for a Media Literate America (<http://www.AMLAinfo.org>) the nations first membership organization for media literacy educators, is now just five years old.

We are still slowed by debates between those who see the primary purpose of media education as teaching about the effects of media, seeing media as something to teach against, and those who ground media education in an expanded notion of literacy, focusing on teaching critical thinking skills and developing sound pedagogical strategies. We have also been slowed by a significant lack of funding and failure to agree on one overarching term (so people remain scattered, calling their approach information literacy or technology literacy or critical literacy or media studies or media literacy education, etc.).

Despite the difficulties, there has been a boom of youth production classes and projects that include media literacy instruction. And the notion that media education should be integrated into the curriculum rather than simply added on as an additional course or topic seems to be taking hold (see, for example, Project Look Sharp at Ithaca College, www.ithaca.edu/looksharp).

We have also been very successful at expanding the ranks of the leadership in the field of media literacy education. Ten years ago, the inner circle of leaders was probably no larger than 20 people. Today, AMLA alone has 5 times that many people taking active leadership roles, either nationally or in their communities.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

There are achievements undoubtedly, and they are written about. As for the problems: in Russian media education related to secondary school the prevailing priority is given to the non-productive activity of students. We also lack system projects (programs) and research (including psychological), dealing with the development of methods and forms of work with children aimed at independent thinking and their "protection" from massive negative information.

Conclusion. The close reading of the answers to the first question shows that leading Russian media educators evaluate the current condition of media education in Russia differently. Some of them are

rather optimistic (V.Gura, V.Kolesnichenko, A.Korochensky, A.Novikova, V.Prozorov), referring to certain facts and tendencies, acknowledge the situation of the movement's rise. The others (S.Penzin, N.Hilko) complain about the lack of the administrative support. Other experts (E.Bondarenko, E.Muryukina) focus of the stabilization of the media education process. Two experts provide the perspective of education for future media professionals, in journalism (S.Korkonosenko) and film (K.Ognev).

Russian experts to a large extent agree that media education movement is facing considerable challenges; general public (including many teachers) on the whole is not aware of the aims of media education, integrated or extracurricular media education in schools is still the result of the initiatives of individual enthusiasts, and teachers often interpret ME as simply use of audiovisual technical aids, ignoring creative activities, aimed at the development of critical thinking, and media production by students as well.

Foreign experts, acknowledging certain achievements of ME in their countries, accentuate problems, similar to the Russian context: lack of the teacher trainings (we should bear in mind though that media educators from Canada, Australia and Hungary didn't take part in the questionnaire, while it's in these countries that ME is the required component of school program from the 1st till 12th grade), lack of the financing, etc. Two foreign experts - from Bulgaria and Georgia remark with a sense of bitterness that ME movement is still a very new domain for their countries.

Question 2. *Have any new tendencies in media education appeared in your country in the 21st century?*

Frank Baker:

The good news is that elements of media literacy are in the standards. There are several regional conferences and other initiatives designed to fill the void in teacher preparation and classroom materials. Some national textbooks have begun to include it, but it is not widespread yet.

Cary Bazalgette:

There is a growing amount of media education practice emerging in the 3-14 age range, located within Literacy teaching, and based on moving image media, led by BFI resources for this sector. There are also plans under way to develop a more outcomes-led, less prescriptive curriculum, which will set schools free to develop and manage their teaching strategies in more adventurous ways, and which is likely to enable much more media teaching to go on.

The 2003 Communications Act set up a new regulatory body for the electronic media industries, giving it a responsibility to foster media literacy. This

has been good for profile, but also a problem because it has encouraged a very simplistic notion of media education – as protectionist, or exclusively concerned with technological access and know-how.

A new Diploma in Creative and Media is planned as an option for students in the 14-19 age range from 2008. This will offer a very broad range of learning in relation to a number of media forms, accredited at three levels, and with a strong practical/creative element. It is a potentially exciting development, although there is the danger that it will be seen as having lower status than A Level.

Elena Bondarenko:

XXI century is marked by the emergence of new forms of a dialogue with mass media - the degree of interactivity rose. Among other things, the web journalism is developing. We see a new stage in the development of media criticism. The differentiation of educational institutions leads to the new level of forming the media complex. Problems to face relate not only to pupils' development on the media material but also to new approaches to shaping the educational environment.

Richard Cornell:

Aside from increased media criticism, the evolution of social networking software is radically changing the communications landscape across America. Blogs, wikis, ipods, instant messaging, and the ever-ubiquitous cell phone has descended upon the populace, and people of all ages, genders, and socio-economic level are turning rapidly to these resources, many of which are without cost to the user. Telephony has morphed into a PC-to-PC phenomenon, also at little or no user cost, and the conglomerate communications companies, AT&T, Verizon, Bell South, etc. are reeling with the loss of what was formerly a monopolized communications environment.

Users now commonly employ instant messaging with video added to communicate with family, friends, and colleagues across the world, on a daily basis, and at no charge other than subscription to a network provider.

More and more households are subscribing to broadband given the increasing number of large files that feature streaming video, Power Point presentations with audio, and other similar programs that benefit from larger bandwidth.

The number of American households now having at least one computer is rapidly increasing. With the cost of fuel escalating, more Americans are seeking cost-effective ways of managing their time, budgets, and travel expenses; thus more are staying home.

All of this in the face of workweeks that often exceeds 50-60 hours by many American workers.

Harald Gapski:

Media education acknowledges and stresses the important role of the organisational setting. The usage of Media implies the change of learning and communication processes. Introducing new media in a social system implies organisational development. Media education in 21st century is closely linked to digital literacy.

Valery Gura:

The main tendency of ME in the XXI century in our country to my mind is the intensive study of the experience of countries leading in this field, such as Canada, Australia, Great Britain, etc.

Nikolai Hilko:

The current tendencies are: striving for a higher status of ME in Russia; need for the constant renewal of approaches to media education activity; widening of media maintenance and need for its arrangement.

Katia Hristova:

In the beginning of the new century Bulgarian society started to use the term media literacy.

Jenny Johnson:

Increasing utilization.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

The best efforts from the viewpoint of persistency and professionalism, are made by the Russian Association of Film and Media Education, including the issuing of the journal “*Media Education*”. It’s too early to speak of tendencies, but media education becomes a topic in academic literature and methodological discussions more and more often.

Alexander Korochemsky:

It’s in the new century that media education is gaining the scale of public, professional and academic *movement*. This is the main tendency.

Susanne Krucsay:

New technologies are changing the traditional conception of the world, their potential is regarded either in an uncritical euphemistic way or condemned altogether. Critical elements do not find their way into a more differentiated attitude.

Geoff Lealand:

Official recognition; the emergence of new, enthusiastic teachers; continuous desire for such course from students; the critical role of NAME, in promoting the subject; the arrival of new media forms (eg mobile technology), and the need for teachers to keep up with these.

Anastasia Novikova:

As for Russia, we evidence the tendency, characteristic for example to GB, Canada, the U.S. or Germany in the mid-late 90s, - and that is the shift of emphasis onto computer literacy and media education on the material of Internet.

Konstantin Ognev:

The main tendency is the modification of basic educational programs, due to the acceleration of the sci-tech progress and the appearance of new screen technologies. Thus for example, the department of the second professional education in VGIK has been training directors of montage as part of the contract with AVID. Along the directing and art department in VGIK now there is the department of multimedia, the economics department was reorganized and today it trains producers-to-be. By the way it was due to the VGIK efforts and not production studios or Federal agency for culture and cinematography, that this

profession got the official status in our country. It is not always easy to align the requirements of educational standards with the requirements of production, based on new technologies. Sometimes this process elongates for years, that's why I don't want to speak of other VGIK projects yet.

Zurab Oshxneli:

The Media Educational Centre of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia was made upon the model of Israel's educational media, but now according to the order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia it was abolished and was renamed as *The College of Media, Advertising and TV Arts*. Of course, the college has no finances and technical and intellectual opportunities to produce educational video products. But now, the condition has worsened. There is only one channel in our country which has clearly expressed educational function and it is the Public Broadcast.

Trygve Panhoff:

Convergence has led to broader implication of computers and multi-media programmes. Equipment is cheaper, even cell phones can be used. Among schools and freetime activities producing programs, digital equipment is becoming the usual tools.

Stal Penzin:

It's easier for me to speak of the tendencies of media education by the example of Voronezh region. In the XXI century it became obvious that the peculiarity of film education, as an important component of ME, is conditioned by the dual nature of cinematography, on the one hand, belonging to mass media, and on the other hand, - to art. Voronezh media educators try to get across this idea to their students. The main tendency of Russian ME today is the introduction of mandatory media education courses in some universities. For example, Voronezh State Academy of Arts, offered the course "*History of Cinema*" (2 semesters) in 2004-2006. At the department of cultural studies of Voronezh State University the course "*Film and Today*" has been taught since 2000, and the Philology department requires taking the course in history of theatre and film.

Valery Prozorov:

An extremely important and partially realized initiative is the pre-service training of school teachers. Although the public opinion is not awake to a degree to insist on real and wide integration of special media education courses in school programs.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

Acceptance by the education community and popularization of the term "media education".

Conclusion. In their answers to the second question Russian experts mentioned not only the creation of Internet sites, opening of the new pedagogical specialization "Media Education" and the issue of the academic journal, but also the intensive study of the foreign experience, publicity around the term, etc. Alexander Korochensky sounds most optimistic, believing that today media education is becoming truly

nation-wide public and professional movement. Foreign experts pay more attention to the activation of integration of ME into curricula (C.Bazalgette, G.Lealand), to the opportunities broadened by the spread of digital media (H.Gapski, R.Cornell, S.Krucsay, G.Lealand, T.Panhoff).

Question 3. Could evidence from foreign experience help the development of media education in your country? If yes, which country's experiences would be useful? And how might it help?

Frank Baker:

I look at some of the material already developed by Canada, Great Britain and Australia as excellent starting points, especially in their curriculum and support.

Cary Bazalgette:

The main help would be to be able to refer to any other country where significant policy decisions had been made to include media education in national curricula and/or to support it financially in some substantial way. It is also useful to hear about specific structures or processes which have been put in place to support media education nationally, and about research into learning outcomes.

Elena Bondarenko:

Media education initially existed as the open information environment. Therefore any foreign experience may be valuable and useful. Thus, theory and practice of organization and work of the young television channel in Bangladesh is quite adaptable to the situation in Russian provincial towns. Problems of the educational television of BBC are the same that are encountered by Russian producers of educational film/TV programs. Film/TV/video creativity is going through the new stage of development; new technology determines new forms of practical film education and media journalism. Thus media education just cannot- and should not! - exist without exchange of experience.

Richard Cornell:

Definitely yes! The sad fact is that, should you ask an American about equity of access or themes such as UNESCO's efforts to provide "Information for All," I suspect 90% of the populace would give you a blank look. America is turning insular, despite that its military is reaching across much of the world.

The recent conflagration related to what to do with 12 million illegal immigrants has polarized the nation into those in favor of deportation vs. those who would grant amnesty and bring these people into the fold of the nation.

As the approaching mid-term election gets closer, the rhetoric becomes more shrill and America's bi-polar political machine cranks out (spews?) innumerable video, print, audio barrages about how good this candidate is as opposed to how bad their rival for office is. Indeed, these are media rich (impoverished?) times as the political thermometer heats up.

At least when we see politicians fighting in their legislative chambers in other countries, we know the message is clear, albeit tinged with anger. Maybe we need some of that kind of political honesty to get us back on track!

Norway has a particularly intriguing system of media access to its schools that could well be emulated in nations around the world. Some universities in Taiwan are using cell phones as integral elements of instruction. Ukraine and Russia are seeking collaborative ways of bridging pedagogy with technology skills. Australia's distance learning schemes are bridging far-flung outback communities and urban centers. All of these efforts plus countless others are worthy of emulation or at least consideration by American educators.

Harald Gapski:

That depends on the media format. One cannot directly transfer educational success stories from one country to another due to the complexity and the differences of the educational systems and cultural embeddings. But there are examples, for example Film Education in France or Pedagogical ICT license (epict) which are localised in different countries.

Valery Gura:

Undoubtedly, it is very useful to study the foreign practice; however one cannot borrow any model of media education directly. We have our own history of film education, journalism, which reflects Russian mentality, among other things, is based on Russian art imagery. I think we need to undertake a deeper study of the ideas of outstanding countrymen who provided the philosophical and methodological foundation for media education, such as M.Bakhtin, B.Bibler, Y.Lotman, etc.

Nikolai Hilko:

Yes, certainly. In particular, the experience of the British Film Institute, Center for Media Literacy in the U.S.A., experience of Prof.A.G.Martin (Spain), etc. The collaboration could take place through exchange programs, workshops, joint media projects, festivals.

Katia Hristova:

I think that the British program *Media Smart* could be successfully used in the Bulgarian environment.

Jenny Johnson:

Yes, any developed country.

David Klooster:

I believe we can ALWAYS learn valuable lessons from the experiences and approaches of other countries and other cultures. I would look to Europe, to Japan and Korea, and to important Latin American countries like Argentina and Brazil for valuable approaches to Media Education.

Victoria Kolesnichenko:

Of course studying foreign experience can promote the further development of ME in Russia. Thus the acquaintance with promising directions and effective practices of leading countries is needed by Russian media educators. I believe that Canadian media education model is worth studying where ME has an official status and is taught in all grades of secondary schools in all the provinces. Especially interesting is the unique experience of CHUM Television, encouraging the development of media literacy of children and youth.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

Questions of the kind should always be answered in the affirmative. Any foreign experience is worthy careful study and perhaps, application. However the poor technical equipment of Russian schools can hinder the process. On a large scale it is hard to transfer the total computerization of education institutions that takes place in Scandinavian countries for instance. But we can go back to the forgotten traditions and methods of editorial offices of mass media, especially local, that earlier served as centers for media literacy, although the term itself was not invented back then.

Alexander Korochensky:

Critical study of foreign experience is useful because it helps escape some dead end directions of media education theory and practice, and study successful practices. However the transfer of such experience should be done thoughtfully taking into account differences of contexts. I would not like to distinguish one particular country, but practices preparing the audience for communication with market driven mass media, with all their intrinsic specificity, are of great interest.

Susanne Krucsay:

Other experiences can always help; I am for selecting those bits of the countries I know which seem most suitable.

Robert Kubey:

Yes, it can help. My visits previously to England, Scotland, Canada, and Israel taught me a lot.

Geoff Lealand:

Initially, the United Kingdom, Australia and Canada (esp. Ontario) provided inspiration and models. In more recent years, there has been more confidence in developing local (New Zealand) models of teaching/assessment, and resources eg we now tend to have less to do with Australian Teachers of Media (ATOM), than in previous years. I would argue that New Zealand media teaching is now in a position to provide models for other countries!

Elena Murukina:

The study of any experience, including foreign, is always important and necessary. For example, we incorporate the experience of British media educators (six key concepts of ME). But in my opinion, we need to study and apply the Russian experiences because they correspond to the peculiarities of Russian way of thinking.

Anastasia Novikova:

Undoubtedly, studying foreign experience is important in any field. Media education in Australia, Canada, Great Britain is a legitimate part of the school curricula, - the experience of media educators in these countries is certainly inspiring.

