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Introduction

“Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia” defines media education as the branch of pedagogical science which studies “mechanisms of mass communication (the press, television, radio, cinema, etc.). The main tasks of media education are: to prepare the new generation for the life in modern informational conditions, to the perception of different information; to train people to understand it and to realize the consequences of its influence on human psyche; to help them master the means of communication on the basis of non-verbal forms of communication with the help of technical means” [Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia. Moscow, 1993. p.555]. The particular importance of the development of media literacy was emphasized by the relatively recent (2002) official registration of the new Russian university specialization “Media Education” (N 03.13.30) by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. The practical introduction of this specialization was realized in 2002 in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute (Russia). This initiative has already been taken up by some other Russian institutions of higher education (in Yekaterinburg, Vladivostok and other cities).

On the materials of the collection of the website of scientific open e-library “Media Education” (http://edu.of.ru/medialibrary), let’s try to trace the development of the views of the Russian scientists, and single out the mechanisms which lead to the significant changes in the subjects, models, theoretical approaches, tasks reflected in these researches by means of the comparative analysis. This will undoubtedly provide great support for the further researches as well as for the raise of effectiveness of contemporary media education in the Russian universities and other educational institutions.

The list of theses of the Russian authors on the subject of Media Education is about numbers 180 titles since 1950. Nearly 70 of them have been defended for the recent 10 years. From 1950 till 1959 six theses were defended, from 1960 till 1969 – 15; from 1970 till 1979 – 22; from 1980 till 1989 – 34; from 1990 till 1999 – 30; from 2000 till 2010 – 73. Thus we may trace the gradual increase of theses on media education (with the exception of the decrease in the nineties which is explainable because at that time there was the decrease of Russian scientific research in all the fields). The number of theses on media education in the 1st decade of XXI century two times exceeded the corresponding number of theses in the 1990s.
Among the researches in the field of media education I singled out scientific works which rest upon
the following theoretical concepts: aesthetic, protectionist, practical, the concept of the development of
critical thinking, cultural, socio-cultural and others.

For the purpose of the subsequent analysis I proposed the conventional system of classification of
theoretical models of media education developed by the Russian media educators in 1960-2010:

- practical models (practical studies and usage of media devices as technical means of education
and/or creation of media texts of different kinds and genres),

- theoretical models oriented towards the development of aesthetic taste and the analysis of the best
pieces of media culture,

- educational and ethic models (examining moral, psychological, ideological, religious, philosophical
problems with the help of media),

- socio-cultural, cultural studies models (socio-cultural, cultural studies development of creative
personality in terms of perception, imagination, visual memory, interpretation, analysis, critical
thinking in respect of media texts of any kind or genre),

- educational, informational models (the studies of theory and the history of media and media
education, the language of media culture, etc.).

It is clear that in different countries all over the world the researches have been made in which the
problems of media education of the students and pupils had been touched (in Russia: O.Baranov,
L.Zaznobina, S.Penzin, A.Spichkin, Y.Usov, A.Fedorov, and others; in Britain: C.Bazalgette,
D.Buckingham, L.Masterman, A.Hart and others; in Germany: S.Aufenanger, B.Bachmair and others;
in France: E.Bevort, J.Gonnet and others).

However, as a rule these researches were of two kinds: either the historical stages of the development
of media education movement in Russia and in the Western countries were analyzed (A.Fedorov,
A.Levitskaya, A.Sharikov, I.Chelysheva, L.Masterman, A.Hart and others), or the theories and
methods of introduction of media education into the studies at schools and universities (C.Bazalgette,
D.Buckingham, L.Masterman, A.Hart, L.Bazhenova, O.Baranov, E.Bondarenko, A.Fedorov,
M.Fominova, S.Gudilina, L.Ivanova, N.Kirillova, N.Khilko, S.Penzin, G.Polichko, A.Spichkin,
Y.Usov, A.Zhurin, and others). These researches didn’t have the science-of-science aspect of the
general analysis of the condition of Russian scientific researches in the field of media education.

Foreign scientists (C.Bazalgette, D.Buckingham, J.Gonnet, L.Masterman, B.Tufte, A.Hart and others)
frequently turned to the comparative analysis of the researches in the field of media education, but
they never went beyond the experience of the leading Western countries. Today Russia basically is
outside the world’s media educational process in foreign researches…

For instance, the “Guru” of world’s media education, L.Masterman conducted a thorough analysis of
media educational process in the contemporary world (the analysis of the protective theory of media
education, of semiotic approach, etc.). Rejecting the popular in Russia aesthetically oriented media
education (which aims to teach the audience to value the masterpieces of media culture and to reject
inferior ones), L.Masterman was convinced that the solid criterions of aesthetic quality of media texts
do not exist, so it is not the aesthetic model that is to be developed, but the theory of critical thinking
and autonomy: the audience must learn to understand who created media texts and why, what
influence they are supposed to have on the audience, etc. I think that the attitude of L.Masterman is
close to this of the followers of the ideological theory of media education (“find out for whom this or
that media text is advantageous”).

Tendencies of globalization in media culture and media education little by little lead to the following:
the traditional position of aesthetic media education is shaken, while socio-cultural, cultural studies
approaches predominate more and more often.

At the same time some Russian scientists and educators still don’t discern the difference between
media education and the usage of ICT, media technique in the studies at schools and universities …
That’s why I consider the comparative analysis of the development of the Russian and foreign scientific researches in the field of media education in the context of social and economical development of the society, as well as the context of globalization of educational process, to be so important. The forecast of the future development, improvement and correction of the researches in the field of media education in Russia is necessary as well.

**Theoretical models of Media Education**

The analysis of the theses from Russian e-library “Media Education” (http://edu.of.ru/medialibrary) shows that by the end of the XX century there exist a kind of parity between practical and aesthetic models used in theses on media educational subjects.

On average 29,3% of the researches from 1960 till 2010 were based on practical models, 23,6% - on aesthetical ones. The same tendency can be observed on the empirical level of the activity of the Russian educators [Fedorov, 2005b, p.259-277], traditionally, since the 1920s they had been divided into the two large groups, approximately equal in number: aesthetically and practically oriented towards media.

Up till 2000 other models were more rarely used as the basis of the media educational researches. Sudden increase of the interest in socio-cultural, cultural studies models in media education occurred only in the XXI century. Due to the intensive international exchange of scientific ideas, the amount of interdisciplinary researches connected with a broad socio-cultural and cultural studies context increased in Russia.

As regards information-educational models, their elements are present in practically all researches on media education in 1960-2010, however I cannot mark them out as predominating.

Of course the proposed classification of media educational models is of conventional character, as in the researches the diffusion of several models (eg, aesthetical and educationally-ethical) frequently takes place.

Moreover, the analysis of the international poll of the experts in the field of media education [Fedorov, 2003; Fedorov, 2005a] proved that the data reflected in Table 1 are peculiar namely to Russia because in the Western countries the spectrum of the predominating models is more or less broader and includes, for instance, semiotic model of media education, which is not popular in Russia (see Table 2).