Konstantin Ognev:

For the two thirds of the XX century education for film professionals around the world took a pattern by our country, and in the first place, by the tradition of VGIK. Approximately since the middle 1960s with the development of television, video industry, screen technologies and World Wide Web, the priorities in screen culture have changed, and as a result, priorities of media education changed as

well. Taking into account the considerable gap between the technical equipment of education system in countries with a strong cinematography tradition (and even with those, who have never had a conspicuous place on the map of cinema world) and Russia, certainly, the experience of foreign countries has to be studied and used. However there is one thing that the VGIK tradition still strongly believes in: the unity of theory and practice: from the first days at the university our students are guided by the laws of production. It has a special meaning today, when screen technologies intervene into the sphere of everyday life, when trade skill dominates over the professionalism, and Art is replaced by its surrogate.

Zurab Oshneli:

Foreign experience may have positive effect on our country's new government. But unfortunately, Russian experience might be unacceptable from Georgian-Russian's relations point of view. Of course, we may take the experience from the little, but developed country as ours like Israel, Denmark, Sweden, or from a similar country, where it is very important to develop media education.

Trygve Panhoff:

Norway has had some media research inspired from England, e.g. David Buckingham. As research stays on the university level, it is rarely directly useful in school education, teachers however who are especially interested may be inspired by other countries. This often takes place on a personal level (attendance at international seminars, etc.).

Stal Penzin:

Foreign experience cannot add anything to the part of media education that deals with film, simply because Russian film educators are interested in a film in the first place as the work of art, able to humanize the life on the planet. In the West they believe that one cannot impose any opinions or tastes (including the good taste) on students. And I am not going this way.

Valery Prozorov:

French projects present a great interest for me, e.g. Active Young TVviewer, Introduction to Audiovisual Culture, etc.

Faith Rogow:

Yes and no. There have been research models and theoretical frameworks developed in places like Great Britain, Canada, Brazil, and South Africa that will be helpful to anyone doing media education.

However, their application to the U.S. will be limited in two ways. First, most countries have a centralized education system. In contrast, education policy in the U.S. is determined state-by-state. So strategies aimed at top-down implementation coming from the federal government will not work in the U.S.

In addition, most current media education initiatives have been constructed within a particular subject area framework, usually Language Arts. The movement in the United States is to integrate media education as an approach to teaching that is used in every subject and at every grade level. So media education would become part of math and health and science and social studies instruction, not just Language Arts and not as a special add-on course.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

Any experience helps register the situation and move forward, developing new directions for research and integration. The European experience of media education in the XX century - France, England, Belgium, etc. was interesting.

Conclusion. Russian and foreign experts show on the whole the consensus of opinion: the dialogue of cultures in media education is important and foreign experience should be studied, though its direct application on an alien national ground is of course problematic. Only the consistent adherent of the aesthetic/art and ethical concept of media education S.N.Penzin is skeptical about it (although the spectrum of foreign models of ME is very broad and of course includes the aesthetical approach as well)...

Question 4. Can modern media criticism become the ally of movement of media education? If yes, how?

Cary Bazalgette:

If this means critical theory as developed in the academy, yes: it can help to refine and re-think curricular content, though a process of debate and dialogue is needed. For example, the BFI has developed a different approach to teaching genre after looking at new critical theory in this area. If however you mean press criticism, then no, probably not: the quality of this is very low in the UK.

Elena Bondarenko:

To my mind modern media criticism is already an ally of media education. Media criticism is in a way a loudspeaker of the reflection process of media, simultaneously self-analysis and reflection about the most significant problems in the sphere of media culture and information exchange. However media criticism exists today as a quite independent and autonomous phenomenon. If we make its materials a field for analysis and interpretation in ME, then we get an ally of ME. If we recall the history of ME, we'll find plenty examples of how an information or aesthetical "enemy" was transformed into an "ally" by using a publication, film, advertisement, etc. as a material for study.

Richard Cornell:

Yes, it can and it should be! It is time we convince the communications conglomerates to emulate what the families of Bill Gates and Warren Buffet are doing – focusing their considerable financial resources on critical areas of need around the world.

Where too, are the sheiks, princes, and presidents from oil-rich nations who are demanding (and getting) obscenely high profits from the sale of their oil and gas products? To what extent are they reinvesting those funds on behalf of their own people, many of whom continue to exist in impoverished conditions?

It seems we are putting media education in front of more dire needs – we do need to get our priorities straight, feeding, clothing, housing, and medicating those in need before we devote time to media analysis. (This is my personal opinion.)

Harald Gapski:

Media criticism is an essential and integral part of media education. Unfortunately it is an under represented dimension of media education, in particular when it comes to digital media.

Valery Gura:

Undoubtedly media criticism is one of the pillars in the world of media for the media consumers. However its influence on masses is minor. It seems that in order to widen the sphere of its impact one should promote it on TV and Internet. In my opinion, the main consumer of media criticism now is the media literate reader or viewer.

Nikolai Hilko:

Yes, it can. Contacts of ME and media criticism may relate to the development of creative thinking, overcoming the aesthetical distance of the biased traditional thinking.

Katia Hristova:

No.

Jenny Johnson:

Yes, by analysing the criticisms.

David Klooster:

I am not completely sure what the question means. If you mean reviews and criticism of the media by experts, then certainly I would hope that this practical criticism would become part of media education. Media education should be founded on theoretical as well as practical bases. The most important goal of media education should be to help citizens become critical consumers of the media, able to understand how the media try to manipulate viewers and listeners and readers, able to identify biases of creators of programs, and able to resist passively accepting everything they are told.

Victoria Kolesnichenko:

The union of media criticism and ME is quite legitimate, especially at the current stage. Unfortunately, the educational potential of media criticism is not used to the full extent. As media criticism is aimed to help the audience to differentiate information flow (often of dubious contents), it can teach to understand and evaluate it adequately and in the result, help become a literate consumer of mass media.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

Media criticism is in fact blending with ME, in particular in continuous exploration of media culture by the audiences. Therefore educational programs should be accompanied by the creation of print, audiovisual, web educational mass media, targeted at different age and social groups, starting with pre-school children. Today media criticism in Russia is working mainly insular for the elite (from the viewpoint of its accessibility to the masses), or for the informative TV-guides, press reviews, etc.

Alexander Korochemsky:

Of course yes. The critical component is build-in in many modern theories of ME. Ideally media criticism can develop the cognitive potential of media audiences interacting with mass media, its rational critical attitude to the

information products of media industry. But it needs the high quality of media criticism. Unfortunately Russian media criticism often suffers from commercial imperative, substituting the critical analysis, interpretation and evaluation of media events with their commercial promotion and entertainment of the audience under the guise of criticism.

Susanne Krucsay:

If media criticism is balanced and fair, it can be an ally.

Robert Kubey:

Yes.

Geoff Lealand:

In can, as long as it does not dominate (eg 'inoculation' imperatives). Students do need to know how the media works AGAINST their interests, but also where it can work FOR their interests. We also need to account for considerations such as 'spectacle' and 'pleasure'. Media literacy is as much about challenging 'common sense' notion of the media (such as moral panics), as understanding processes. In nearly case, media teaching is a political activity but it also should allow for diversity and difference.

Anastasia Novikova:

Yes, quality media criticism.

Konstantin Ognev:

Resuming my speculations above, I'd mark the rise of responsibility of media criticism under modern conditions. Although often we encounter not the analysis, but a bare fact description, based on the desire of audience to look behind the scenes of the world of art.

Zurab Oshxneli:

Media criticism might not become the ally of movement of media education, because their functions are much dissociated.

Trygve Panhoff:

Modern media critique has its own fora, like *MedieNorge* and *Nordicom*, with their own publications. Articles are broadly read by media teachers.

Stal Penzin:

Anyone can become our ally, and any help will be of use, although in my opinion the term "media criticism" is artificial. There is film critique, television critique, etc...

Valery Prozorov:

Media criticism undoubtedly can become an ally of ME, as in its time the Russian literature criticism became (and still this potential is hardly exhausted) an active assistant in the complicated process of teaching language arts in schools and universities of Russia.

Faith Rogow:

If modern media critique can help identify the mechanisms through which media influences people's ideas, then it can help inform high quality educational practice. But if the conclusions of media critics, especially those that are not supported by research, substitute for teaching critical thinking skills, or substitute

indoctrination for teaching, then media criticism will be a hindrance to media literacy education.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

If media criticism contradicts everything that ME stands for, then of course, no. But if it is an attempt for positive changes, then - yes. It is unlikely that tenuous “critics” or “critique” can be someone’s or something’s ally at all. But the attempt to listen to the media critique, analyze its main platforms, involve in a dialogue- is a normal practice.

Conclusion Only two experts (from Bulgaria and Georgia) exclude the ability of modern media criticism act as an ally to ME. K.Hristova didn’t comment on her reply, and Zurab Oshxneli referred to the discrepancy of the two fields, although in my opinion, it can’t become a real obstacle to establishing contact points of media education and media criticism. On the whole, both foreign and Russian experts evaluate media criticism, able to “develop the cognitive potential of media audiences..., its rational-critical attitude to the media industry products”, as a natural partner in media educational process.

Question 5. Is it essential to introduce compulsory integrated or specialist media education courses in curricula of mainstream schools? Or would it be better to set up informal courses for general audiences?

Frank Baker:

Compulsory is difficult in the US: already there are many mandates which are insufficiently funded and thus get little if any attention.

Cary Bazalgette:

Both are essential, but if it’s a choice between the two, then the former is more important. Both integrated and specialist courses can work – young people need access to both. Specialist courses should probably be optional – but it depends how the curriculum is organised and managed. Informal courses for general audiences are unlikely to achieve the same level of inclusiveness as school courses.

Elena Bondarenko:

Today there are schools with both variants mentioned above- and it is difficult to say if one way or another should become the mainstream. Perhaps it would be better to provide schools, teachers, administration with a wider choice of forms- but media education itself should be compulsory. Compulsory integrated media education has its boundaries, where it becomes little effective; autonomous (special) ME requires the technical base and special training; elective media education courses are also hard to set up without additional preparation of teachers...One thing is of no doubt: it’s not enough if ME is limited to one form, modern practice shows that when one and the same group works in minimum two of the above directions it is more effective.

Richard Cornell:

American tried the compulsory approach in the 1950's during the fabled "Space Race" when, while not making classes in mathematics and science compulsory, they were clearly the focus for almost two decades. American's rebel when they hear compulsory, kind of like, "unless it is a life-threatening issues, you can's make me do this...!" (NCLB being the most notable and recent exception!)

My sense is that a well-executed public relations effort that extols the virtues of sound media education and instructional design would go a lot farther than making study of media a must-do event.

Every day an American awakens, he or she is hit with "media education courses." The question remains – do they realize that such is happening? If the pressure of teaching-to-the-test can be reduced and other subject areas integrated back into what is now tested, we would be "taking one small step for mediakind..."

Harald Gapski:

I think media education should be integrated cross curricular and compulsory given the importance of media in our life world. We spend hours per day with different media. Almost everything we know about the society and the world around us, we know from the media.

Valery Gura:

I think in future we should get ready for compulsory integration of ME in secondary schools, as it happened with the subject Computer technology. Therefore it is necessary to start training teachers now.

Nikolai Hilko:

To my mind, as a compulsory subject it is enough to extend the course of Computer technology. However depending on the interests of school students, these may be integrated units on Media Ecology, and Media Impacts within the course of Social Ecology, or the unit introducing the audiovisual culture and media criticism within the course "World Art Culture" (10-11 grades). Elective course like Media Culture, Screen Art, Animation, special media classes (on television, video, multimedia) may suit for schools and gymnasiums specializing in media studies.

Katia Hristova:

In my opinion the two educational forms can be efficient.

Jenny Johnson:

A mixture of integrated or special media education courses in curricula of schools.

David Klooster:

I believe media education is more and more important, and should become part of the curriculum in secondary schools. It can become part of what language teachers, social science teachers, and humanities teachers do as part of their normal work. I would prefer to see media education become part of existing courses, instead of a new, separate course, where its influence could be marginalized.

Victoria Kolesnichenko:

Perhaps integration of media education into the existing curricula is more effective nowadays.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

Media education as part of the personality development, cultural development and providing security for school children must become one of the dominant components of the compulsory curriculum.

Alexander Korochemsky:

Mass media education for school students is a must- the one that introduces mass media to them, the world which often influences young generations more than family and school.

Susanne Krucsay:

I am for both creating a subject in its own right where concrete subject matters such as media languages...can be taught and having it as a transversal element through the curriculum where the media constructions of special disciplines can be demonstrated.

Robert Kubey:

I see value in both the integrated model and also one where media literacy education stands as its own strand.

Geoff Lealand:

'Compulsion' is not a consideration here, as natural growth is occurring (even though I might argue that Media Studies should be as 'compulsory' as the core subjects of English and Maths!)

Elena Murukina:

I believe that a compulsory media education course in regular schools is not necessary and today is not possible anyway. The system of education has neither sufficient resources nor teachers trained in ME.

Anastasia Novikova:

The required subject "ME" is possible only in special schools or lyceums now. I think that inclusion of ME into the list of elective courses, and/or its integration across the existing curriculum is a more workable solution for Russia.

Konstantin Ognev:

It is necessary to implant into the conscience of youth the awareness of what the screen culture is, how it correlates with the world culture, what it borrowed from it and to what extent influenced the processes of the humankind development. There are no ready-to-use recipes here, but in my opinion, school curricula should have some minimum of courses, related to media culture, and high school students should have an opportunity to study these problems in depth in special media education courses. I hope that the training courses for prospective VGIK applicants opened in the academic year 2006 will become a foothold for new developments in this field of media education.

Zurab Oshxneli:

Both of them are very important with the priority of the first one. It is much more important to introduce compulsory integrated or specialist media education courses in curricula of mainstream schools.

Trygve Panhoff:

Optional courses belong mostly to the past in Norway, where obligatory courses are introduced in many, but far from all schools. The

loss of optional courses has weakened media education in primary schools.

Stal Penzin:

Subjects like “Photography” and “Cinema art” (autonomous or integrated) should be included into secondary schools curricula.

Valery Prozorov:

The next thing of the agenda is the introduction of media education in schools from the first till the last grade (at first optional as a choice of parents and school students). We need innovative methods to use in pre-school media education. The culture of video and audio perception is nearly one of the most vital, alarming (and age-related unlimited) in the today’s world. From the aggressor and dictator, enslaving the personality, media insight can turn into the power helping develop the human soul and feed it with the eco pure products.

Faith Rogow:

Media education should become a teaching method as much as a separate discipline and it should apply to course at every grade level, in the same way that we use the reading and writing of print to teach in every curriculum area now.

We are well past the point of media education being seen as a nice, but optional curriculum enhancement. In the same way that a person who cannot read or write print was not well prepared for life in the 20th century, a person who is not media literate is not prepared for work or citizenship in the 21st century. Media literacy education must be compulsory.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

If the young generation, “zombied” by commercials and low quality information, provided by some TV channels and some Internet sites, meets views of the State and nation, then it is not necessary to integrate elements of ME (development of critical thinking, analytical skills, etc.) wherever. At the same time, school programs are so overloaded that it would be quite wrong to add another core course.

Conclusion. The dominant viewpoint of Russian and foreign media educators supports both integrated and autonomous media education. However several people in Russia are skeptical about the perspective of media education in schools, perhaps because they remember numerous examples of progressive pedagogical ideas that disappeared for good.