**Theories of Media Education**

In the course of the analysis of the theses from the Russian e-library “Media Education” I managed to concretize the theories of media education which used to predominate in the Russian researches 1960-2010. Here we can observe clear coincidence of the percentages (29,3% and 23,6%) of the above mentioned theoretical models – practical and aesthetic – with the corresponding practical and aesthetic theories of media education. The cumulative percentage (14,4% + 21,8% = 36,2%) of the magnitude of cultural studies and socio-cultural theories equals the cumulative percentage (39,6%) of the corresponding models (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Theoretical predominant models used in the Russian theses on media education in 1960-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Predominating theoretical models used in the Russian theses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The number of theses on media education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aesthetical</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Educationally-ethical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Socio-cultural, cultural studies</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information-educational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The importance of the other media educational theories, which used to be the leading ones during the period of 1960-2010, ranges between 0,0% and 7,5%, which proves their low popularity.

At the same time the low prevalence of the theory of the development of critical thinking (it used to predominate in 3,4% of the researches on the subject of media education) can be explained by the following. The development of critical thinking in the soviet period to put it mildly was not encouraged by the government as well as the use of semiotic approaches in education.

So I could have concluded that in USSR the ideological theory should have predominated. However the analysis of the data from the Table 2 as well as of the theses proves that during the soviet period 1960-1991 media scientists aspired to leave ideological aspect: they came to nothing more than several ritual “party” phrases in the introduction. In the researches they were primarily guided by practical and aesthetic theories of media education. As a result this ideological theory could be singled out just in 6,9% of the theses.

Quite a popular among media practitioners is the protectionist theory of media education (according to the results of the poll (2005), 38,5% of the Taganrog teachers consider this theory to be the most important) in the analyzed theses was supported only by 3 researches (1,7%). In general this reflects the worldwide tendency: for the last 50 years this theory is unpopular among researchers, though there are many followers of this theory among school teachers, especially the religious ones.

The relativist theory of “consumption and satisfaction” of the audience’s needs didn’t win much popularity among Russian researchers of the period of 1960-2010 as well. This is clear as Russian media researchers never aimed to mechanically serve the spontaneous interests and tastes of the audience. On the contrary the development of the student’s personality has always in priority.

For the purpose of the comparison of the importance of the media educational theories in Russian theses (1960-2010) with the results of the earlier conducted international poll of the experts [Fedorov, 2003; Федоров, 2005а] Table 3 was created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Predominating media educational theories used in the Russian theses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The number of theses on media education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theory of the development of critical thinking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural studies theory</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Socio-cultural theory</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Semiotic theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practical theory (resting upon the teaching of how to work with media devices)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aesthetical / artistic theory</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ideological theory</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Theory of “consumption and satisfaction” of the needs of the audience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Protectionist theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. The degree of importance of the media educational theories in Russian theses of (1960-2010) with the results of the international poll of the experts (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Predominating theories of media education</th>
<th>% of the importance of the theories of media education</th>
<th>From the point of view of the foreign experts</th>
<th>In Russian theses (1960-2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theory of the development of critical thinking</td>
<td>84,6%</td>
<td>3,4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural studies theory</td>
<td>69,2%</td>
<td>14,4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Socio-cultural theory</td>
<td>65,4%</td>
<td>21,8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Semiotic theory</td>
<td>57,7%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practical theory</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>29,3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aesthetical / artistic theory</td>
<td>46,1%</td>
<td>23,6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ideological theory</td>
<td>38,5%</td>
<td>6,9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Theory of “consumption and satisfaction” of the needs of the audience</td>
<td>30,8%</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Protectionist theory</td>
<td>15,4%</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the data from this table led to a conclusion that actually there’s a significant gap between the level of importance of the theories of media education in Russian theses of 1960-2010 and the results of the international poll of the (2003). Though the experts in media education claimed that the most important is the theory of the development of critical thinking (84,6%), it is still reflected poorly in the theses of the Russian scientists (3,4%). The reason for this misbalance was above mentioned: in democratic society critical thinking can be developed easier than in authoritarian society.

The real importance of socio-cultural and cultural studies theories in Russian researches on media education turned to be understated as against the priorities of international experts.

Semiotic theory which is rather popular with the experts (57,7%) and the theory of “consumption and satisfaction” of the needs of the audience (30,8%) turned out to be left out of the Russian theses.

The difference between the approaches of the experts and of the Russian authors of theses (1960-2010) can be seen by the example of practical and aesthetic theories of media education. In the Russian researches these theories share the first and the second place according to the level of importance (29,3% and 23,6% respectively), while the experts consider them to be less (the 5th – the 6th place). As against international experts who choose a varied range of media educational theories, the Russian researches of the XX century preferred to concentrate on aesthetic and practical theories.

Contrary to the Russian researchers who think of ideology with suspicion, owing to its superfluity in the life of the Soviet people, 38,5% of international experts mentioned ideological theory as important and priority.

The unity of opinions of Russian researchers and international experts showed up only in the fact that all of them gave minimal support to protection theory (1,7% - 15,4%), i.e. both sides didn’t consider the concentration on the protection of the audience from the negative influence of media to be perspective.

As regards cultural studies and socio-cultural theories which are very popular in the Western countries, in Russia they have been gathering strength only for the last 10 years…

**The Tasks of Media Education**

The analysis of the theses from the Russian e-library “Media Education” (Table 4) shows that generally over the period of 1960-2010 in Russian theses on media education the task of the development of knowledge of social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts. This task which is important for cultural studies, socio-cultural, aesthetical, educational and ethical models of media education predominated in 58% of the scientific
works. Second most important (48%) was the task of teaching the audience to experiment with various means of technical application of media, to create media production / media texts (the crucial task for the realization of practical model of media education). The third and the fourth place according to the level of importance was given to the task of the development of the abilities to perceive, to evaluate, to understand and to analyze media texts and the task of teaching to decode media texts / media messages, which predominate practically in all media education models except the practical one.

The least important were such tasks as the development of critical thinking and the preparation of people to the living in democratic society. The latter task began showing up in the Russian theses as an important one only in the XXI century. The development of critical thinking right up to the present time was poorly accentuated in theses on media education as well.

Table 4. The tasks of media education which predominate in the Russian theses (1960-2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>The tasks of media education which predominate in the Russian theses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To develop critical thinking</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To develop the abilities to perceive, evaluate, understand and analyze media texts</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To prepare people to the living in democratic society</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To develop the ability to understand social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To teach the audience to decode media texts / media messages</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To develop the communicative abilities of a personality</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To develop the abilities to aesthetical perception, evaluation, understanding of media texts, to the evaluation of aesthetical qualities of media texts.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To teach people to express themselves with the help of media</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To teach people to experiment with various means of technical application of media, to create media production / media texts</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To give knowledge on theory of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To give knowledge on history of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The tasks of media education which predominate in the Russian theses (1960-2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 To develop critical thinking</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To develop the abilities to perceive, evaluate, understand and analyze media texts</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 To prepare people to the living in democratic society</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 To develop the ability to understand social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 To teach the audience to decode media texts / media messages</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To develop the communicative abilities of a personality</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 To develop the abilities to aesthetical perception, evaluation, understanding of media texts, to the evaluation of aesthetical qualities of media texts.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 To teach people to express themselves with the help of media</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 To teach people to experiment with various means of technical application of media, to create media production / media texts</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 To give knowledge on theory of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 To give knowledge on history of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* in every research we find several predominating tasks.