Question 6. Are there specialist “Media educator” courses in higher education in your country? If not, why? If yes, what kind(s) of courses are there and how were they set up?

Frank Baker:

Only a handful of universities offer degrees in media education. The problem, in many places, is that media education fits into several schools (business, art, journalism, education) and in many ways there turfdom battles.

Cary Bazalgette:

There is only one PGCE (post-grad cert of education) course in media with English: several higher education institutions would like to offer one but they have to persuade the government to allocate them funded places. There are several postgraduate courses and a few institutions offering accredited professional development courses, including the BFI, the English and Media Centre, and Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds.

Elena Bondarenko:

To begin with, we should determine what we mean by a “media educator”. Is anyone who is actively using media in class or extra-curricular club, a media educator? Is a librarian a media educator by definition? Often this term conceals the reality behind the wish. For Russia with its long tradition of wide use of extra school information in teaching, any teacher should have a high level of media culture. Still practice shows that teachers do need special training and sometimes also a serious “remodeling” of own perception, change of the attitude to information environment, and mastering the media education’s toolkit. It is not effective to educate specifically media teachers yet because most probably a graduate with such a diploma will have a hard time looking for a job at school or extra-school club. A media educator is a special practical orientation of a professional, already working in education. From this viewpoint, the training of media educators should be widely integrated into the advanced training, career development courses and into their subject training per se.

Richard Cornell:

Yes, in American there are many hundreds of universities who offer some form of media education, be it for training librarians, educational technologists for schools, pre-service teacher training, or business, industry, healthcare, the military, or more. To give you an idea of just those who are related to education, please see: *Curricula Data of Degree Programs in Educational Communications and Technology* by Dr. Jenny Johnson, Editor, University of Maryland and sponsored by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (www.aect.org).

For many years, AECT collected information on degree programs in educational communications and technology and published the directory *Degree Curricula in Educational Communications and Technology*. As a service to the educational community AECT now brings *Curricula Data of Degree Programs in Educational Communications and Technology* online (<http://www.aect.org/Intranet/Publications/index.asp#cd>).

There are other “flavors” of media education that are also found across many American universities. Lately there has been a resurgence of programs that offer studies in digital media, gaming and simulation – all forms of media for use in education...and training. Likewise many universities offer programs of study in cinematography, communications, broadcasting, and more. All are part of a rich fabric of media education.

Harald Gapski:

Yes there are universities which focus on media pedagogy. Even a 2 year "Master of Arts in Media Education" as a distance education programme was

available: unfortunately it had to close <http://www.fernuni-hagen.de/festum/index.shtml> But there are other programmes running: <http://www.bildungsserver.de/zeigen.html?seite=2675>

Valery Gura:

As far as I know Russian universities do not prepare media educators, but institutes are making first steps, Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute is one of them.

Nikolai Hilko:

This qualification remains uncalled because the demand for such specialists on the modern labour market is undiagnosed. However there is a demand for at least five models of specialists: a librarian-consultant in a media centre, an anchorman of TV-, film-, video programs, an art director of a TV, photo-, video studio, a specialist in web-design and Internet communications, specialist in educational technology for distance education.

Unfortunately there is no direct correlation between the existing educational standards. To my mind, every school should have a media educator, who would work on the cross curricular (World Art Culture, Ecology, Art) level. Moreover, he or she can act as an advisor/ consultant together with a psychologist and a social worker. The specialist of this kind must get training in humanities and technology as well. A prototype of a media educator remains the existing qualification of an “art director”. Thus the computer applications component should be reinforced. Further we need more higher education institutions to train such specialists.

Katia Hristova:

There is a course at Sofia University, Department of Journalism and mass Communication called Media for children. It is optional for the students in 5th or 6th semester of their study.

David Klooster:

Yes, in the United States, every university has a department of Communication, and within this department, experts in Media Studies offer courses and conduct research.

Victoria Kolesnichenko:

It is difficult to speak of the steady training of media educators on a scale of the whole country. I know only the case with Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, having been working in this direction since 2002. The question of the training of future media teachers remains open. Taganrog experience is the first and important step in this direction.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

In Russia we know of pre-service training for media education in Taganrog. However in a broader sense departments of journalism in universities around the country are involved in such activity too. There is no objective to teach students the pedagogy, because the departments’ function is to train potential journalists, not teachers. However some experience is being accumulated. For example for several years I’ve been teaching the course “Methods of teaching journalism” to the students of St.Petersburg University. The summary of the course is given in the textbook “Teaching Journalism” (St.Petersburg, 2004). More and more Ph.D.

students in Moscow, Chelyabinsk, and other cities advert to this topic in their dissertations.

Alexander Korochensky:

There are training programs but very few.

Susanne Krucsay:

No university specialisation – due to a lack of money and political will.

Robert Kubey:

Not really.

Geoff Lealand:

Well, we are Media Studies/Communications/Journalism academics. Within, these broad categories, there are some people (such as myself) who put a strong emphasis on educating potential media educators.

Elena Murukina:

In the majority of higher education institutions - no. Why? There are several reasons: first, there's no demand for media educators (where and what subject can they teach if there is no subject for media studies in Russian schools); secondly, there is a lack of professionals able to train students in this field.

Anastasia Novikova:

Since 2002 students of Departments (Institutes) of Education can choose media education as their minor.

Konstantin Ognev:

As it is known, one of the most important components of educational process in VGIK is teaching skills of film pedagogy. This contributed to the continuity of educational process in the VGIK itself, and promoted the appearance of many film schools in our country and abroad. Unfortunately this sphere of activity today is less and less attractive due to the poor funding. Only the change in government policy can facilitate the renaissance of the prestige and authority of the teacher's profession. It is regretful that many VGIK graduates become the nucleus of the faculty in many foreign film schools and even universities, while Russian film education reside at the periphery of social and cultural life of the country. Actually the latter statement is to a large extent the answer to the seventh question.

Zurab Oshxneli:

By initiative of the documentary director – Mr.Zurab Oshxneli, Youth Television was founded in 1989 in Tbilisi, Georgia, which was broadcasted on the State Television for 13 years. In 1992 the concept of media education and production was reconstructed. We have got acquainted with the educational system of several countries, including Israel's and their principle of work and we set up a new Georgian model. The Youth TV was renamed as the Media Educational Center of the Ministry of Education and Science, with its own media education and production. But the inactivity of the Ministry of Education and Science and the lack of finances weakened the function of the center. There are no similar centers or educational studios in Georgia. There is only one “Ltd” and “Creative” that produces educational movies with the financial help of other projects.

Trygve Panhoff:

In Norway you may study media to become a media teacher, in some high schools and universities.

Stal Penzin:

Voronezh State University does not offer such a qualification simply because there's no demand on the job market for it...

Valery Prozorov:

So far only the secondary qualification - Media Education minor for pedagogical institutes is registered -, now we need to go further...

Faith Rogow:

Not exactly, but we seem to be heading in that direction. Librarians are now routinely referred to as library media specialists. And a few universities are beginning to offer media education minors or specialization in the context of other degrees (e.g., education or psychology).

Conclusion. The answers from different parts of the world show a multicolored picture of teacher training in media education. In some countries (Norway, New Zealand) the situation is better, in some - worse. With all the diversity, most of the academic training takes place in the departments of Communication (Journalism, Media Studies) while there are very few examples (in the so-called "information age"!) of an accredited qualification "media educator" in departments of education.

Question 7. What prospects are there for the development of media education/literacy in your country in the foreseeable future? What, in your opinion, are the essential first steps?

Frank Baker:

Teachers and parents must demand it; gatekeepers need to understand it; currently there is no major national commitment to media literacy education....

Cary Bazalgette:

See (2) above. I think the prospects now are very good. I believe that by 2008 we will have a large amount of media teaching going on in both formal and informal contexts; it will be more generally valued, and will be working to more explicit standards of achievement.

Elena Bondarenko:

Media education is rather a promising direction. However there are tendencies that lead to following conclusions: for the Russian mentality the media educational activity is often simply a part of the wisely organized process, but not a separate strand. This is the reason for recent comments: "Media education? I always did it, and didn't know the term for it!" Therefore those who advocate the organization of modern ME as an independent subject matter run risk of being in opposition to the real process. The sphere of a dialogue with mass media is naturally included into many aspects of organization of educational environment and learning activities. Hence, according to the viewpoint of the Laboratory of Media Education of the Institute of Means and Methods of Education of the Russian Academy of Education, the main way of modern ME is its integration into all existing forms of education, that of course does not exclude the necessity for

special teacher training courses. However the priority should be granted to practical activity, while the study of the concepts of ME and its history may not be as useful for a media educator as the understanding of the essence of the process and ability to communicate effectively in a poly-cultural dialogue with mass media information and to help students do that too.

Richard Cornell:

The prospects are unlimited! Personally, we need to return America to its democratic roots, to enable all its citizens to share in the bounty that comes to us. We need to care for our sick, elderly, impoverished, and those lacking education. Once we have done this we might then perhaps turn our attention to the design of sound media educational experiences for the entire nation. This will take time but first we need to get our own house in order!

Harald Gapski:

Stressing the importance of media education and media critics with regard to new digital media. Concepts like informational self-determination, awareness of data protection and privacy seems to be under estimated and neglected. Localise and apply concepts of "digital literacy" (for example www.digeulit.ec). Link media education with the concept of life long learning. Define indicators for progress in media education on all levels (individual learning, organisational development, societal framing conditions). Monitor and evaluate the development of media education.

Valery Gura:

In the foreseeable future integrated ME will occupy a big share of time in the school curriculum. Media education will merge with computer applications. In order to be prepared, one needs to develop the methodology and methods of this synthesis, to train media competent teachers and equip schools with necessary technology.

Nikolai Hilko:

The prospects are:

- national commitment to ME goals as developing culture and creativity;
- creation of the system of media aesthetical education;
- accreditation of the new qualification in universities, departments of education, cultural studies, drama, because there's need for specialists in informal media education (computer clubs, video studios, media centres, clubs).

Katia Hristova:

It is a difficult question. My country has a lot of problems to solve and every one of them seems more important than the problem of children's media literacy. I think that the first step is to teach the teachers and parents what media literacy is and why it is important for the children.

Jenny Johnson:

Great prospects for media education, major disciplines incorporate it in their programs.

Sergei Korkonosenko:

At first we need to support the pioneers of mass and professional media education, include activities in this direction into the national priorities. The new

generation of free and critically thinking people, immune to mass communications' manipulation and computer addiction - this is what the state and society should hope for. Then - organizational and financial support of life-long learning.

Alexander Korochensky:

First we need to introduce the major "Media Education" in pedagogical institutes (or/and Humanities departments of universities) to provide training for pre-service teachers, and then introduce the sequence of ME courses in schools. Today school students only get a limited set of narrowly technical skills of computer and Internet applications at their computer science classes.

Susanne Krucsay:

The most important step is giving all teachers a basic idea of what media education is.

Robert Kubey:

We need better funding and especially support from public education governance and from education schools in higher education.

Geoff Lealand:

Good-to-excellent prospects. See above too.

Elena Murukina:

There are undoubtedly good prospects. But in my opinion in the foreseeable future ME will develop thanks to the efforts of enthusiasts. In our country this is a tried-and-true approach, an effective one.

Anastasia Novikova:

Embedment of media education in school electives and extra-curricula subjects, cross-curricular integration, introduction of the major qualification in education departments.

Konstantin Ognev:

To my mind VGIK needs to be reinforced as the nucleus of the fundamental cinematographic school, integration of VGIK experience into universities and institutes, training future specialists of media field, an elaborate plan of the program of multi-level media education, aimed at the understanding of the aesthetics of the screen art.

Zurab Oshxneli:

In Georgia, the necessity of founding media educational center and its development has increased. Georgian educational system is becoming European; it will unite with Bolivian and Copenhagen agreement. So if Europe wants the system of media education, it will be needed by all the countries which are going to have European education. First of all, we will need to collect information about European media education and their work, about their production, and about educational programs, which include educational television and their effectiveness.

Trygve Panhoff:

The first thing that should have been done is obligatory media education training for all teachers.

Faith Rogow:

Efficacy research (not media effects research) is a top priority. We need to start evaluating specific teaching strategies and set standards for most promising

practices based on research, not just random claims of success. Driven by continually changing media technologies, the demand for media education will continue to grow.

Elena Yastrebtseva:

Modern school must become not only the school of knowledge for children, but also the school for creative work and research.

Conclusion. The answers to the last question illustrate a wide spectrum of opinions concerning the future of media education. Still they are in concert with the vision of good perspectives of the development of media education in the foreseeable future. I am of the same opinion. On a global scale media education in the XXI century speaks out stronger than before. The above forum that experts from different countries took part in outlined different perspectives on media education, its strengths and weaknesses, rewarding approaches and regrets of a current situation. Many countries still have to do a lot to challenge the general public attitude (or indifference) and to get the attention of education policy makers to include media education on the agenda of perpetual school reforms. One of the urgent priorities is teacher training that entails accreditation of the corresponding qualification in universities. But are we moving forward? Definitely.

Notes

1. Mediaobrazovaniye. In: *Rossiyskaya pedagogicheskaya encyclopedia. Vol.1. Moscow, 1993. p. 555.*
2. Fedorov, A. (2006). Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. Interview in *Thinking Classroom, 2006. Vol.7, Number 3, pp. 25-30.*

3. The Development of Media Education in Modern Russia: Experts' Discussion *

Creation of this text was supported by Council of the President of the Russian Federation for the Leading Research Groups of Russia (the leader of the project is Prof. A.Fedorov, grant NSH-657.2003.6).

Leading Russian media educators, members of Russian Association for Film and Media Education (<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>) discussed about their vision of the development of media education in modern Russia.

Participants:

Dr. Oleg Baranov, associate professor of the Tver State Pedagogical University, Emeritus Teacher of the Russian Federation, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, Union of Russian Cineastes, author of numerous publications on film and media education;

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov, President of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, main editor of Russian Pedagogical Journal 'Media Education', pro-rector of Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, has authored many books, textbooks, programs and articles on media education;

Dr. Svetlana Gudilina, head of the Laboratory of Experimental Work in the Institute of Contents and Methods of Education of Russian Academy of Education, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education;

Dr. Valery Gura, head of the chair in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute, member of the Russian Association of Film and Media Education; author of the monograph and articles on distance education;

Dr. Nikolai Hilko, senior research fellow of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Institute of Cultural Studies, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, author of many books, teaching guides, and articles about media education;

Prof. Dr. Natalya Kirillova, professor of the Ural State University, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, Union of Russian Cineastes, author of numerous books and articles on film and media education.

Prof. Dr. Alexander Korochensky, Dean of the Journalism Faculty of Belgorod State University, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, Union of the Russian Journalists, author of the monograph, dedicated to problems of media criticism and media education;

Prof. Dr. Valery Monastyrsky, deputy director of the Institute of Social Work of Tambov State University, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, author of many works on audiovisual education;

Dr. Stal Penzin, associate professor of Voronezh State University, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, Union of Russian Cineastes, author of many books and articles on film education;

Dr. Tatiana Shak, associate professor of Krasnodar State University of Culture and Arts, directs the Centre of Music and IT, member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education;

Prof. Dr. Alexander Sharikov, professor of the University "High School of Economics" (Moscow), member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, author of many books and articles on media education and sociology of media.