The analysis of the data in Table 4 led us to the conclusion that such gently claimed in the Russian theses of 1960-1999 tasks as the development of knowledge on the history and theory of media and media culture, with the beginning of the XXI century has begun to predominate. This phenomenon can be probably explained by the following: after the long period of the comprehension of the empirical media educational experience the time has come to systematize, generalize the data, to conduct researches on science of science and regional geography. And not by chance since 2000 year numerous theses on the history of Russian and foreign media education have been defended in Russia [Novikova, 2000; Chelysheva, 2002; Khudoleeva, 2006; Kolesnichenko, 2007; Pechyonkina, 2008 and others].

The analysis of the data in Table 5 showed the divergence of the levels of importance of the tasks of media education in Russian theses of the period of 1960-2010 as against the results of the poll of
international experts [Fedorov, 2003; Fedorov, 2005a]. The most essential divergences were found in the following tasks: the task of the development of critical thinking (the first place in the priorities of the experts and the tenth – in Russian theses) and the task of preparation of people to the living in democratic society (the third place in the priorities of the experts and the eleventh – in Russian theses). Certainly in consideration of the period of the last ten years this misbalance is being reduced, however in general that these tasks have not become the most popular with Russian educators and researchers.

Table 5. The level of importance of the tasks of media education in Russian theses of the period of 1960-2010 as compared with the results of the poll of international experts (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Predominating tasks of media education</th>
<th>% of the importance of the tasks of media education</th>
<th>From the point of view of the foreign experts</th>
<th>In Russian theses (1960-2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To develop critical thinking</td>
<td>84,3%</td>
<td>12,2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To develop the abilities to perceive, evaluate, understand and analyze media texts</td>
<td>68,9%</td>
<td>37,3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To prepare people to the living in democratic society</td>
<td>61,9%</td>
<td>5,1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To develop the ability to understand social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts</td>
<td>61,5%</td>
<td>58,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To teach the audience to decode media texts / media messages</td>
<td>59,4%</td>
<td>32,7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To develop the communicative abilities of a personality</td>
<td>57,3%</td>
<td>28,7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To develop the abilities to aesthetical perception, evaluation, understanding of media texts, to the evaluation of aesthetical qualities of media texts.</td>
<td>54,9%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To teach people to express themselves with the help of media</td>
<td>53,85%</td>
<td>18,4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To teach people to experiment with various means of technical application of media, to create media production / media texts</td>
<td>50,0%</td>
<td>48,3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To give knowledge on theory of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>47,9%</td>
<td>25,9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To give knowledge on history of media, media culture, media education</td>
<td>37,8%</td>
<td>27,6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand in the Russian theses the task of the development of the ability to understand social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts has become the most important. Actually this task can’t be fully completed without the development of critical thinking of the audience. Thus we may assume that the task of the development of critical thinking was latently included into numerous Russian researches of the period of 1960-2010.

The attitudes of both the experts and the Russian researchers were practically the same with respect to the following tasks: the task of the development of the ability to decode media texts, the task of the development of the communicative abilities of a personality, the task of the development the abilities to aesthetical perception, evaluation, understanding of media texts, to the evaluation of aesthetical qualities of media texts, the task of teaching people to express themselves with the help of media.

It is interesting that though both international experts and Russian researchers (50,0% and 48,3% respectively) consider the task of teaching people to experiment with various means of technical application of media and to create media production / media texts to be rather important, as we can see from Table 5 it occupies the second place for Russians and only the fifth for the international experts.
Media material

The analysis of the Russian Ph.D dissertations of the period of 1960-2010 allowed us to work out Table 6, which shows that up till the beginning of the 1990s the most popular media material with the Russian researches on media education was the cinema. On average 62% of the researches of 1960-1989 were built up on cinematographic material. More modest positions were occupied by television, radio, sound recording (25%), the press (7%), the synthesis of several types of media (7%) and other media (4%).

This is the evidence of the fact that in spite of the intensive development of television in the period of 1960-1980 it seemed less attractive to Russian researchers who orientated themselves mostly on the aesthetic model of media education (this was one third of all researches on media education of this period), and consequently on the kinds of media which are at the most connected with the artistic sphere, i.e. mostly on cinematography.

On the other hand the followers of the practical models of media education in the period of 1960-1980 didn’t get a move on with the relatively new kind of media (television) as well, preferring to rest upon the material of educational films.

At first glance the most surprising it the weak presence of the important media material since 1920s - the press in Russian theses of the period of 1960-2010. Truly in the course of the current practice of the mentioned period amateur (school, university, factory, etc.) press was being developed rapidly, and the number of pupils and students involved in the process of creation of amateur newspapers and magazines significantly exceeded the number of pupils and students involved in film education. However the analysis of the practical experience proves that educators who guided the process of media education on the material of the press were less oriented on research work than their colleagues working with film education. This couldn’t but influence the percentage of the themes of the theses.

Table 6. Media material used in Russian theses on media education (1960-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Media material used in Russian theses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The number of theses on media education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>14 (8,0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cinematography, Film</td>
<td>60 (34,5%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Television, radio, sound recording</td>
<td>29 (16,7%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Computers, the Internet</td>
<td>15 (8,6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>8 (4,6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The synthesis of various types of media</td>
<td>48 (27,6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 174 | 15 | 22 | 34 | 30 | 73 |

For the first time in the 1990s cinematography as the material for media education gave its first place to the synthesis of various types of media. The researches resting upon several types of media made up 30% of total number of theses on media education, whereas the number of cinematographically oriented works decreased to 20%, which is a third less than in the period of 1960-1989.

But the real boom of media educational researches resting upon the synthesis of various types of media has begun in the XXI century: in our opinion 46,6% of the total number of theses of the period of 2000-2010 can be related to this task.

Nevertheless it’s logical: the beginning of the new century was marked by the intensive development of multimedia technologies. We shouldn’t forget that personal computers and the Internet reached Russian masses much later than people in Western countries. Thus there’s no surprise that these types of media began being used as the material for media educational researches only since 1990s (they make up 14,6% of total amount of theses for the last 20 years).
However in spite of multimedia (including the Internet) orientation of media educational researches of the XXI century, “old” types of media still attract attention of researchers in the field of media education. In the period of 2000-2010 cinematographically oriented researches make up 13.7%, the press – 9.6% and television radio, sound recording – 15.1%.

**Autonomy and/or integration**

The analysis of theses on media education (1960-2010) (see Table 7) showed that approximate equality between the followers of autonomous and integrated media education is observed. 37.3% of Russian researchers preferred the autonomous type of media education (special courses, optional studies, etc.), 41.2% - preferred media education integrated into basic disciplines. 21.3% of the researches rested upon the synthesis of autonomous and integrated types of media education.

**Table 7. Autonomous and integrated types of media education used in Russian theses (1960-2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>65 (37.3%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated into basic disciplines</td>
<td>72 (41.2%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The synthesis of autonomous and integrated types</td>
<td>37 (21.3%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2003 I conducted a poll of 26 experts in the field of media education from 10 countries [Fedorov, 2003; Fedorov, 2005], in which the synthetic way of introducing media education was named as the most effective (61.5%). Integrated type was supported by 30.7% of international experts, whereas the autonomous type - only by 7.7%.

The differences between the approaches are obvious. However the analysis of data from Table 7 proved that the interest of Russian researchers of the XXI century to the synthesis of autonomous and integrated types is evidently rising. Anyway we see that the peak of media educational researches oriented to the synthetic type falls at period of 2000-2010.