Prof. Dr. Leonid Usenko, professor of Rostov State Pedagogical University, member of Union of Russian Journalists, and the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, author of the books on history and theory of Art and Film education;

Alexander Sharikov:

Media education is the dynamically developing field. Media pedagogy in Russia has essentially started to assert itself since the 1920s (when film education and education on the material of press developed rapidly). However it was only in 1986 that the term “media education” appeared in Russian publications, while in western European countries it has been familiar since late 1960s. And if in the 1980s this direction evoked somewhat suspicious interest in Russian pedagogic community, now the term is used so often (and not always to the point), that it is alarming - are the boundaries of this direction so diffused that it has become omnivorous and has lost its specific character?

Achievements. Media education ideas were caught up by a lot of people in early 1990s, and by now the number of media education proponents grew by many times. There are dissertations where the term “media education” is the key word, and it indicates the acknowledgement of this direction in academic circles. There are monographs on theory and history of media education (Alexander Fedorov being the most active author), and numerous articles. This testifies of media education maturing as the fundamental direction in pedagogy.

There emerged the administrative necessity for specialization of pedagogic personnel in media studies, systematic training of media educators, that is confirmed in documents of the Ministry of Education of Russian Federation. This is a proof of acknowledgment of media education on the administrative level.

Therefore great achievements in the development of media education in Russia are to be seen. The last two-three years can be characterized as the completion of legitimization of this direction, and its integration with traditional pedagogical directions, both on the academic and on managerial-administrative levels.

Problems. The main problem is the fragmentation and difficulties in compatibility of different branches of media education. This is to a large extent due to the absence of the single universally acknowledged theory of mass communications (there are many mid- and low-level theories, developed in various philosophical schools). Further on, each type of media in Russia is rather separated from the others. We can only speak of more or less degree of comprehension of each branch within the sphere of mass communications.

Thus, traditionally strong are the cinema theorists whose interests are mostly focused on the study of cultural and semiotic aspects. And film education is to a large extent aimed at building skills of perception and critical evaluation, and less at creativity.

The theory of journalism looks quite comprehensible. It is traditionally connected to philology on the one hand, and on the other hand, to social sciences, in the first place, political science and sociology. Still there is a difference here too. Journalism is an applied field. According to the Russian pedagogical tradition it is

customary to organize the issue of some informational production than to study theory and history of journalism. Therefore the tendency emerged to transfer students' efforts in journalism from school to extra-curricular activities. Herewith it is obvious that it is easier for teachers to set up the project of producing a newspaper or magazine, than a radio or a TV program.

Internet direction deserves special attention. To a considerable degree it is associated with enthusiasts in IT. There are more quests here, and less dependence on tradition.

In my opinion media education does not demonstrate the unity but on the contrary, is tied to a specific direction, comparatively autonomous fields, almost escaping intersections. Therefore it is difficult to organize the education of prospective media teachers, who should gain knowledge and skills in maximally wide field of media directions.

There is another problem - what is the target university major for the school students of media? Will they enter the Film Institute, Journalism Departments, Schools of Advertisement and PR? Will they be able to get a job in mass communications after they leave school? Or is it just about not obligatory but appealing for children sphere of practical activity, taking place extra-curricula or even out-of-school: to issue a newspaper, to shoot a video, just watch a good film and discuss it? There are no simple answers to these questions. But they keep emerging.

Another problem is the compatibility of elements of knowledge from theory and practice of mass communications with material of other subjects, the compatibility that is absolutely not worked out.

And finally, the most vital problem: who and where should train media educators?

Generally. There are four "eternal", key problems of media education:

- 1)What are its main aims? What do we need it for?
- 2)What are its content and forms? Or what is media education about?
- 3)How should media education integrate with other fields of pedagogical activity, both didactic and educational?
- 4)Who trains media teachers and where? What are the content and forms of higher education?

Stal Penzin:

I also evaluate the current condition of Russian media education positively on the whole. It is developing although slower than it could.

First, in 2002 the Ministry of Education of Russia registered the new university specialization 03.13.30 "Media education" (within the major "Social Pedagogy"). Until that all of us, media educators, worked as if "underground": writing research publications, introducing electives on film studies in schools and universities circum - official curricula. But now media educators' activity has gained the official status. Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute is the first one in the country to offer the specialization 'Media education' since academic year 2002.

The situation is far from being idyllic, but the attitude to media teachers has changed: our qualification is demanded. Another important factor is that the

Ministry of Education made a resolution to introduce the new specialization as a result of the initiative of the Assembly of the Russian Union of Cineastes and the Association for Film and Media Education. Therefore, if one expresses such sort of initiative, results can be achieved. It inspires.

Secondly, I'd like to acknowledge the activity of our colleagues from the Association for Film and Media Education. In the first place - professor Alexander Fedorov, who since 2005 is the main editor of our new pedagogical journal '*Media Education*' (full texts of this journal are on the web of Russian Committee of the UNESCO Program 'Information foal All' (<http://www.ifap.ru>) and on the our Association web <http://edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). The scientific school of media education directed by him has gained the official status of the leading scientific school of the Russian Federation in Humanities since 2003, and was supported by the grants of the President of Russia, Russian Foundation for Humanities and the program 'Russian Universities'. His colleagues and he have published numerous research publications, monographs, teaching guides and programs on media education. In my native Voronezh I used to be a "loner" (for instance, in my book "Cinema in Voronezh" that came out in 2004, among other things I describe my experience in teaching media for 35 years), and now I work together with many colleagues: V.Bykov, V.Polevoi, L.Romanova, and others. Only for the last five years more than a dozen Ph.D. dissertations on media education were defended.

Alexander Fedorov:

I can cite the specific numbers. According to my estimation, since 1990 about 50 candidate's dissertations, related to media education, and 3 doctor's dissertations have been defended in Russia. On the whole, since 1950 till present the State Degree Committee approved of more than a hundred of dissertations related to media education, among which are the fundamental Doctor's thesis of Professor Yury Usov (aesthetical concept of audiovisual media education) and Lev Pressman (practical concept of media education). I would also distinguish the works of Oleg Baranov, Elena Bondarenko, Inna Levshina, Valery Monastyrsky, Stal Penzin, Gennady Polichko, Yuly Rabinovich, Alexander Sharikov. Among the recent dissertations I'd like to mark the thesis of Natalia Legotina, Nikolai. Hilko, Irina Chelysheva, Ekaterina Yakushina, Elena Murukina, Elena Stolbnikova. In 2003 Professor Alexander Korochensky successfully defended his Doctor's thesis in St. Petersburg. His work was dedicated to media criticism, and he was the first one in Russian academia to analyze the juxtaposition points of media criticism and media education.

I would also like to acknowledge the productive activity of the firm "VIKING" (Video Kino Gramotnost (video and film literacy), founded by the CEO of our Association – Professor Gennady Polichko. During its, alas, short existence in early 1990s and due to its support, the Russian Association for film and Media Education successfully implemented several interesting projects. For example, in May 1991 the first Russian film lyceum was opened. International conferences on media pedagogy, Russian-British seminars on media education (together with the Laboratory of Screen Arts of the Institute of Art Education of Russian Academy of Education) were held. There were first and unfortunately last national film education courses in Moscow.

Today Gennady Polichko heads the Chair of the State University of Management and annually runs media education festivals for schoolchildren (first time in Uglich and Maloyaroslavets, now - in northern Apatity).

Since the late 1990s the national Russian resort center for children “Orlyonok” has hosted the festivals of visual arts run by the Russian film director V.Grammatikov - with film/TV/computer and journalism workshops and master classes for children and teenagers. Plus the activity of the Laboratory of Screen Arts at the Institute of Art Education of the Russian Academy of Education (till 2000 headed by professor Yury Usov, and now by Dr. Larissa Bazhenova). Several interested projects were implemented by the Laboratory of Media Education of the Russian Academy of Education (chaired by professor Ludmila Zaznobina (1939-2000, modern chair is Dr. Elena Bondarenko), including the draft of the Standard of Media Education integrated into secondary curriculum (1998).

Media educational projects and research done by the members of our Association were funded not only by the grants of the President of the Russian Federation, Russian Foundation for Humanities and Ministry of Education of Russia, but also American, German, French and Swiss research grants and scholarships. Here are just some names among the leaders of research projects, distinguished by the grants - Yury Usov, Stal Penzin, Elena Bondarenko, Anastasia Novikova, Nikolai Hilko, and others.

Svetlana Gudilina:

I'd like to focus on school media education. Today media education in schools is developing in two main directions - as a special field of extra-curricula training and as a cross-curriculum, integrated field. In both cases methods of work with media texts are under discussion. The main difference is that in extra-curricula education with more instruction hours pupils have an opportunity to get the deeper insight into the work of mass media. While at other subjects, as we all understand, in the first place the subject matter objectives are dealt with, and only if time permits, some elements of media education are integrated, that have junctions with the topic under study. Still it is the second direction that determines the mass integration of media education for all school children, and not only for those who attend film/TV/radio/ school newspaper clubs, and other extra curricula activities.

The monitoring of the integration of media education in schools showed that both for teachers and for parents it appears to be of current concern and a perspective direction. It's a must now to talk about the increasing role of the media, their influence on teenagers and the need for the special training of school children in sensible perception of media texts of different types and genres. However one needs to realize that media education is not obligatory in schools and none of the federal educational standards contains the direct reference to media education, therefore not every teacher deals or planning to deal with it in future.

Another detail of the condition of media education development is that the term “media education” still remains vague for the broad circle of pedagogic community. Here's the example. Each year we add new participants to our experimental field in media education. On the one hand, we see the enthusiasm of teachers, interested in this direction, and interest and some appreciation of our

research in education administration. On the other hand, we discover that not only some teachers but also head teachers/supervisors hear about media education for the first time. This fact should be taken in consideration, although it first may sound shocking and improbable.

There always have been and will be problems in a new and “live” activity. Therefore I’d like to tell also about our successes, our annual conferences “Educational Technologies of the XXI century”, which include the following sessions: instructional design, media education technologies in teaching and learning, informational - communicative technologies in education, pedagogical technologies in creating media and web projects (www.art.ioso.ru). Every year the number of participants grows along with the number of enthusiasts, who are involved in media education and information culture in primary, secondary school and higher education.

Valery Monastyrsky:

Unfortunately I don’t have enough information to objectively evaluate the current state of media education on the whole in the country. My impression is that it is still the field depending on initiative activity of enthusiasts, who are supported by the Russian Association for Film and Media Education. However there are obvious achievements: journal ‘Media Education’, research publications and teaching manuals, proving of the continuous search, widening of the sphere of research interests, inclusion of new media objects.

The main problem to my mind is the absence of the shaped public opinion about the necessity for media education as the component of secondary education, and media literacy as the component of general culture of the modern personality. In its turn, the problem leads to another - absence of the official state demand for qualified specialists in the field.

Oleg Baranov:

Media education issues of children and youth are still the domain of individual enthusiasts in Russia. There is no state policy about it, and we lack the purposeful and systematic state coordination in developing the theory and methods of media education, forms of administration and teacher training programs.

The most prolific team that is working on these problems is the one headed by professor Alexander Fedorov. They are the closest to elaborating the future model of media education.

Leonid Usenko:

Undoubtedly, the contemporary condition of media education in Russia is characterized by certain advantages. As it has been mentioned above, the great achievement is the establishment of the new university specialization “media education” (in 2003 the complete set of curricula for this minor was developed by the research group of members of the Association for Film and Media Education headed by Alexander Fedorov). University instructors, post graduate and undergraduate students can study Fedorov’s monograph “Media Education: History, Theory and Methodology” (2001) and the textbook “Media Education and Media Literacy” (2004). The research experience of 2001 is widened and deepened in the monograph co-authored by Alexander Fedorov and Irina Chelysheva “Media

Education in Russia” (2002) (Irina Chelysheva defended her Ph.D. dissertation on history of media education in Russia), in further books by Alexander Fedorov “Media Education in Pedagogical Institutes” (2003) and “Media Education in Foreign Countries” (2003), ‘Media Education of the Future Pedagogy’ (2005). One of my Ph.D. students (N.Vedenejeva) is going to defend her thesis on the pedagogical lessons of Italian neo-realism. Thus, there are obvious academic achievements in history and theory of media education.

However some aspects of practice of media education, in particular - film education in schools and universities - are less impressive. For today’s young generation the experience of interaction with media culture (alas!) is connected with the bombardment of American media garbage. And this leads to creation of stereotypes that are so hard for teachers to oppose to. As a rule, practical film education is more successful not in schools and colleges but in film/video clubs, although media education now is increasingly integrating into traditional subjects.

Speaking of the media education practice in Rostov-on-Don, I’d like to mention TV programs by E.Berezhnaya, broadcasted on the TV channel Don-TR. Rostov State university offers courses in media and film, journalism. I’m teaching film studies courses in Lyceum under the Rostov State Univeristy, in the Institute of Business, Management and Law, in Rostov State Pedagogical University. Film club movement is reviving in Rostov too: S.Novikova and A.Mityuhin direct two of them. The centre of media education in Don region is now Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute with its various projects and programs.

Nikolai Hilko:

Certainly the present condition of the development of media education in Russia can be considered dynamic, but leaves much to be desired, especially in Siberian regions. Film education in the form of electives, extra-curricula clubs are replaced by elite video clubs, accumulating the flow of Western film production. At the same time the opportunities of media education on the material of press are being widened because of the growing number of higher education institutions training journalists, including television journalists. Media education requires application of modern digital and information technologies, providing the conditions for the realization of socio-cultural regional projects, initiatives on setting up the “preserved areas” within the ecology of screen culture, film/TV centers of retrospective character.

In training future specialists in advertising, the creativity in screen sphere plays a special role, being based on the set of methods of pragmatic image creation. However there are problems in somewhat “soullessness” of modern ads, their alienation from the creative potential of a client.

The integrated media education provides opportunities for the realization of interactive web technologies in intellectual, aesthetic and art directions. There’s a tendency to integrate interactive computer programs in traditional knowledge systems.

Photo-creativity of pupils needs to be developed too, either in out-of-school clubs, or at “young technician’s stations”. Low quality and vulgarity of some TV/radio production raises the question of the responsibility of people running

media agencies before the youth. Hereby television is increasingly becoming a team creative activity in media education - for example, within the framework of the reflection of pupils of the events of their micro environment of education and leisure in schools, and out-of-school clubs. Children's TV journalism moulds the system of perception and the new way of thinking, thus promoting the cultural creativity, integration of media technologies into developing knowledge.

Natalya Kirillova:

I think that media education in our country is on the right track, and can be viewed as a developing system. There are a lot of accomplishments in the field:

- the experience of preceding decades in film/media education, both Russian and foreign, has been studied and summarized;
- Russian Association for Film and Media Education (founding members included N.Lebedev, Y.Usov, O.Baranov, S.Penzin, I.Vaisfeld and others; since 2003 the Association has been headed by A.Fedorov and G.Polichko);
- formation of the system of main directions in media pedagogy;
- development of the administrative necessity for teacher training in media education.