However in spite of that tendency I may suppose that in future Russian researches all the three types will be present, because each of them has its own peculiarities and advantages. For instance high-grade training of professionals in the field of media (or media competent teachers) is impossible without the autonomous media educational courses, whereas in schools integrated media education seems to be more preferable.

**Institutions**

The analysis of the contents of the theses (see Table 8) shows that during the period of 1960-2010 the main type of educational institutions used as an experimental base for theses on media education were schools (39.6%). They were followed by institutes of higher education (21.3%), media agencies (14.9%), institutions of accessory education, leisure centers / institutions (11.5%), and several institutions (9.8%).

In the XXI century schools as an experimental base for researches still prevails (36.9%) but a sudden increase of media educational researches on the material of higher institutes of education took place (35.6% of theses of the period of 2000-2010). The detailed analysis of theses showed that such increase can be explained as follows: Russian educators of media of the XXI century came to the conclusion that widespread media education in schools is impossible without media competent teachers. Consequently the interest in researches on the basis of pedagogical institutions of higher education increased. For instance 53.8% (14 of 26) theses of 2000-2010 on media education in institutes of higher education are dedicated to media education of the future teachers.
Table 8. Types of institutions used as the experimental basis for Russian researches on media education (1960-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The number of theses on media education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Institutes of higher education</td>
<td>37 (21.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Institutions of specialized secondary education</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>69 (39.6%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institutions of preschool education</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Institutions of accessory education, leisure centers</td>
<td>20 (11.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Media agencies</td>
<td>26 (14.9%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Libraries, media libraries</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Several institutions</td>
<td>17 (9.8%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also want to mention that during the whole period of 1960-2010 institutions of specialized secondary and preschool education as well as libraries were barely ever used as the basis for researches on media education. Together they make up only 1.7%. Thus I see a perspective for new researches in this direction which may touch upon little-developed media educational specifics of these institutions.

Age groups

The analysis of the contents of the theses (see Table 9) shows that during the period of 1960-2010 the main age group researched in Russian theses on media education had been schoolchildren (39.6%). Less researched were students of the institutes of higher education (23.6%), schoolchildren and students simultaneously (26.4%). As for the gradation of the audience of schoolchildren, it was researched in Russian theses in the following percentage: schoolchildren in general (39.6%), senior pupils (21.3%), middle-school pupils (10.9%), junior pupils (1.7%). The interest of Russian researchers to junior pupils and pre-school children is inadequately low. I think that researches on media education of grown-ups and students of specialized secondary education institutions need to be intensified as well.

The data from Table 9 sort well with the data from Table 8 (for example, in both tables the first place is occupied by schools and schoolchildren, whereas the last is occupied by pre-school children and institution of pre-school education).

Table 9. Age groups of media audience researched in Russian theses on media education (1960-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Age groups of media audience researched in Russian theses on media education</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The number of theses on media education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-school children</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Junior pupils</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middle-school pupils</td>
<td>19 (10.9%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior pupils</td>
<td>37 (21.3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Schoolchildren in general</td>
<td>69 (39.6%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students of specialized secondary education institutions</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University students</td>
<td>41 (23.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Schoolchildren and students simultaneously</td>
<td>46 (26.4%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Grown-ups</td>
<td>15 (8.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Geography of researches**

The analysis of Table 10 shows that most of the researches on media education of 1960-1980 were conducted in Moscow (61.9%). The percentage of the researches of provincial scientists was only 22.5%. However in 1990s their percentages became practically equal: 46.6% and 40.0% respectively.

**Table 10. Correlation of researches on media education conducted in Moscow, St. Petersburg and the provinces***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>81 (46.5%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>21 (12.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The provinces</td>
<td>72 (41.2%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* taking into consideration the fact that the sequence of theses formally defended in Moscow and St. Petersburg were conducted by provincial scientists on the basis of provincial schools and universities.

The first decade of the XXI century showed that the tendency which is taking shape is quite natural. During the period of 2000-2010 the percentage of regional researches has greatly exceeded the number of researches conducted in Moscow (60.3% and 31.5% respectively).

In my opinion this sharp decrease of the number of capital researches on media education can be explained by the following causes:

- firstly, in 2000 the two leaders of scientific schools of Moscow passed away (Y.N. Usov and L.S. Zaznobina);
- secondly, the tendency of the youth leaving scientific work showed in Moscow in greater degree than in the provinces (there are more opportunities to change low-paid scientific work with more profitable in the capital than in the provinces);
- thirdly, perhaps this is the most important thing, by the beginning of the XXI century several scientific schools and centers of media education have been founded in the regions (Taganrog, Belgorod, Yekaterinburg, Siberia and others), which generated a number of new researches (including the researches on foreign material).

**Russian researches on media education (1960-1970)**

Unlike in the 1950s, when media was considered by Russian pedagogical science as technical means of education [Kaschenko, 1951; Menshikh, 1952; Sycheva, 1955; Chirkova, 1955; Gromov, 1958] in the context of compulsory school disciplines and/or as means of ideological and ethical education of the new generation [Koldunov, 1955], in the 1960s the situation began to change under the influence of «thawing» processes in all the spheres of life in the state.

Of course practical (practical study and use of media equipment to create media texts of various types and genres, application of media equipment as technical means of education) model of media education still held its strong positions [Archangelsky, 1963; Pressman, 1963; Shakhmaev, 1967; Cherepinsky, 1968 and others]. However researches oriented to aesthetic model of media education gained equally great importance [Karasik, 1966; Rabinovich, 1966; Penzin, 1967; Baranov, 1968 and others].

In spite of the inevitable for that period of time ideological turns when the documents of communists party [for example, Levshina, 1975; Ivanova, 1978; Malobitkaya, 1979] as well as Marxist works [Levshina, 1975; Ivanova, 1978; Malobitskaya, 1979] were more or less quoted everywhere, in the researches oriented to aesthetic model of media education the tasks of the development of aesthetic needs [Levshina, 1975], and full-fledged aesthetic perception on media material [Sokolova, 1971; Ivanova, 1978; Monastyrsky, 1979] was in the first place.
As a rule in the researches on media education of 1960-1970s the aesthetic component of pedagogical process was considered alongside with the ethical, that’s why we cannot single out the research models in their “crystal clear” state. The aesthetic conception of media education often included the practical component as well (especially in the research of O.A. Baranov [Baranov, 1968].

Besides the analysis of the theses on media education of this period allows us to make a conclusion that school themes were completely predominating.

Educational and informational model was present in the works in which the history of the press of children in 1920s was researched [Kolesova, 1966; Alekseeva, 1968]. In our opinion ideological model predominated only in one thesis [Saperov, 1969].

The detailed analysis of the theses of the period of 1960s showed that in some of them scientific basis was formulated rather freely. For example in the research of S.N. Penzin “The problems of theory and practice of television propaganda of cinematography” [Penzin, 1967] the importance of the problem, the aim and scientific newness of the research were declared, however the object, the hypothesis, the task, methodology, theoretical importance of the research were not accentuated.