Still the problem here is much bigger than it seems at first sight, and namely, it consists in the fact that "super-task" of media education is not determined completely, unlike the well elaborated methodology of media education. Theoretical-conceptual basis of media education, implemented for many years by representatives of different sciences (journalism, art studies, pedagogy, cultural studies, sociology, aesthetics, etc.) independent from each other, led to the field narrowness as the main problem of Russian media education. One of the principal objectives today is the scientific-methodological integration, consolidation of all efforts - of academicians, practitioners, authorities - to determine the main directions of media education as the factor of social modernization. I believe this aim is able to unite the efforts of teachers and critics, journalists and cultural studies educators, sociologists and politicians in forming of the new public consciousness, spiritual culture of a personality.

Tatiana Shak:

I'll try to express my point of view not as a media educator but as a musicologist working on the problem of integrating principles of media education into the practice of supplementary training of a teacher of music and a musician.

It's quite difficult to define the current state of media education component in modern music education. Unfortunately, we face the insufficient awareness of professional musicians of this direction. The term itself and its definition raise questions. For example, the course "Computer applications in music", aimed at providing the elementary computer literacy for future musicians, is sometimes equated to media education!

There are a lot of reasons for a discreet attitude of musicians to media education. They include the conservatism of the conservatory's education, resisting any innovations, and psychological motives (for many musicians it's more important to HEAR, than to SEE. Sound for them is self-meaningful, all-sufficient; it substitutes the visual imagery, and doesn't become a sound design. It should be

noted that methodology of media education, focusing on screen arts, in our opinion is underestimating the role of music as an essential component of a media text.

Still the modern condition of musical culture demands a certain updating in training of professional musicians. And we can't do without media technologies.

The music conservatory of Krasnodar State University of Culture and Arts is integrating the media pedagogy in music education and is working on creation of supplementary training for musicians in new qualifications, that emerged due to the development of musical culture and music business in Russia. We've accumulated considerable experience in creative student production accentuating the musical component (ads, music videos, television programs, etc.).

Oleg Baranov:

The media education of the 1960's - 1970s appears to me as the most interesting. This period is characterized by the great involvement of Arts agents in rising of the audiovisual culture of the youth. We witnessed an amazing phenomenon-junction of the pedagogy and Arts studies: teachers became art critics, and art critics became teachers. It's at the intersection of education and arts studies that were developed the mutually enriching models of film education in Tver, Voronezh, Kurgan, Armavir, Moscow and Taganrog. Provincial centres of film education were leading in the field. In Moscow and then Petersburg these models were synthesized, and the general strategy of the development of the film education system with joint efforts of state structures of culture and education was clarified. The Union of Cineastes took an active part in this too.

Press of the 1960s - 1970s paid considerable attention to the system of film education, summarized the work experience. Magazines "Cinema Art", "People's Education" published very interesting articles related to this topic. Publishing houses BPSK and 'Prosveschenije' published series of books on film education in different regions of the country. Actors, directors, screen writers were often guests of young film clubs, which hosted interesting meetings.

Today, for example, in Tver, there are constant film productions, including feature films and TV series. But one can't even come close to the film group, not to mention arranging the meeting with school children. Newspapers inform readers about the hotel the film crew is staying at, which sauna they go to, what they eat, etc. but not a word of the artistic problems of modern cinema art...

Nikolai Hilko:

If we speak about the accumulated experience in media education in Russia, the following activities are considered by us as the most valuable for the current sociocultural situation:

- establishment of contacts on film/media education between universities, colleges of Arts, schools and pre-school institutions;
- regular national and regional conferences on urgent problems of media culture and media education, exchange of practices;
- media centers activity, comprising traits of a movie theater and a film club, including show programs and at the same time working in education, entertainment, and "edutainment";

- activity of film clubs as the form of social life and social communication (incl. screenings of film classics, propaganda of the best works of art of cinema art, etc.);
- screenings of amateur films, the movement of film fans, their collaboration with television, combining the technical and creative training;
- polycultural classes using media in the space of the dialogue of cultures;
- film/TV/ video workshops, synthesizing education and leisure (film lyceums, arts lyceums) in the system of the supplementary education;
- informal voluntary clubs in children radio centers at summer camps, schools, colleges;
- clubs of photography, with “exchange circles”, regular exhibitions, social- publicist collections, etc.;
- film museums and children film theaters;
- educational projects on TV channels using computer graphics, archive and new film/photo/video documentary;
- creation of the folklore television programs engaging school pupils;
- slide-clubs, screen photography studios, festivals of this direction;
- film/video centers, providing service for kindergartens, schools and summer camps.

Tatiana Shak:

The most considerable result of the efforts of several generations of enthusiasts of media education in Russia is the accreditation of the new minor in education - “Media education” and journal ‘Media Education’. Plus the number of books by Alexander Fedorov on media education.

Alexander Korochensky:

In my opinion most important is the experience collected by the representatives of film education - the direction, that has successfully developed in Russia for many decades and was based on the profound national traditions of theory of cinematography and film criticism.

Valery Gura:

For me, too the film education experience seems to be very valuable, including organization of film clubs, film forums, supported by the developed film studies.

Valery Monastyrsky:

I am of the same opinion...

Stal Penzin:

I could go into the detail account of it, but I’d rather refer the interested colleagues to monographs by Alexander Fedorov - “Media Education: History, Theory and Methods” (2001) and by Alexander Fedorov and Irina Chelysheva “Media Education in Russia: Brief History” (2002). They give a complete account of media education experience, and draw conclusions that I agree with. On the whole, I would distinguish Fedorov’s works as one of the best in the field...

Svetlana Gudilina:

And I would not like to distinguish someone. All initiatives are very important and valuable, because they contribute to the vital movement. We are working on media education technologies, which are used in schools, therefore for our research

team and teachers who experiment with us, the standard of integrated media education, elaborated by professor Ludmila Zaznobina, is the keystone.

Alexander Sharikov:

In general the whole experience - theoretical, practical, and historical - is important for the development of Russian media education. It's difficult for me to make a distinction of something special. I think it is unique as regards other countries.

Alexander Korochensky:

In foreign experience the most interesting and valuable for Russia are the achievements of humanistic media education, aimed at the democratic values, at the variety of resources of mass media in order to develop a personality intellectually and spiritually, teaching of children and adults the literate and effective perception of mass media, training the skills of independent critical analysis, interpretation and evaluation of mass media and media texts. Valuable are in the first place those foreign media education practices that help to enrich the spiritual world, culture of a modern person (including one's civic and political culture), preparing for the active life in the information saturated environment, turning into the cognitive and critical participant of mass communication processes. These are the works of L. Masterman, D. Buckingham, C. Bazalgette, K. Tyner, J. Gonnet and other representatives of humanistic, democratic schools in media education.

Oleg Baranov:

Of course the experience of foreign colleagues can assist the development of Russian media education. Besides the summarizing and systematizing of own approaches to solving the problem, perhaps we need to study the system of state approaches to management of media education, and not directly copy the contents, forms and methods of work. The attempt of Ministry of Education to transfer the western model on to the Russian school leads to the loss of individuality. One can't, as K. Ushinsky said still back in the 19th century, to relocate the western experience on Russian realia. We need to take into account the specifics of the people, its national peculiarities. Though of course a school teacher needs to have access to the information about foreign curricula. Take for example, Russian TV: when the audience watches mainly western film production and western TV shows, it leads to the low culture of senses of a young person.

Svetlana Gudilina:

Undoubtedly the study of foreign experience is useful and essential. But I would say that Russian media education experience can help foreign colleagues as well. There are a lot of ways of exchange of experience - seminars, conferences, Internet workshops, video conferences. Perhaps, language problems might occur, but they can be solved. As the most effective I'd suggest making a project, in which different research schools, pedagogical community, teenagers and parents could take part.

Alexander Sharikov:

I agree that we need collaborative media educational researches both fundamental and applied.

Nikolai Hilko:

We could organize joint festivals of media arts; integrate international media education programs, set up exchange visits to media centers.

Tatiana Shak:

Besides I'd like to learn if there are practices in integration of media education in music education in other countries, and which directions they are working in.

Stal Penzin:

Of course the study of the foreign media education experience can play an important role. As for my own experience, when French exchange students from Rennes University came to Voronezh Pedagogical University, they chose three courses to study: the Russian language, Russian literature and History of Cinema Art. I was teaching them the latter course, including for instance the work of A.Tarkovsky and N.Mikhalkov. This fact proves the popularity of media education in France. Therefore, we also need to study media education experience of France, Great Britain, Canada, the USA, Germany and other countries.

Alexander Korochemsky:

I'd like to highlight the connection of media pedagogy and media criticism. Media criticism is the form of operative cognition and evaluation of media practice and media texts, and therefore called upon to become one of the most important components of media educational activity - as in its journalism field (mass media criticism in press, based mainly on the direct practical cognition and the assessment of media practices and media texts; film criticism in press), and in the form of academic criticism of mass media, implemented through strictly academic approaches and methods. Ways of interaction of media criticism and media education are various- from use of published articles in classroom to journalistic and research activities of media educators, as demonstrated by Alexander Fedorov and others.

Oleg Baranov:

Integration of media criticism and media education is necessary. There is need for the mass press agency, targeted at teachers, university instructors, where media critics together with media educators would deeply, far and wide analyze the condition of film/video/media process, would determine the possible approaches to teaching media texts of different types and genres in schools and universities. Media criticism should be targeted at young audience, be comprehensible and purposeful, has a distinct educational message. Media critics should understand and accept the standpoint of the teacher.

Nikolai Hilko:

The role of media criticism in my opinion consists in selective, differentiating and evaluating-reflexive activity concerning any information. It is absolutely necessary in developing of the culture of thinking. Educational media/film criticism can interact within the system of media education through the forms of clubs, round table discussions, TV- and Internet conferences.

Alexander Sharikov:

From Greek *kritikos* is the art of judgment. If we accept this definition, then criticism is the essential part of media education, one of its aims. What is the attitude of media critics to media education? I think there is no univocal answer to that, but

gradually the media critics' community begins to understand that media education, both as a special and as integrated field, is the indispensable element for the valid functioning of the media sphere itself. Pragmatically, media critics should take an active part in media education, teach, and set standards and models that media educators could use in their practice.

Valery Monastyrsky:

I'd limit myself with the example of film education. Film criticism is an ally of film education. Talented film criticism, included into the process of film education promotes its activation, increase of its problem accentuation, vitality and creativity, and also is one of the means to overcome "didactic" self-righteousness.

Tatiana Shak:

I'll try to continue by the example of music criticism, as one of the components of media education for musicians. Its state is much to be desired, because music criticism and music journalism focus their attention mainly on academic genres and composers (with the exception of professional jazz critics). The following problems thus are left out:

- popular (mass) music culture (it is covered generally by journalists who don't have music education);
- functioning of music in the structure of a media text (music video, music in ads, music in TV programs, music in feature films or documentary);
- perception of music in a media text;
- work of composers writing for films;
- use of classical music in media texts, etc.

All of the above can become an object for study of music critics and an important component of media education for musicians. The problem of training of a music media critic is vital also for the Conservatory major "Music Studies". It's aimed at teaching mainly prospective music critics, but till now has been focused on academic direction. Perhaps the new qualification, enriched with principles of media education - "Musical Journalism" can solve this problem.

Valery Gura:

Media criticism is important, to my mind, for professionals, but for broad masses it exercises only a limited effect because ordinary people including youth rarely read such publications. Although of course media criticism can help sharpen the aims of media education and raise the effectiveness of pedagogical technologies.

Stal Penzin:

And I think that media criticism can achieve a lot. It's very encouraging for example that Guild of Film Critics of Russia twice awarded prizes for work in media education - in 2001 and 2003 (to Alexander Fedorov and me). The newspaper of the Union of cinematographers of Russia "SK-News" has published quite a few of my articles about media education in Voronezh. But the magazine "Film Art" pays almost no attention to the problems of film and media education... In short, there is huge potential for fruitful alliance of media criticism and media education, but its realization is very weak so far.

Alexander Fedorov:

I'd like to point out that recently the important step toward the expansion of the interaction of media criticism and media education has been made. Thanks to the efforts of professor Alexander Korochemsky the Internet site "Media Review" (<http://mediareview.by.ru>) was launched, where the problems of both media criticism and media education are combined for the first time.

Alexander Korochemsky:

I'm sure that in Russia the necessity for the opening of the new university pedagogical major "media education" (and not only the minor qualification) is imminent. This new major will be the step, adequate to the modern social-humanities significance of media education. Training within the framework of minor qualification lets preparing only "incomplete" specialists in the field. Maximum immersion in theory and methodology of media education can be achieved only through the major. The present state of media education theory and practice technically gives the opportunity to introduce the corresponding pedagogical major – under the condition of media education growth as the academic field and providing the readiness of mass Russian teaching community to accept such specialists.

I expect future graduates majored in media education to be employed in higher education institutions and schools above all. Today the number of teachers able to teach media education in schools, colleges and universities is very small compared to the objective social demand for the qualified specialists of the kind.

Valery Gura:

I think that the launching of the new speciality "Media education" is actual and essential, parallel with informing the public about the significance of this qualification in the epoch of the information society.

Oleg Baranov:

And I doubt that the new specialization Media Education will solve the problem... For instance, where will a media teacher work? In school? Will he get a full-time time job? Which institutes and universities can prepare such specialists? I think we should consider integrated training, comprising specializations of a teacher and of an art critic. These specialists should work in professional development institutes, city and district teaching resource centers, providing help for schools and institutes. In my opinion, it is essential to introduce obligatory courses and seminars on media education into the State Standard of Higher Pedagogical Education. It will give an opportunity to a teacher of any subject to integrate media education. But one shouldn't connect media education with only philological or historical specialization. Today a teacher of each subject should be ready (at least on a basic level) to work on developing the media culture of a personality.

Tatiana Shak:

Applied to music, I see the necessity of introduction to the State Standard of Education the new specializations, which are needed under the modern condition of music culture and music business in Russia. It will allow to solve the problem of employment in spheres of culture - leisure activity, mass media, news in music (for example, "Music Journalism", "Music Editing on Radio and Television", "Computer Adaptation of Music", "Teacher of the Electronic Instruments"). One shouldn't also forget the teachers of music schools and teachers of music in secondary schools,

who also need to be media literate and teach traditional subjects (Listening to Music, Music Literature, Music) taking into account media technologies. I don't exclude that in the nearest future there's going to emerge the new speciality "Music Media Educator".

Stal Penzin:

The university major "Media Education" seems to me very necessary. As for the employment, I'm sure that this qualification will be demanded - in the first place qualified media teachers could teach in universities, colleges, schools, various out-of-school institutions. It's not necessary to think that such speciality should become widely spread in each university or pedagogical institute. State Institute of Cinematography, for instance, is the only one in the country to give degrees to 20-30 graduates majoring in "Film Studies" annually. However no one doubts the right of existence of this speciality.

Natalya Kirillova:

For me the introduction of departments "Cross Cultural (mass) Communications" with main specializations: "Theory and History of Media Culture" and "Management in Media Sphere" into universities and pedagogical institutes looks as one of the most promising directions. This qualification will let the graduates to join the system of media education in both research and practice directions: to teach "Foundations of Media Culture" in schools and colleges, engage in media criticism and sociology, work as consultants, experts or analysts in executive and legislative authorities bodies, TV/radio companies, information agencies, press, etc.

This major will fill media education with new contents and will enable to vary its forms. But most importantly, it will unite efforts of those, who are connected with problems of media in this form or another – Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Culture of Russia, Union of Cineastes, Union of Journalists, and others.

Nikolai Hilko:

Being a consistent proponent of the launching of the new university major "Media Education", I'll focus of the following employment opportunities for qualified media educators:

- media educator in cultural studies (teacher in colleges or universities);
- programmer (teacher of computer design/instructional design);
- director of the center of film/photo/video children's production (out-of-school centers);
- supervisor of the children's film club;
- recreation media teacher;
- librarian;
- editor, journalist;
- TV programs director;
- designer (Art schools);
- media teacher-rehabilitator (rehab centers, psycho neurological centers);

Svetlana Gudilina:

As for the development of media education naturally we need to start thinking about the training of specialists. Schools need qualified media teachers. Many schools would be happy to hire a specialist for setting up a journalist's club or school television, but it's not easy to find a teacher who knows the specifics of media education.

Since media education is more than a stand alone subject, we need to consider its integrated nature. Therefore besides the new university major 'Media Education', we need to raise the question about the integration of media education objectives into the courses in Methods of Teaching for all subjects. One may argue about which school subjects can be loaded with media educational aspects. But the experiments which are already being conducted and leading to interesting results, will be very useful for future teachers.

Alexander Sharikov:

I think that today qualified media educators are in great demand, and especially in higher education. Recently there occurred many new specializations, somehow connected to the sphere of mass communications. "Advertisement" and "Public Relations" are among of them. The common set of courses for such specializations includes "Theory of Mass Communications", "Sociology of Mass Communications". Due to the fact that no one trains specialists in these subjects so far (at least I haven't heard of it), there's a lacuna.

Media education could become a specialization within somewhat broader circle of majors, specifically, in communications. Therefore I suppose that it is appropriate to open *departments of communications*, including following specializations:

- communications studies (general theory of communications);
- media education;
- journalism (with minors in press, photography, TV, radio, Internet);
- advertisement;
- public relations;
- management in the sphere of mass communications.

Perhaps it should also include training of specialists in rhetoric that in this context is understood as the theory and practice of speech communication. Maybe other minors will add to it too, film studies among other.

All these specializations can have a common basis, and then the employment problem would be easier solved since students could quite quickly accommodate and get re-education within the range of above mentioned specializations. Judging by the tendencies in development, soon Russia will experience deficit of specialists in these fields.

Alexander Fedorov:

The idea of professor Alexander Sharikov to create the Departments of Communications at big universities seems to me very promising and convincing. Moreover that European and American universities have long replaced the traditional departments of journalism with such departments, comprising of course all functions of training future professionals in the sphere of press, radio, television and Internet. I think another option is to open the departments of "Information

Technologies in Education” at pedagogical institutes. These departments could offer education in following:

- computer sciences;
- information security;
- media education;
- management in educational IT s;
- supervision of leisure activities with media; etc.

These departments would perhaps be suitable in universities of Culture and Arts. Then the set of specializations could be the following:

- cultural studies;
- media education;
- arts studies (including theatre and film studies);
- management in sphere of culture, media and education, etc.

Today we have prepared the complete package of documents (draft of the educational standard, curriculum, syllabus, etc.) for the university/institute’s major “Media Education”, that is currently under the review at the Ministry of Education and Science of Russia

Tatiana Shak:

We need propaganda and advertisement of media education among general public and “authorities” as far as its necessity concerns, and the need for the specialization. The Association for Film and Media Education should promote the exchange of experience between media educators working in different fields; hold regular conferences (including via Internet) on media education problems; set up workshops of the best teachers; organize contests of students’ creative media works. In general, I’m optimistic about the future development of media education in Russia, as life itself necessitates it. Our work shows that students of music institutes are ready to adapt to new forms of learning with media technologies. But are teachers and institutes ready for that? The application of principles of media education in teaching is possible only under the condition of breaking down the outdated stereotypes in the consciousness of the faculty.

Alexander Korochemsky:

First we need to “enlighten” the “enlighteners”- i.e. to effectively and widely integrate the pioneer ideas and concepts of media education into the academic and education environment, in order to turn media education into the acknowledged and obligatory component of the educational process on different levels of system of education, and the obligatory element of public-informing activity, targeted at various age and social groups. The role of Russian Association for Film and Media Education can be the leading one. It is aimed at becoming the nucleus of the intellectual and executive consolidation of representatives of different directions and schools in national media education. The first thing to be initiated and implemented by the Association is the series of national and international conferences.

Valery Monastyrsky:

Main aims are to continue patiently developing the public opinion about the need for media education as an integral part of the personality’s culture, provision of its information freedom and means of psychological defense against manipulative

impacts of media; educational activity and other measures aimed at raising the awareness and media culture level of people, together with above mentioned state and public institutions; exchange of practices between the effective centers of media education, its generalization and promotion.

Valery Gura:

In my opinion, the main task of Russian Association for Film and Media Education is the coordination of the efforts of media education activists, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Education and Science, Russian Academy of Education, Russian Union of Cineastes, aimed at the development of a modern media literate citizen, able to use media for personal growth and effective work. To do that the Russian Association for Film and Media Education has to possess sufficient financial resources and empowerment, for example, to be able to assign age ratings to media production and write recommendations for possible target audience. Although it is difficult to achieve today.

In the first place media education itself needs to be developed, filled with specific courses, syllabi, contents.

Oleg Baranov:

The principal task of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education is to succeed in building the interaction of all organizations involved in education and upbringing of young generations, to summarize and systematize the experience of media educators, to determine the strategy and tactics of the development of film and media education, to create teaching manuals.

Stal Penzin:

Here are my suggestions:

a) we need a film/video anthology. As soon as I got the VCR, I immediately started compiling video sequences for classes: TV programs about cinema, documentaries about directors/actors/etc., film episodes. And now the film center named after V.Shukshin, which I run, has a rich collection of valuable audiovisual material. Because if we talk about cinema - same as with music or art - we need illustrations, you can't do without them. Or imagine a literature teacher, whose students don't have an access to a library... However the majority of Russian schools, institutes and even city libraries don't have media centers. Maybe the Ministry of Culture could encourage Russian Institute of Cinematography's faculty and staff prepare such teaching aids - either on tapes or DVDs.

b) we need to catch the attention of those businessmen who are interested in media education ideas. For example, there's a businessman in my native Voronezh funding the video club in a state library, and another one, who finances the Shukshin film center: provides funds for video purchases, publications. Another entrepreneur has collected a big set of art house films.

I consider these points as basic condition for promotion of mass media education in this country...

Natalya Kirillova:

One of the main tasks of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education is to enhance the integration work, including holding conferences and forums, publications, expertise of curricula, research grants, academic exchanges, etc...

Nikolai Hilko:

One of the most important tasks of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education (provided the support of Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Education and Science, Russian Academy of Education, and other interested organizations) are the following:

- promotion of propaganda of screen culture as a form of aesthetical, artistic and creative development;
- activation of efforts to saturate the media education centers with ethnic-cultural content;
- creation of the database of these media texts in order to develop creative resources of folk art;
- development of the audience's culture, depth of the perception of screen works of art by the audience of difference ages;
- setting up children-youth festivals of media creativeness.

Perspectives of the development of media education in Russia in the nearest future consist in overcoming destructive orientations in viewers' culture and in educating young people about spiritual, ethnic, ethnic-cultural and aesthetical values through media, enhancing of the patriotic and civic education in the sphere of screen culture.

The following means are necessary for that:

- 1)to include media culture in the structure of education standard for all levels of general education;
- 2)to organize training of media educators of different specializations within the frameworks of the new specialization "Media Education" and the specializations "Cultural Studies", "Social-cultural Performance", "Social Pedagogy", "Information Security", "Library and Bibliography" as well.
- 3)to organize regular screenings of Russian films with following discussions in educational institutions and out-of-school leisure centers;
- 4)to widen the broadcast and raise the prestige of the television channel "Culture", distinguishing three directions: Arts, Leisure, Folk Art;
- 5)to add to the programming of federal and state TV channels educational, entertainment, scientific, sport, culture and analytical programs for children and adults, and also the best samples of Russian cinematography (at the expense of some reduction of the share of foreign film production and of course ceasing broadcast of programs and films loaded with violence, debauch, befogging human ethics.

Leonid Usenko:

By mutual efforts we need to launch the wide integration of curricula and media education courses for pre-service and in-service teachers (seminars, summer schools, conferences, publications, etc.). The main aim of media education should become the opposition to "mass culture". The only TV channel that tries to do this difficult job is "Culture".

Svetlana Gudilina:

Certainly the problem should be solved on the level of Ministry of Education of Russia, and specialists of the Russian Academy of Education, Association for Film and Media Education, Ministry of Culture, Union of Cineastes can help in working

out foundational documents. Only then it will be possible to see the results of work of institutes training media educators, and the results of work in schools that can realize the ideas of media education through these media educators, develop children's and teenagers' knowledge and skills necessary for this challenging and information saturated world.

Alexander Sharikov:

As any association uniting its members according to their professional activity, Russian Association for Film and Media Education should work in at least the following directions:

- interchange of experience that in particular presupposes: publications (including our journal 'Media Education'; Internet site (<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation> - Russian and English versions) with such materials, current news in the field; holding seminars, conferences; festivals of children's creativeness;
- defense of the field's interests: interaction with state federal and regional structures - Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Culture and Mass Communications, Federation Council, State Duma, Administration of the President, administrations and legislative bodies of the Russian Federation areas, etc.;
- incorporation of media education ideas in public opinion: interaction with press; with other social organizations (Union of Cineastes, Union of Journalists, etc.); international cooperation with media education associations.

But perhaps the most important direction of work is the establishment of departments or at least the media education major. It is critical to start systematical training of specialists and prepare the complete infrastructure (textbooks, teaching manuals, etc.).

Alexander Fedorov:

The Russian Association for Film and Media Education undoubtedly has a lot of objectives. Most of them require of course the effective collaboration (and mutual understanding) with Ministries and other organizations. And most significantly - substantial financing.

I'd like to remind that the Association annually holds media education festival for school children (run by Gennady Polichko). The members of the Association have an opportunity to learn about their colleagues' experience and to share their own through the journal 'Media Education' and site of Association located at the federal portal of Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (<http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation>). I invite everyone who's interested to contribute their articles.

Media educational topics (many of which are full-text copies) - monographs, textbooks, articles, curricula - may be read at the following sites <http://www.mediaeducation.boom.ru> , <http://www.medialiteracy.boom.ru>, <http://mediareview.by.ru/mediaeng.htm> , <http://www.mediaeducation.ru> , <http://www.ifap.ru> , <http://www.auditorium.ru> and others.

Alexander Korochensky:

The development of media education till recently was implemented with elaborating of its theoretical-conceptual foundations and methods of teaching

questions on the agenda. For many years the scientific-conceptual research in the field has been realized by the representatives of various academic fields and scholarly-pedagogical schools, working discretely. In my opinion, further field narrowing of scientific approaches and concepts of media education essence and aims, inherent trait of some projects, can lead to failures. One cannot work with smaller problems while problems of general theory, concept-related remain unsolved. Field limitation is the main, although quite solvable problem of the current stage of Russian media education; it's it "infant illness".

Today with a considerable scientific material available, we need the quality breakthrough. There comes the stage of conceptual consolidation of knowledge about media education, complex scientific criticism and systematizing of research, done by representatives of various directions and approaches in theory and methods of media education and film education, media education on the material of press, TV, video, advertisement, Internet, representatives of journalism schools and communication studies. Success of such consolidation is the prerequisite of further development of Russian media education required to infuse the achievements of the past years - both Russian and foreign.

Series of cross discipline, cross field scientific forums, uniting representatives of all main directions in media education and promoting the exchange of theoretical and practical experience, interaction of different approaches, could contribute to such consolidation. The vital necessity for large-scale academic activities of the kind is obvious today - otherwise media education efforts will be stuck in 1st or 2nd gear. We need to brainstorm the key problems of media education through the discussion process of the leading representatives of different directions in media education. Of course we cannot hope that it will lead to theoretical-conceptual consensus of opinion among media educators. However better understanding and convergence of standpoints (for example, through improving, unification of key concepts of media education) can be achieved.

Oleg Baranov:

To talk about the perspectives of the development of media education in Russia means to talk about the problem of training qualified media teachers, able to determine the direction of own work. We need to clearly resolve aims and objectives of this training, provide all the necessary facilities. It needs to be done not on the enthusiasts' level, but on the State level.

Natalya Kirillova:

Perspectives of the media education development in Russia are directly connected to the process of socialization of the personality in the XXI century, problems of developing the foundations of the civic society that is especially vital and significant.

Alexander Fedorov:

So, media education today maybe divided into the following directions: 1) media education of future professionals in media sphere-journalists (press, radio, TV, Internet), cinematographers, editors, producers, etc.; 2) media education of pre-service teachers in universities, pedagogical institutes, training for in-service teachers at professional development courses; 3) media education as part of the

general education of school pupils and students in schools, colleges, institutes (that in its turn can be integrated with traditional subjects or autonomous (clubs, optional subjects); 4) media education in leisure centers (Palaces of Culture, out-of-school centers, children clubs); 5) distance media education of children and adults through television, radio, Internet (media criticism plays a very important role here); 6) self/independent/continuous media education (theoretically lifelong).

Media education is closely connected not only to pedagogics and art education, but with such academic fields as Arts studies (including film studies, literature, and theatre studies), cultural studies, history (history of world art culture), psychology (art psychology, creativity) and others. Responding to the needs of modern pedagogy in development of a personality, media education broadens the spectrum of methods and forms of classes. And comprehensive study of press, cinema, television, video, Internet, virtual computer world (synthesizing traits of almost all traditional mass media) helps to correct for example such significant drawbacks of traditional aesthetical education as the isolated, one-sided study of literature, music or art, separate study of the form (so-called “imagery”) and contents while analyzing a specific work.

Media education involves heuristic methods of teaching based on problem solving, role-plays and other productive forms of teaching, developing the individuality of a student, his/her independence of thinking, stimulating creative abilities through the direct involvement in creative activities, perception, interpretation and analysis of the structure of a media text, learning about media culture. Media education combines lectures and practical classes to involve students in the process of media text production, merges the audience into the inner laboratory of main media occupations, which is possible both at the autonomous option and during the process of integration into traditional subjects.

I think that media education should be and partially is of high priority in Russia today, as shown by our discussion...

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

**The article is supported by the Grant Council of the President of the Russian Federation for the Leading Research Groups of Russia (the leader of the project is Prof. A.Fedorov, grant NSH-657.2003.6). The author is grateful to Dr. Irina Chelysheva, member of the Association for Film and Media Education, for help in organizing the interviewing of teachers.*

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;

-ensure 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 the interaction with media, development of the creative, communicative skills, critical thinking, perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, teaching different forms of self-expression using 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].

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 questioning 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. The General Attitudes 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:										
Age 21-30/total	0,00	60,00	30,00	0,00	80,00	10,00	40,00	40,00	20,00	60,00
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
Age 31-40/total	16,67	83,33	33,33	0,00	83,33	25,00	83,33	41,67	25,00	50,00
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
Age 41-50 /total	9,10	72,73	36,36	0,00	54,54	45,45	72,73	45,45	27,27	63,64
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
Age 51-60 /total	25,00	41,67	50,00	8,33	50,00	16,67	58,33	50,00	25,00	41,67
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
Age 61-70 /total	16,67	58,33	33,33	8,33	33,33	8,33	33,33	50,50	25,00	41,67
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
All age groups/total	14,03	63,16	36,84	3,51	56,14	21,05	57,89	45,61	24,56	50,88
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 Major 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 of the women’s voices here then of 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 the teachers’ opposition changes its point of view 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 s and mass communication boom is demanding media literacy to the extent not less than it is demanding the traditional literacy.