In the 1970s the description of research aims and tasks in theses on media education became more detailed [Levshina, 1975; Ivanova, 1978; Malobitskaya, 1979 and others], but at times it was rather contradictory in the sense of terminology. For instance, in I.S. Levshina’s thesis “the process of ideological, moral and aesthetical development of pupils’ perception of feature films” is stated as the subject of the research [Levshina, 1975, p.7], whereas in Z.S. Malobitskaya’s thesis “the process of moral and aesthetic development of senior pupils by means of cinematography” [Malobitskaya, 1979, c.8] is called the topic of the research.

I.S. Levshina insisted on media education on the material of cinematography being realized “in the environment at most free from methods of education – compulsory tasks, written works, grades” [Levshina, 1975, p.21]. Other researchers who defended integrated media education thought that it can be integrated into the usual subjects (the Russian language, Literature, etc.). For example, S.M. Ivanova thought that the problem of media education of schoolchildren “can not be solved outside of the system of obligatory lessons” [Ivanova, 1978, p.6]. There was the majority of researchers in 1960-1979 who shared this opinion.

The analysis of the thesis by V.L. Polevoy showed that he was one of the first researchers in Russian media education who tried to ground the necessity of the development of critical thinking in respect to media texts. He wrote that ‘students’ thinking on the level of perception of a film would be stirred to high activity only if they had an opportunity to evaluate and distinguish essential and inessential, necessary and casual on the screen, to analyze, synthesize and generalize what they see on their own” [Polevoy, 1975, p.8].

On the whole in theses on media education of the 1970s a varied scale of the levels of perception and evaluation of media texts by the students was presented [Usov, 1974; Levshina, 1975; Ivanova, 1978; Malobitskaya, 1979 and others], however they can be generalized as follows: low level (perception and evaluation of a media text on the level of plot; orientation on entertainment predominates), mid-level (perception and evaluation of a media text on the level of understanding of moral qualities of the characters), high level (perception and evaluation of a media text on the level of understanding of author’s position/conception including their appearance in audiovisual solution). In general such typology most convincingly grounded in works by Y.N. Usov, dominated in Russian media education not only in the 1970s but also in succeeding years [Usov, 1989].

**Russian researches on media education in 1980s**

The toughening of the confrontation between the Soviet government and Western countries which was peculiar to the first half of the 1980s, led to a certain revival of ideological constituent in researches on media education. [for example see: Kirillova, 1983]. However on the whole the balance between practical and aesthetical conceptions in media education continued to remain over the 1980s. as well as the domination of school and cinematicographic material.
The analysis of the theses showed that during the second half of the 1980s in the time of the so-called “perestroika”, when censorship began to weaken and the society in general began to move slowly towards democratization and pluralism of opinions, for the first time in Soviet media education scientists began to use socio-cultural and cultural studies conceptions as bases for their researches. Consequently they rested upon such tasks as the development of understanding of social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts. This tendency was most brilliantly presented in the thesis of A.V. Sharikhov [1989].

In the research by Y.I. Bozhkov [1984] almost for the first time the practical media educational model was criticized for a “significant drawback as according to its methods from the 1950s amateur cinema creation was rated as mere mastering of technical skills of filming” [Bozhkov, 1984, p.4]. I must add that this drawback is peculiar to the practical pedagogical researches dedicated to media education on the material of the Press, photography, radio, television, sound recording and other kinds of media. Only instead of technical skills of filming the skills of taking photos, producing TV/radio programs, wall newspapers, newspapers of low circulation, etc. were rated. Nowadays the same drawback is peculiar to numerous researches dedicated to teaching of computer literacy, informational technologies in education, when training of the audience to master creation of Power Point presentations and websites is proclaimed as the main aim of a teacher...

There is no doubt that the most significant research on media education of the 1980s is the doctoral thesis of Y.N. Usov “Cinema education as means of aesthetic and artistic education of schoolchildren” [Usov, 1989], where he generalized his nearly 20-years experience of media education based on the aesthetic conception. The matter concerned the creation of an integral system (taking into account the structure, the contents, forms and methods) which would give to the students the criteria of self-dependent selection of audio-visual information coming from various media channels [Usov, 1989].

Reasoning from the idea that perception of a film text is comprehension of sound and image dynamically unfolded in the special conditions of cinematographic time and space, whereas perception of a film is the process of formation of a film image in viewer’s mind” [Usov, 1989, p.16], Y.N. Usov put forward the concept of “audiovisual culture as a certain system of levels of aesthetic development of schoolchildren on the material of screen arts: needs, education, audiovisual thinking” [Usov, 1989, p.21].

In his thesis film education was defined as “the branch of science about regularities, forms and methods of development by means of screen arts” [Usov, 1989, p.15] and “audiovisual literacy, i.e. skills of analysis and synthesis of space-time form of narration … based on the developed process of perception of audiovisual image: the appearance of associations, revelation of semantics of real units of film narration, figurative generalization of these units as the synthesis goes on, the comprehension of multidimensionality of what was seen, the determination of one’s attitude to it” [Usov, 1989, p.16].

At the same time in our opinion it was fairly stated that the consideration of the evolution of a film image and its perception allows to consider the matters of the history of cinema as the history of the development of the viewers’ culture: from the perception of elementary units of film narration (the events recorded by the camera) to the shot and its inner composition, from the linear film narration to the associative (1920s) and the polyphonic ones and the following development of cinema” [Usov, 1989, p.21].

Analyzing the series of definitions of “film education” contained in the works of Russian pedagogues and art critics, Y.N. Usov fairly noted that in most of the works film education was considered as a part of the general system of pedagogical influence, aesthetic development, as means of emotional, harmonious development of a present-day human, which was connected with the tasks of introduction of the best pieces of screen art, with the mastering of its language, with the organization of the artistic experience. Y.N. Usov wrote that “the solution of the given tasks stirs up the process of socialization of a schoolchild when using the method of communication on the basis of cinematography. It allows them to receive moral and civil experience, to determine their attitudes to life, labor and society through the world of ethical, cultural and social values” [Usov, 1989, p.3].
Y.N. Usov interpreted film literacy as knowledge which uncovers the peculiarities of the influence of film narration that stimulates perception, interpretation, aesthetical evaluation of pieces of screen arts. Audiovisual thinking was interpreted as understanding and interpretation of audiovisual, space-time form of narration as speech production, forming of the ideas about world outlook, aesthetical perception of the author on the basis of the analysis of pieces of screen arts. He meant that the level of education and the depth of audiovisual thinking determine the development of a viewer’s need for the contact with pieces of screen arts of a different level, linear or the more complicated associative, polyphonic form of narration.

Y.N. Usov considered film education as purposeful pedagogically organized process of perfection of moral and aesthetical development of a personality in the system of four main kinds of activity on the material of screen arts: “1) mastering the knowledge about screen arts, about mechanisms of their functioning in social life; 2) perception of ideological and artistic contents, which unfolds in space-time form of narration; 3) interpretation of the results of perception, aesthetical evaluation of a piece of screen arts; 4) artistically creative activity in the field of screen arts – amateur filming and image acquisition” [Usov, 1989, p.8].

In his research Y.N. Usov proved that screen arts become the effective means of artistic development of a personality exactly in the system of the above mentioned activities. Film education was considered to be the means of development of audiovisual thinking of schoolchildren; the constituent of the general system of aesthetic development. At that the contents of film education was determined by the specificity of perception of space-time form of narration and by the peculiarities of the influence of screen arts on students’ minds and world outlooks.

As a result Y.N. Usov defined film education as the system of aesthetic development and artistic development of the audience which is realized during “the process of perfection of perception and evaluation of ideological and moral conception, which is unfolded in audiovisual form of film narration, in the artistic structure of screen arts. Realization of this system creates favorable possibilities for the forming of world outlook, artistically creative abilities, aesthetic consciousness of schoolchildren and their general culture. The suggested system allows to develop:

- aesthetic feelings as the result of cognitive and creative activities which improves audiovisual thinking, perceptive skills of familiarization of audiovisual image as the main means of the expression of author’s consciousness, comprehension of social reality;
- aesthetic taste which includes such components as artistic education in the field of screen arts, historical culture, audiovisual literacy, moral culture, social orientations of a personality;
- artistically creative abilities … (imagination, intuition, thinking, a personality’s need for self-actualization) on the basis of receiving of a complex of skills, abilities and knowledge in practice of the analysis and aesthetical evaluation of a film, comprehension of such concepts as screen reality, audiovisual nature of film art, television, the essence of perception of space-time, audiovisual form of film narration, artistic structure and ideological and moral conception of works of film art and television” [Usov, 1989, p.6-7].

Thus as compared with Usov’s candidate thesis [Usov, 1974] by 1989 his general conception of film education significantly broadened, it took into consideration not only the work with pieces of film art, but also with audiovisual texts, it absorbed practical approach (creative activity of schoolchildren – amateur filming, etc.). In other words in doctoral thesis by Y.N. Usov film education acquired multifold character which allows to avoid extremities – approaches aimed only at practical activity or only at the development of artistic taste.

The main tasks of film education were indicated by Y.N. Usov as follows:
- to give an idea about the main phenomena of screen arts;
- to help the audience to orient itself in the stream of audiovisual information;
- to develop cognitive interests, audiovisual literacy and culture, artistic taste with respect to screen arts;
- to develop perception of the system of audiovisual images, self-dependence of aesthetic judgments, evaluations;

- to prepare the students for self education in the field of cinematography [Usov, 1989, p.15].

It is reasonable that for practical usage of the given theses it was necessary to work out the indicators of audiovisual literacy of a schoolchild. Y.N. Usov thought that this can be indicated by the following abilities: 1) to comprehend in a multifold way the figurative reconstruction of a fact in plastic composition of single frames, their concatenation in the artistic structure of the whole film; 2) to define the logics of the development of author’s thought in space-time dimensions of the screen: in changes of the plans of representation, in the motion of filmed object, in the specific rhythm of film narration; 3) to read the hidden figurativeness of a frame, the technique of the artistic resolution of the theme, multi-layer character of the inner contents of a film; 4) to perceive the development of the artistic thought in the complex unity of sound and image organization of screen space: graphical, tonal organization of a frame, tempo and rhythmical organization of film narration owing to the repetition of visual images, cinematographic plans, their temporal duration, emotional and semantic correlation of individual frames, visual themes according to the laws of montage thinking and musical tune” [Usov, 1989, p.18].

At that Y.N. Usov justly pointed out the typical defects of methodical approaches in Russian film education when instead of the forming of the integral perception of audiovisual image, unfolded in the dynamics of space-time coordinates, the students were taught only separate specific characteristics of cinema – montage, foreshortening, etc.” [Usov, 1989, p.16].

It is worth mentioning that by the time this work was written [Usov, 1989] video equipment in Russia had not been widespread. As a rule schools and universities hadn’t had portable video cameras and camcorders yet to quickly and easily record videos during the classes. Therefore Y.N. Usov had to a greater extent to rely on methodical approaches connected with collages, shooting sheets, slide-shows, etc.

Nevertheless in our opinion basic methodical approaches of Y.N. Usov are still relevant even nowadays: “methods of the development of audiovisual literacy is the purposeful forming of a branchy system of sensory models and operative units of perception of cinematography on the material of editorial scripts, exposures, short films, educational films. Such methods help to comprehend social and philosophic contents of the artistic structure of a film, to trace the dynamic change of camera angles, to emotionally and semantically correlate the units of film narration with each other, to master the emotionally imaginative contents of film narration when perceiving with the “reductive” process of identification, and to master the process of “unfolding” of audiovisual form of film narration when analyzing a film” [Usov, 1989, p.17].

In the course of long-term researches and practical approbation Y.N. Usov worked out the following main stages of forming of audiovisual literacy:

- “consideration of element wise construction of a film image, the process of its formation in the screen space and in the mind of a viewer;

- mastering of the key concepts: the laws of montage thinking, discontinuity of film narration, the specifics of cinematographic time, space and rhythm, the artistic possibilities of subject development of author’s thought in space-time form of narration;

- mastering of perceptive actions of analysis and synthesis of the forms of film narration, of a frame as a unit of film narration, its space-time dimension, the use of the mastered units of film narration by the students in their artistic and creative activities;

- mastering of the concept of film image, its structure on the basis of its comparison with artistic image in other arts; the examination of the constituents of an image and their meanings; the synthesis of these constituents and their contents; the comparison of author’s point of view in audiovisual form with one’s own” [Usov, 1989, p.17].

At that the level of audiovisual thinking was directly connected with the depth of understanding and interpretation of the form of various types of film narration, which contains world outlook orientations
of the author, with the ability of a student to assimilate the screen environment, to sympathize with the characters and the author. The result of the interpretation depended on the ability to comprehend one’s emotional reaction, aesthetically evaluate the artistic text, the system of author’s views.

For the collective analysis of works of screen arts at school Y.N. Usow worked out the following succession of practical actions:

- “the consideration of the inner contents of the first frames, of the beginning of the development of main themes of film narration;
- the determination of the conflict which uncovers the logics of the development of author’s thought in the main parts of the film;
- the comprehension of author’s conception unfolded in audiovisual form of narration;
- the substantiation of one’s attitude to ideological and aesthetic conception of the film” [Usow, 1989, p.20].

Theoretical conceptions of Y.N. Usow became the basis for the series of educational programs for secondary schools which were worked out under the direction of Usow. A clear logic of gradual complication of the material can be seen in them: from perception of an episode containing an event, and actions of a character (forms 1-3), through perception of a group of episodes united by the outline of the plot and cause-effect relations (forms 4-7), to emotional and semantic correlation of frames and elements of intraframe composition united by images, associative relations of polyphonic development of author’s thought in space-time form (forms 9-10).

For many years the staff of the laboratory of screen arts of scientific research institute of artistic education (now Institute of Artistic Education of Russian Academy of Education) under the direction of Y.N. Usow had been experimentally approving his system of film education of schoolchildren:

**Forms I-III.** Forming of viewer’s culture in the practice of creative activities and playing which allows to become familiar with plastic potentials of cinema and other kinds of art which are able to reproduce author’s thoughts and feelings in the special space-time dimensions of a literary text, of a painting, of a musical composition, of a scenic or screen reality. The experiment showed that the solution of these tasks can turn the viewing of a film into the joyful way of cognition of the world of basis of students’ active perception of the dynamic system of audiovisual images.

By the end of the third year of studies primary school children master elementary knowledge about cinema as special kind of art, they learn to emotionally perceive and evaluate the contents of a film, to memorize and retell some individual events, episodes, scenes, to describe the characters and their attitude to them, to recognize music from films, to participate in collective games and tasks.