It seems interesting to me to compare 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.Korochemsky, 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 their attitude to 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, appreciation of masterpieces of media	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 psychology.
	Number of teachers (in %) who chose this variant of an answer													
Age 21-30 total	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
Age 31-40 total	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

Age 41-50 total	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
Age 51-60 total	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
Age 61-70 total	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
All age groups/total	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 over estimate 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. Teachers' Use 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		
Age 21-30 /total	70,00	0,00	30,00
21-30/men	100,00	0,00	0,00
21-30 /women	57,14	0,00	42,86
Age 31-40 /total	41,67	25,00	33,33
21-30/men	50,00	0,00	50,00
21-30 /women	37,50	37,50	25,00
Age 41-50/total	36,36	18,18	45,45
41-50/men	25,00	25,00	50,00
41-50 /women	42,86	14,28	42,86
Age 51-60 /total	25,00	33,33	41,67
51-60/men	60,00	20,00	20,00
51-60/women	0,00	42,86	57,14
Age 61-70 /total	8,33	25,00	50,00
61-70/men	0,00	0,00	100,00
61-70/women	10,00	30,00	60,00
All age groups/total	35,09	21,05	43,86
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. Teachers Opinions about Frequency of Media Education Elements Occurred 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		
Age 21-30 /total	20,00	30,00	50,00
21-30/men	33,33	33,33	33,33
21-30 /women	14,28	28,57	57,14
Age 31-40 /total	16,67	33,33	50,00
21-30/men	0,00	50,00	50,00
21-30 /women	25,00	25,00	50,00
Age 41-50/total	0,00	27,27	72,73
41-50/men	0,00	25,00	75,00
41-50 /women	0,00	28,57	71,43
Age 51-60 /total	8,33	25,00	66,67
51-60/men	20,00	20,00	60,00
51-60/women	0,00	28,57	71,43
Age 61-70 /total	0,00	25,00	75,00
61-70/men	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/women	0,00	10,00	90,00
All age groups/total	8,77	28,07	63,16
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 directions and obligations from the school authorities
	Number of teachers (in %) who chose the answer				
Age 21-30 /total	30,00	0,00	40,00	10,00	70,00
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
Age 31-40 /total	50,00	8,33	100,00	16,67	66,67
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
Age 41-50/total	54,54	18,18	90,91	18,18	90,91
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
Age 51-60 /total	83,33	8,33	91,67	25,00	100,00
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
Age 61-70 /total	50,00	33,33	66,67	50,00	58,33
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
All age groups/total	54,38	14,03	89,47	24,56	77,19
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 do anything about it.

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*. 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 on the topic “Attitude of the School Teachers to Media Education of Pupils and University Students”

(the author of the questionnaire is A.Fedorov)

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 autonomous course
10	Media education in school and university should combine both forms, autonomous and integrated classes

2. What would you say 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 the critical thinking and critical autonomy of the personality towards media texts.
3	Protection from the 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 and learning the knowledge about the history of media, media culture
13	Transmittance of the knowledge about the theory of media, 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	Hard to say

4.

5. If you use the elements of media education during your classes, then how often?

(choose of the following)

1	Regularly
2	Occasionally
3	Seldom or never

6.

7. 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 need more knowledge about theory and methods of teaching media
2	I do not want to teach media
3	I do not feel financial motivation
4	I am not familiar with technology
5	There are no directives from school authorities
6	Other reason (what?)

5. Russian Teachers' Attitude towards the Problem of Screen Violence*

** This publication was supported under a grant funded by the Program of Individual Research of The John and Catherine MacArthur Foundation (grant N 03-77894-000-GSS).*

The author wants to acknowledge Irina Chelysheva, Ph.D., member of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education for her help in the organization of the process of questioning the teachers.

The problem of the screen violence has been gaining more and more importance during the recent years. While many of my researches and articles were dedicated to how the violence scenes on the screen are perceived by the young audiences, This time I was interested to learn the teachers' attitude to this problem. 57 secondary school teachers took part in the study. The gender and age differentiation is shown in table 1.

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

Teachers' Ages:	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
Total:	57	100,00	39	18

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

Table 2. The teachers' attitude toward on-screen violence

Teachers' Age/Gender	Number of Teachers(in %) who are attracted by the scenes of violence on the screen	Number of Teachers (in %) who are not attracted by the scenes of violence	Number of Teachers (in %) whose opinion is not definite
21-30 /total	10,00	50,00	40,00
21-30 лет/male	0,00	33,33	66,67
21-30 лет/female	14,28	57,14	28,57
31-40/total	25,00	58,33	16,67
21-30/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
21-30/female	25,00	62,50	12,50
41-50/total	0,00	81,82	18,18
41-50/male	0,00	75,00	25,00
41-50/female	0,00	85,71	14,28
51-60/total	8,33	75,00	16,67

51-60/male	20,00	60,00	20,00
51-60/female	0,00	85,71	14,28
61-70/total	8,33	83,33	8,33
61-70/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	10,00	80,00	10,00
All age groups /Total	10,17	70,17	19,30
All age groups/male	11,11	61,11	27,78
All age groups/female	10,26	74,36	15,38

If we take a look at the generic numbers, according to them, the number of teachers who get attracted by the scenes of violence on the screen, is slightly over 10 per cent, while the number of those who are opposed the screen violence is 7 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 watching violence 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).

According to the similar study among the 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 to 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 the Screen Violence

Teachers' Age/Gender	Factors Attracting Teachers to the Screen Violence:								
	Entertaining Factor	Identification Factor	Information Factor	Compensatory Factor	Recreation Factor	Dynamic/s/speed of action	Professional directing	Outstanding acting	Outstanding Special Effects
	Число учителей (в процентах), указавших данные факторы:								
21-30 /total	30,00	60,00	20,00	0,00	20,00	20,00	20,00	0,00	0,00
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
31-40/total	41,67	16,67	16,67	33,33	25,00	33,33	25,00	25,00	25,00
21-30/male	75,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	25,00	25,00	25,00
21-30/female	25,00	12,50	12,50	37,50	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	25,00

41-50/total	63,64	36,36	27,27	27,27	27,27	54,55	27,27	27,27	9,10
41-50/male	50,00	25,00	25,00	25,00	50,00	75,00	25,00	25,00	0,00
41-50/female	71,43	42,86	28,57	28,57	14,28	42,86	28,57	28,57	14,28
51-60/total	33,33	25,00	25,00	16,67	25,00	33,33	41,67	41,67	16,67
51-60/male	20,00	20,00	40,00	20,00	20,00	60,00	40,00	40,00	20,00
51-60/female	42,86	28,57	14,28	14,28	28,57	14,28	42,86	42,86	14,28
61-70/total	33,33	33,33	41,67	16,67	8,33	25,00	33,33	25,00	25,00
61-70/male	0,00	50,00	50,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	50,00	50,00	50,00
61-70/female	40,00	30,00	40,00	20,00	10,00	20,00	30,00	20,00	20,00
All age groups /Total	40,35	33,33	26,31	19,30	21,05	33,33	29,82	22,81	15,79
All age groups/male	33,33	33,33	27,78	16,67	22,22	55,55	33,33	27,78	16,67
All age groups/female	45,59	33,33	25,64	20,51	20,51	23,08	28,20	23,08	15,38

These data show that the main factor that contributes to attracting the teachers to screen violence scenes is the 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 liked 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 draw any major conclusions.

Entertainment was the leading factor in the student's reasons for watching violence, too. Moreover, in contradistinction to teachers, pupils did not attribute much importance to the skills of a director (2%), informational factor (7%) and compensatory (7%) factor of screen texts.

Anyway, both teachers and students agree on the main point - entertainment - is still the leading factor drawing people to media violence.

Table 4. Reasons for Resentment against the Screen Violence

Teachers' Age/Gender	Motivations for not liking on-screen violence:				
	Hatred toward violence of any kind	Disgust towards seeing blood and crippled people	Not wanting 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 % who gave this reason:					
21-30 /total	20,00	50,00	30,00	70,00	10,00
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
31-40/total	33,33	58,33	58,33	83,33	16,67
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
41-50/total	54,55	36,36	45,45	81,82	27,27

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
51-60/total	25,00	58,33	66,67	83,33	16,67
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
61-70/total	41,67	58,33	66,67	100,00	25,00
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
All age groups /Total	35,09	54,38	56,14	80,70	19,30
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 the Table 4 gives a rather clear vision of what is the most repulsive about scenes of violence for the teachers. First of all, it's their belief that the screen violence does effect the growth of crimes in society (80%). After that there are such factors as the disgust at the sight of blood, gore, graphic images of violence; unwillingness to experience disturbing emotions; fear of any kind of violence.

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), which corresponds to the "braver" men's status in any group of the people participating in the study.

Teachers from 41 to 70 are the most strongly resentful towards media violence. The same age group is the most convinced that the screen violence has an impact on the growth of violence in real life.

The comparison of the teachers' and students' opinions shows that the last are more tolerable towards screen violence. Only 20% of students (compared to 80% of teachers) think that it affects the violence in society. The gore disgusts 25% of the students (54% of teachers). Experiencing the unpleasant emotions is a reason of not-watching the violent episodes for 18% of the students (56 % teachers), and the resentment of any violence- 21% (35% of the teachers). Both teachers and students percentage agree on the question of fear of violence.

Table 5. Whom do the Teachers Usually Watch Violent Content Programs with

Teachers' Age/Gender	The type of company with whom teachers prefer to watch on-screen violence:						
	Alone	Friends	Girlfriend/Boyfriend/Spouse	Parents	Students	Children/Grandchildren	Strangers
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this type of company:						
21-30 /total	40,00	60,00	50,00	10,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
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

31-40/total	25,00	75,00	66,67	25,00	25,00	16,67	0,00
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
41-50/total	36,36	72,73	45,45	18,18	36,36	36,36	18,18
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
51-60/total	41,67	58,33	75,00	0,00	16,67	33,33	16,67
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
61-70/total	33,33	83,33	83,33	0,00	16,67	50,00	0,00
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
All age groups /Total	35,09	70,17	64,91	10,53	21,05	29,82	3,51
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 tells us that generally teachers watch programs/movies with violent content in the company of their partners/spouses (65-70%). Further on follow: watching alone (35%), with children/grandchildren (30%), with students (21%), with parents (10%) and with strangers (3%). Noticeably, men tend to watch violent programs by themselves twice more as women. Not a single woman teacher marked strangers (e.g. in a movie theatre) 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).

I'd like to remind that the similar study was made for the students of various age. Comparing their answers with the teachers' answers, we can notice the common grounds among these two groups: the most desirable 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 answer differ a lot. In contradistinction to teachers, students do not like to watch media production 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. Psychological Reasons for Watching Scenes of Violence on the Screen

Teachers' Age/Gender	Teachers' motivations for watching on screen violence:				
	Good Mood	Low Spirits	To Irritate the Others	Normal Mood	Other Reasons
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this reason:				
21-30 /total	0,00	10,00	0,00	50,00	10,00
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
31-40/total	8,33	25,00	0,00	66,67	0,00
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
41-50/total	18,18	45,45	0,00	36,36	0,00
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
51-60/total	8,33	50,00	0,00	41,67	0,00
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
61-70/total	8,33	41,67	0,00	50,00	0,00
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
All age groups /Total	8,77	31,58	0,00	54,38	1,75
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

Good mood, Bad mood, , Normal Mood, Other reasons

The analysis of data of Table 6 shows that teachers usually watch scenes of violence in a normal psychological state (54%). Low spirit follows 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 a good mood (20%), that probably is not surprisingly for young people to be in a good mood overall more frequently than for adults.

Table 7. Types of Psychological States That Occur After Watching the Violent Scenes

Teachers' Age/Gender	Psychological states in which teachers find themselves after watching on-screen violence:									
	Aggression	Joy	Isolation	Depression	Excitement	Disorder	Agitation	Indifference	Desensitization	Psychological state doesn't change
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this type of their psychological state:									
21-30 /total	10,00	0,00	10,00	10,00	10,00	20,00	10,00	20,00	0,00	20,00
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
31-40/total	8,33	0,00	8,33	25,00	8,33	25,00	0,00	0,00	8,33	25,00
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
41-50/total	0,00	0,00	18,18	18,18	18,18	18,18	0,00	0,00	0,00	27,27
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
51-60/total	8,33	0,00	33,33	25,00	25,00	8,33	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
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
61-70/total	0,00	0,00	16,67	8,33	16,67	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00	25,00
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
All age groups /Total	3,51	0,00	19,30	17,54	15,79	19,30	1,75	3,51	1,75	19,30
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

Violence on the screen does not evoke joyful feelings in a single teacher (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 said: «My psychological state doesn't change»...

In other words, almost 3 times more of the questioned students that the teachers confessed the rise of aggressiveness, and 4 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 reported their likeliness to feel an aggressive mood or indifference more often that women, while women teachers were most inclined to feel sad or agitated.

Table 8. The Teachers' Reflection on the Scenes of Violence on the Screen

Teachers' Age/Gender	On-screen violence are forgotten immediately	On-screen violence are remembered for a short time only	On-screen violence are remembered for a long time
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this variant:		
21-30 /total	20,00	40,00	40,00
21-30/male	33,33	66,67	0,00
21-30/female	14,28	28,57	57,14
31-40/total	16,67	41,67	41,67
21-30/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
21-30/female	12,50	37,50	50,00
41-50/total	27,27	36,36	36,36
41-50/male	25,00	25,00	50,00
41-50/female	28,57	42,86	28,57
51-60/total	8,33	33,33	58,33
51-60/male	20,00	40,00	40,00
51-60/female	0,00	28,57	71,43
61-70/total	8,33	41,67	50,00
61-70/male	0,00	50,00	50,00
61-70/female	10,00	40,00	50,00
All age groups /Total	15,79	38,60	45,61
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 the 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's 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 similar, 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've seen on the screen for a long time and only 16% of both of the groups do not remember them afterwards.