**Forms IV-VII.** The development of viewer’s culture in the process of studies of cinematographic concepts which are necessary for film analysis: screen space and time, “cut thinking” and rhythm of film narration, the role of cinematography in the life of man and society, variety of impacts of the artistic peculiarities of cinema, cause-and-effect relations between the parts of a film in the process of viewing and discussion.

By the end of the 7th form schoolchildren master knowledge about the synthetic nature of cinema, about the main cinema professions, about cinema genres and kinds; they master the abilities to single out the main elements of the composition of the film in the sequence of episodes: entanglement, climax, denouement; to follow the clash and the development of characters of the heroes, to see the position of the author of the film which is determined by selection of episodes, the manner of dramatic play, the techniques of the cameraman.

**Forms VIII-X.** The development of viewer’s culture in the process of comprehension of general and peculiar features of artistic image in cinema and other arts, the specific form of film narration which reproduces the idea of the film. The comprehension of such concepts as the artistic regularity of film construction, “cut thinking”, the peculiarities of the organization of outer and inner plans of narration which reveal author’s conception of films of various genres.
By the end of the 9th form schoolchildren master the knowledge about the peculiarities of the influence of cinema as a space-time art, about plot construction; they master the abilities to comprehend the recorded in different connections, relations, to perceive the general emotional mood of different episodes, the figurative contents of film narration, to reveal the inner semantic connection of the plotlines of the film, to evaluate the conception of the film, to express their reasoned attitude to the artistic contents of the film” [Usov, 1989, pp.25-27].

It is known that during the most of 1980s Russia has been isolated from the West. Therefore by 1989 Y.N. Usow couldn’t have familiarized himself with the works of the greatest foreign media educators. However even restricted analysis of foreign works undertaken in his doctoral thesis on the whole was the evidence of his correct understanding of media educational conceptions in the world. Y.N. Usow singled out such tasks of foreign media education as the development of self-dependent thinking, critical attitude to reality, the development of perception and media literacy, understanding of the peculiarities of functioning of media in society, etc. [Usow, 1989, p.4]. Thus having the idea about the main trends media education in the West, mostly about those which were aimed at the development of critical thinking and media literacy/competence, Y.N. Usow continued to stick to “aesthetical conception” aimed at the development of artistic perception and taste, at the analysis of works of art.

Many Western media researchers (L. Masterman, R. Kubey, R. Hobbs and others) considered such approach to be out of date. In particular L. Masterman thought that it is impossible to prove the high or low artistic value of a film to schoolchildren. But to the greater extent due to the predominance of informational media spectrum over the artistic one because of the rapid development of television, personal computers and the Internet. This was the origin of the heightened interest in the West to such categories as “agencies” (“sources of information”), “informational effect”, etc., which are not directly connected with the aesthetic qualities of a media text.

Regardless of such opinions, Y.N. Usow earnestly defended his point of view: the development of creative personality of students can be successful above all when addressing to aesthetic material of audiovisual media. Here his wide experience helped him: Y.N. Usow conducted media educational experiment among schoolchildren (forms 8-10) in Moscow schools N 91, N 1140 (1974-1978); he worked out experimental curricula and model of film education for pupils (forms 1-10), film education of teachers of Moscow schools (1978-1980), conducted the famous “Tushinsky experiment” (1980-1985) in 30 Moscow schools. In this large-scale media educational experiment secondary schools NN 15, 313, 599, 613, 818 and others were involved. In these schools pupils from the 1st to the 10th form were involved in film education. For all these years Y.N. Usow led film education of teachers. In 1983-1986 Y.N. Usow together with professor Z.S. Smelkova gave a course of “The basics of cinematography” for students of Moscow State Pedagogical Institute. Theoretical and methodical approaches of U.N. Usow were approved not only in Russia but also in Estonia, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

The role of Y.N. Usow as the leader of Russian film/media education is enormous. For all his conscious life Y.N. Usow rejected the media educational conceptions of “leaving” evaluation of the quality of media texts which were popular in the West. He also rejected the attempts of numerous Russian researchers to turn film/media education into the ordinary education with media technical support or artwork at different lessons at schools and institutes of higher education. Y.N. Usow was against the so-called “philosophic and moralistic” approaches to media texts (when a work of screen art became a mere cause for discussion of moral or ideological problems). There’s no doubt that in Russian film/media education I can mention a lot of famous names, but exactly Y.N. Usow could lead media education to the highest level of theoretical generalizations, consecutively and clearly elaborated methodical principles, he determined the “aesthetic” orientation of Russian film/media education as the basic adherence to the artistic values, taking into consideration the connection between the traditional and new arts, “old” and “new” technologies.
Russian researches on media education in 1990s

The economical crisis of 1990s in post-soviet Russia influenced media education as well. The total number of dissertational researches on media education remained the same as in 1980s whereas in western countries media education was developing rapidly.

The introduction of new technologies in 1990s was the defense of theses in which personal computers and the Internet were used as media educational material [Gura, 1994; Petrova, 1995; Kulikova, 1999, Moiseeva, 1997; Lepskaya, 1999 and others].

At the same time the tendencies of globalization of education led to the equal use in Russian researches of socio-cultural / cultural studies models and the practical [Zaznobina, 1990; Gavrichenkov, 1997 and others] and aesthetical ones [Fedorov, 1993; Shiyan, 1992, 1995; Breytman, 1997 and others]. One of the most bright examples of cultural studies approach in media education is the thesis by V.V. Gura which was based on M.M. Bakhtin’s conception of “dialogue of cultures” [Gura, 1994].

In this research the author rightly wrote that “humanization of computing education must be realized by means of switching from the development of computer teaching systems to the creation of cultural informational and educational environments which take into consideration the multiformity of information in the developing screen culture” [Gura, 1994, p.8].

Researches based on the integrated approach took a noticeable place among researches on media education of this period. For example, in the research by M.U. Bukharkina [1994] which rested upon the ideas of E.S. Polat (1937-2007), media education was viewed through the prism of telecommunicational projects interpreted as joint educational, creative or play activity of students (partners) organized on the basis of computer telecommunication which have common object, coordinated methods and means of activity aimed at the achievement of common result [Bukharkina, 2004].

These projects divided into language, cultural studies and role-playing which was determined by the aims of education connected in M.U. Bukharkina’s thesis with practical mastering of language, linguistic and philological development of schoolchildren, with the receiving of cultural studies knowledge, with situational and communicative nature of human intercourse.

In particular role-playing projects included:
- business-imitating, simulated situations of this or that professional activity in imaginary situations;
- dramatization of literary works in play situations, when students could play the parts of the characters or the author;
- imitating-social when students play different social roles (political leaders, journalists, teachers, etc.) [Bukharkina, 2004, p.13-15].

L.A. Ivanova in her thesis (based on the integrated approach in media education as well) which is connected with basic courses of teaching of foreign languages, worked out the model of the development of media competence of the audience at foreign language lessons (however in the thesis “media competence” was named “media-communicative education” which we don’t consider to be very apt) [Ivanova, 1999, p.12].

The effectiveness of the given model proved itself as a result of long-term forming experiment, however I think that it has some drawbacks. Firstly, it doesn’t take into consideration the whole media spectrum used during the process of media education (however it can be explained by the fact that cinema and video were selected as the basic media). Secondly, the skills acquired during the process of media education don’t accentuate the necessity of the development of critical thinking with respect to media texts of different kinds and genres. Thirdly, there’s no clarity with respect to the ability to treat media information selectively.