Table 9. The Attitude of Teachers Towards Talking about Scenes of Violence on the Screen

Teachers' Age/Gender	On-screen violence is never discussed	On-screen violence is discussed sometimes	On-screen violence is discussed regularly
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this variant:		
21-30 /total	20,00	80,00	0,00
21-30/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
21-30/female	28,57	71,43	0,00
31-40/total	8,33	50,00	41,67
21-30/male	0,00	50,00	50,00
21-30/female	12,50	50,00	37,50
41-50/total	27,27	54,54	18,18
41-50/male	25,00	50,00	25,00
41-50/female	28,57	57,14	14,28
51-60/total	0,00	58,33	41,67
51-60/male	0,00	80,00	20,00
51-60/female	0,00	42,86	57,14
61-70/total	16,67	66,67	16,67
61-70/male	0,00	100,00	0,00
61-70/female	20,00	60,00	20,00
All age groups /Total	14,03	61,40	24,56
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 3 times here). And the quarter of the surveyed teachers discuss these episodes regularly. The age range 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 much 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. Most Frequent Interlocutors of the Teachers when Discussing the Screen Violence

Teachers' Age/Gender	The type of company with whom teachers prefer to discuss on-screen violence:				
	Friends/Spouses	Parents	Students	Children/Grandchildren	Strangers
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this type of company:				
21-30 /total	70,00	20,00	20,00	0,00	0,00
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
31-40/total	91,67	33,33	50,00	33,33	8,33
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
41-50/total	72,73	27,27	54,54	45,45	27,27
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
51-60/total	41,67	0,00	25,00	66,67	16,67
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
61-70/total	58,33	0,00	33,33	66,67	16,67
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
All age groups /Total	66,67	15,79	36,84	43,86	14,03
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 state that on the whole teachers prefer to watch and discuss scenes of violence in the company of their spouses or friends (65 to 70%). In descending order follow the 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 the pupils and the 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:				
	Psychological deviants	On-screen violence	Inherent to the human nature	Material inequality	Other reason
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this reason:				
21-30 /total	70,00	20,00	10,00	0,00	0,00
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
31-40/total	41,67	33,33	25,00	16,67	00,00
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
41-50/total	27,27	36,36	18,18	18,18	0,00
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
51-60/total	25,00	41,67	8,33	41,67	0,00
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
61-70/total	25,00	41,67	0,00	33,33	0,00
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
All age groups /Total	35,09	35,09	12,28	22,81	0,00
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 material 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 material factor. Their concern about the spread of violence on the screen is also greater.

Table 12. Teachers' Opinion about the Influence of the Scenes of Violence on the Screen and the Increase of Crime in Society

Teachers' Age/Gender	The type of teachers' opinions:				
	On-screen violence undoubtedly leads to an increase in crime	On-screen violence leads to a small an increase in crime	On-screen violence does not lead to an increase in crime because crimes existed before the invention of cinema and television	On-screen violence leads to an increase in crime among those with psychotic behavior	On-screen violence does not lead to an increase in crime because it disgusts people
Number of Teachers in % who gave this reason:					
21-30 /total	50,00	20,00	0,00	40,00	0,00
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
31-40/total	58,33	16,67	16,67	8,33	0,00
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
41-50/total	81,82	9,10	0,00	9,10	0,00
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
51-60/total	75,00	8,33	0,00	16,67	0,00
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
61-70/total	83,33	0,00	0,00	16,67	0,00
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
All age groups /Total	70,17	10,53	3,51	15,79	0,00
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 by mentally sick people. 3% deny any affect of screen violence (twice as much men as 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 as less students). 22% of pupils are sure that screen violence affects crime

rate to a minimum. But the most serious difference in opinions provoked the question about the reverse effect of the screen violence. 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 Prohibition of Violence on the Screen

Teachers' Age/Gender	Teachers' attitude towards prohibition of on-screen violence:						
	On-screen violence should be proscribed because it make people aggressive	The current levels of on-screen violence are acceptable	Only the most violent scenes should be proscribed	There may be violent scenes on the screen, but inaccessible for children	There may be violent scenes on the screen but only for adults and after midnight	Further on-screen violence won't do any harm	Other opinion
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this variant:						
21-30 /total	20,00	0,00	50,00	0,00	30,00	0,00	0,00
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
31-40/total	8,33	8,33	41,67	25,00	16,67	0,00	0,00
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
41-50/total	18,18	0,00	45,45	27,27	9,10	0,00	0,00
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
51-60/total	25,00	0,00	41,67	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00
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
61-70/total	50,00	0,00	16,67	33,33	0,00	0,00	0,00
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
All age groups /Total	24,56	1,75	38,60	24,56	10,53	0,00	0,00
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 differences by gender) 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 get no access to 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 thesis that it would be all right even 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 think that it will not hurt to have more violence on the Russian screen.

Table 14. Age that Teachers Find it Appropriate for their Children/ Grandchildren to Watch Programs with Violent Scenes

Teachers' Age/Gender	The types of teachers' opinions:				
	From birth	From the age of 10	From the age of 15	From the age of 18	Forbid a child to watch violence no matter how old he/she is
	Number of Teachers in % who gave this variant:				
21-30 /total	0,00	30,00	10,00	20,00	40,00
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
31-40/total	0,00	25,00	41,67	25,00	8,33
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
41-50/total	0,00	27,27	45,45	27,27	0,00
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
51-60/total	0,00	0,00	25,00	41,67	33,33
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
61-70/total	0,00	0,00	0,00	50,00	50,00
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
All age groups /Total	0,00	15,79	24,56	33,33	29,82
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 from the data that no one wishes his or her children/grandchildren to see violence from birth. 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%). Older the teachers are, more strict they become about age restrictions. The 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 see it from an early age.

So in conclusion, let's summarize the findings:

- students are more tolerant on the whole 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 a good mood is typical 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 to watch violent programs alone;
- 1 in 5 teachers is eager to watch violent content media with their students, 1 in 3 teachers is ready to discuss it with the students;
- on 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 the 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 crimes in society;
- one third of teachers and students agree that the 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.

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov is President of Russian Association for Film & Media Education, vice-rector at Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (Russia), editor-in-chief of Russian Journal "Media Education" (Moscow). He also has taught at the Russian New University. He is the member of Russian Academy of Cinematographic Arts & Sciences, Russian Union of Filmmakers, CIFEJ (International Center of Films for Children and Young People, Canada) and FIPRESCI.

He holds a MA degree from Russian Institute of Cinematography (VGIK, 1983), Ph.D.(1986) and Ed.D.(1993) degrees with an emphasis in media education from Russian Academy of Education (Moscow).

Postdoctoral affiliation: guest professor and visiting senior research scholar in: *Central European University* (Budapest, Hungary: 1998, 2006), *Kassel University* (Germany, 2000, grant DAAD), *Humboldt University* (Berlin, Germany, 2005, grant DAAD), *Maison des sciences de l'homme* (Paris, France, 2002, 2009, grants MSH), *Kennan Institute* (The Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C., U.S., 2003), Mainz University (2010).

He received the scientific grants/fellowships from: *Federal Target Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science* (2010-2012), *Program of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science "Development of Science University Potential"* (2006-2008), *Russian President Program for Leading Scientific Schools* (2003-2005), *MacArthur Foundation* (USA, 1997, 2003-2004), *Russian Foundation for Humanities* (1999-2010); *President of Russian Federation Cultural Foundation* (2002), *The Russian Ministry of Education The Program "Russian Universities"* (2002); *Soros Foundation* (USA): 1) *Research Support Scheme* (2000-2002); 2) *Program "Civil Society"* (1998-1999); 3) *HESP-CDC - Course Development Competition* (1998); *Education Program for the best text of university*

lectures (1997); Switzerland Scientific Foundation (2000); Russian Ministry of Education: research in humanities area (1997-2000), etc.

He was the speaker in the many international media and media education/literacy conferences: World United Nation Forum ‘Alliance of civilizations” (Media Literacy Section, Madrid, 2008), Council of Europe Conference “Media Literacy” (Graz, Dec. 2007), International Media Literacy Conference (Prague, Apr. 2007), UNESCO Media Education Conference (Paris, June, 2007), Information Technologies International Conference (Moscow, May, 2007), International Conference E-Citizen. (Moscow, Feb. 2006), UNESCO Conference on the Information Society (St.Petersburg, May, 2005), Conference of Association for Media and Technology in Education, Concordia University (Montreal, Canada, May, 2003), National Media Education Conference: ‘Literacy & Liberty’ (AMLA: Alliance for Media Literate America) (Baltimore, U.S., June, 2003), World Congress ‘Toys, Games and Media’, University of London, Institute of Education (London, UK, Aug. 2002), The Council of Europe: Hearing on Internet Literacy (Strasbourg, France, March 2002), 3rd World Summit on Media for Children (Thessaloniki, Greece, March 2001), International Council for Educational Media ICEM-CIME - Conference ‘Pedagogy and Media’ (Geneva, Switzerland, Nov. 2000), World Summit 2000: Children, Youth and the Media - Beyond the Millennium (Toronto, Canada, May 2000), AGORA European Children’s’ Television Center Summit (Thessaloniki, Greece, June, 1999), Educating for the Media and the Digital Age: UNESCO International Conference (Vienna, Austria, UNESCO, Apr. 1999), World Media Education/Literacy Summit (Sao-Paulo, Brazil, May 1998), Media & Science Forum (Montreal, Canada, Oct. 1997), Youth and the Media, Tomorrow: UNESCO International Conference (Paris, France. UNESCO, Apr. 1997) and many others.

He is the author of 500 articles and 20 books about media culture, media education and literacy. e-mail: mediashkola@rambler.ru

List of Selected Publications of Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov

Selected Books:

- **Fedorov, A. & Chelysheva I.** (2002). *Media Education in Russia: Short History of Development*. Taganrog: Poznanie, 265 p.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). *Children and Media Violence: Comparative Analysis*. Saarbrücken (Germany): Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010, 164 p.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). *Development of University Students' Media Competence on the Media Education Lessons*. Saarbrücken (Germany): Lambert Academic Publishing, 2010. 580 c.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). *Media Education and Media Literacy: Russian Point of View*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing, 364 p.

Selected Articles:

- **Fedorov, A.** (1993). The Screen Arts and the Students Youth. In: *The Problems of Film Education Now*. Moscow: Association for Media Education, p.100-104.
- **Fedorov, A.** (1994). The Russian Screen since 1960. *Audience (USA)*, N 179, p. 20-22.
- **Fedorov, A.** (1995). Film & TV – The Features of Mass Culture. *Audience (USA)*, N 184, p. 40-41.
- **Fedorov, A.** (1995). Filmclubs Yesterday & Today. *Audience (USA)*, N 183, p. 15-17.
- **Fedorov, A.** (1996). Crime on the Russian Screen. *Audience (USA)*, N 186, p. 14-16.
- **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, p. 129-138.
- **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, p. 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, p. 93-95.
- **Fedorov, A.** (1999). The Cinema Market: What about Russia? *Canadian Journal of Communication*, N 24, p. 141-142.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2000). En Sammenlignende Analyse Mellom Tyskland og Russland. *Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway)*, N 4, p. 38-41.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2000). The Digital Media Challenge & Russian Media Education. In: *Pedagogy and Media: The Digital Shift*. Geneva: ICEM-CIME, p. 21.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2000). The Terminology of Media Education. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 33-38.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2000). Ungdom og Russisk Filmvold. *Media I Skole og Samfunn (Norway)*, N 1, p. 16-23.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). A Russian Perspective. *Educommunication (Belgium)*, N 55, p. 92-95.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). Media and Media Education. *Alma Mater*, N 11, p. 15-23.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). Media Education in France. *Alma Mater*, N 3, p. 46-47.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). Problems of Audiovisual Perception. *Art & Education*, N 2, p. 57-64.

- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). Violence on the TV and Russian Youth. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p. 131-145.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2001). Von der Filmpadagogic zur Mediaenpadagogik. *MERZ: Mediaen + Merziehung* (Germany), N 4, p. 256-261.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2002). Media Education in Canada. *Higher Education in Russia*, N 1, p. 116-118.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2002). Media Education in Russia. *Alma Mater*. N 7, p. 29-32.
- **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, p. 100-110.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2002). Problems of Media Perception and Audience's Development in the Area of Media Culture. *Practical Psychology*, N 2, p.84-89.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2002). Russian Cinema: Very Short History. *Total DVD*, N 5, 38-45.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2003). Elektroniske og digitale medier og russiske barn: Problemet med lovregulering. *Tilt* (Norway), N 4, p. 22-23.
- **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.** (2003). Mediebegivenheter I Washington. *Tilt* (Norway), N 3, 27-28.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2004). Austrian Issue in the Mirror of Russian Media (1945-1955). *Mediaenimpulse* (Austria), N 12, p. 37-39.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2004). The Influence of TV & Screen Violence on the American Children Audience. *U.S. and Canada: Economics, Policy and Culture*, N 1, p. 77-93.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2004). The Right of the Child and Violence on the Screen. *Monitoring*, N 2, p. 87-93.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2004). The Specific Nature of Media Education for Students of Teachers Training Institutes. *Pedagogica*, N 4, p. 43-51.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2004). Violence on the Screen. *Chelovek*, N 5.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2005). Media Education, Media Literacy, Media Criticism and Media Culture. *Higher Education in Russia*, N 6, p. 134-138.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2005). Russia//Media Education in Europe. *Media Education Journal*. (Scotland). N 37, p.20-21.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2005). The Basic Tendencies of Western Media Education Development in 70s-80s of XX Century. *Journal of Russian Foundation for Humanities*, N 1, p.180-191.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2006). Analys of Media Stereotypes on Media Education Lessons in Student's Audience. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 6, p.24-38.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2006.) Media Education Must Become Part and Parcel of the Curriculum. In: *Thinking Classroom*. Vol.7. N 3, p.25-30.
- **Fedorov A.** (2007). Classification Parameters of the Development of Media Literacy of Students. In: *Journalism and the world of culture*. S-Petersburg: S-Petersburg State University, p. 137-149.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Critical Analysis of Media Violence Text on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Media Education*. N 4, p. 29-54.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Critical Thinking Development in the Media Education: Basic Conceptions. *Innovations in Education*. 2007. N 4, p.30-47.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Development of Media Education in the Modern Time. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 3, p. 40-51.
- **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, p. 110-116.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Media Competence of Personality: From Terminology to Levels. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 10, p.75-108.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Media Study in the Classroom: Creative Assignments for Character Analysis. *Thinking Classroom*. 2007. N 3. p.13-19.

- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Media Violence and Young Audience (NGO Russian Association for Film and Media Education Survey). In: *International NGO Journal*. Vol. 2 (3), p. 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, p. 107-116.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Semiotic Analysis on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Education World*. 2007, N 4, p. 207-217.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2007). Theological Theory of Media Education. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 11, p.96-101.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2008). Culture Mythology Analysis of Media Texts on the Lessons for Students. In: *Innovations in Education*. N 4, p. 60-80.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2008). Iconographic Analysis of Media Texts on the Media Education Lessons for University Students. In: *Innovations in Education*, N 2, p. 73-90.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2008). Structural Media Texts' Analysis on the Media Education Lessons in the University. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2008. N 6.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2009). Autobiographical Analysis on the Media Education Lessons in the University. In: *Innovations in Education*. (Moscow). N 1, p.118-128.
- **Fedorov, A.** Basic Media Education Models. In: *Mediateque and World*. (Moscow). 2009. N 1, 24-28. N 2.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2009). Media Education in Russia: A Brief History. In: Marcus Leaning (Ed.). *Issues in Information and Media Literacy: Criticism, History and Policy*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press, p.167-188.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). Mass Media Education: Professionals and Neophytes. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2010. N 8, p. 102-119.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). Media Educational Practices in Teacher Training. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*. 2010, Vol. 3, N 3, p.57-70.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). Russian Media education Literacy Centers in the 21st Century. In: *The Journal of Media Literacy (USA)*. 2010. Vol. 57. NN 1-2, p.62-68.
- **Fedorov, A.** (2010). Umberto Eco and Semiotic Theory of Media Education. In: *Innovations in Education*. 2010. N 5, p. 56-61.
- **Gilbert, L., Fedorov, A.** (2004). A Model for Media Education Research in Russia and the US. *Educational Media International*, Vol. 41, N 2, p. 157-162.