On the whole the thesis by L.A. Ivanova became a noticeable contribution to Russian researches on media education of the 1990s oriented to integrated approach.
Among other remarkable works of that period I can name the researches by E.A. Bondarenko [1997] and A.Y. Shkolnik [1999]. In the first one U.N. Usov’s ideas of audiovisual education of schoolchildren were creatively developed. A broad panorama of media educational methods on the material of the press was given in the second one.

**Russian researches in the field of media education in the beginning of the XXI century**

The stable socio-economic development of Russia from 2000 till the crisis in August of 2008, mainly determined by unprecedented prices for energy carriers, created prerequisites for the intensive development of media education. Due to our “Media education and media competence” scientific school’s initiative in June, 2002 the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation registered the new specialization for institutes of higher education 03.13.30 – “Media education”. This specialization was introduced in Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute. In 2008 this institute concluded an official treaty of cooperation in the field of media education with UN’s program “Alliance of Civilizations”. Russian media pedagogues actively joined in the process of cooperation with foreign colleagues in UN, UNESCO, The Council of Europe. Media educational websites and portals were created one after another (http://www.mediaeducation.ru, http://edu.of.ru/medialibrary and others).

Russian Association for Film and Media Education (http://www.edu.of.ru/mediaeducation) began to cooperate with ICO “Information for all” (http://www.ifap.ru) and UNESCO Moscow office (http://www.unesco.ru). New centers for Media education appeared all over Russia. For example, in Belgorod State University media education was integrated into the courses of journalism and media critics [A.P. Korochensky], in Russian State Professional Pedagogical University (Yekaterinburg) – into the courses of cultural studies and management [N.B. Kirillova]. More and more Russian schools, universities and institutions of additional education began to include media education in their curricula. State structures began to support media education movement more frequently (granting support from Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, hearing of the questions on informational literacy and media education at the meetings of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, inclusion of media educational themes into the text of state conception of the development of informational society, etc.). Russian experience in media education became the subject of studies in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukraine, Czech Republic and other European countries where media education hasn’t reached such heights as in Canada, Australia or the UK yet…

Against this background the number of dissertational researches on media education of 2000-2008 increased twice in number as compared with the previous decade. At the same time socio-cultural and cultural studies media educational models obviously began to prevail after the appearance of the tendency to synthesize different media as the material for education.

For the first time in the history of Russian media education the tasks of the development of knowledge/understanding of social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, economical meanings and implications of media texts began to prevail in 70% of the researches on media education. In some of the theses appeared the task which was new for Russian media education – the task of preparation of people for life in democratic society. The tasks of the development of critical thinking and the abilities of a personality to communicate, to evaluate, to comprehend and to analyze media texts were posed more frequently as well. The number of works oriented to the creation of media texts of different kinds and genres, to the spread of knowledge on history and theory of media, media culture and media education also increased.

These changes can be explained by several factors: the rapid development of media (especially the computer-based and audiovisual ones) in the whole world; globalization of educational process, enlargement of international scientific contacts (including the field of cultural studies, sociology, theory and history of media and media education), including the electronic ones (via the Internet, e-mail); desire of Russian researchers to find new research niches in the field of media education literacy. Henceforth appeared the interest to the history of the development of media education in Russia [Chelysheva, 2002] and in the Weste [Kolesnichenko, 2007], [Novikova, 2000], [Pechinkina, 2008], [Ryzhik, 2007], [Khudoleeva, 2006]. Many of the researches of 2000-2010 were conducted on the basis of universities.
On the other hand in some theses of this period the ideas of the aesthetic model which is traditional for Russian media education, developed as well at the turn of literary and film education [Dorofeeva, 2000], approved to a variable degree in the researches of Y.M. Rabinovich [1966], G.A. Polichko [1987] and others.

The theses by M.N. Fominova [2001], A.A. Zhurin [2004], N.U. Sokolova [2004], D.V. Zalagaev [2005], I.M. Khizhnyak [2008], N.V. Chicherina [2008] reflected the tendency to research of the possibilities of integrated media education in schools and institutes of higher education, which outlined during the previous decades.

For example, M.N. Fominova [2001] views media education in the context of mastering of the course of world’s artistic culture in schools of general education. From her thesis I clearly see the orientation to the aesthetic model of media education: “the main aim of the inclusion of media education into the subject “World’s Art Culture” is the development of a literate reader, viewer, listener, apt to perceive and analyze artistic images created in the language of different arts, to decode different layers of the meaning of the images” [Fominova, 2001, p.10].

In most of other researches of integrative character (A.A. Zhurin [2004], N.Y. Sokolova [2004], D.V. Zalagaev [2005] and others) predominated the traditional for Russia practical model of media education.

However, the authors of researches on media education which are oriented to the integrative approach agree that “media education integrated into the Humanities and the Arts at school is meant to prepare schoolchildren to the life in informational space by means of intensification of media educational aspects when studying different school subjects” [Fominova, 2001, p.10].

For Russian media researchers the beginning of the XXI century also became the time of conceptual generalizing doctoral theses [Vozchikov, 2007; Kirillova, 2005; Korochensky, 2003; Khilko, 2007; Fateeva, 2008 and others].

In the doctoral thesis by N.F. Khilko [2007] spiritually-personal approach to the development of students on the material of screen technologies is grounded. It’s based on the idea that audiovisual culture is a type of popular culture, which crosses with aesthetical, technical and artistic culture. N.F. Khilko soundly claims that at the heart of audiovisual culture lie the perceptive processes of visualization of an audiovisual image and forming of sensory models which are capable of creating new images on the screen. The author treats viewer’s culture as a kind of perceptive culture which includes different approaches and meanings. At the same time he justly noticed that creative status depends on bringing of personal meanings in the perceived material. The perceptive approach to the analysis of screen culture is specially emphasized.

N.F. Khilko analyzes the concepts and the function which characterize audiovisual media culture. At that peculiar attention is focused on resolution of the contradiction between the needs for self-actualization (typical of teenagers and adolescents) and the attitudes of society to screen culture [Khilko, 2007, p.4].

Guided by the conception of social ecology N.F. Khilko grounds the new branch – audiovisual creation education which is connected with the ecology of screen/viewer’s culture [Khilko, 2007, p.18]. He considers various forms of audiovisual creation, reveals the structure and the model of special creative abilities and skills, included in personal development.

Analyzing psychologically pedagogical mechanisms of screen creation, N.F. Khilko justly connects them with the reconstruction of different ideas and transformations into the new visual quality. One can see in this the essence of creative changes which lead to the evolution of a personality.

On the basis of the studied theoretical and empirical material the author concludes that the phenomenon of audiovisual culture is divided into four groups. The author singles out the following aspects of audiovisual culture which are represented in the form of the advancement of the essential force of self-revelation, as a result of which non-creative information is transformed into creative forms: cognitive-educational space of audiovisual development, creative-communicative space, artistic informational resources of the screen, ethnic-cultural and rehabilitation-ecological system of self-
actualization. All this finds its reflection in the creative-pedagogical potential of audiovisual culture as multi-level and multi-functional phenomenon [Khilko, 2007].

The author’s model of audiovisual creation [Khilko, 2007, p.34] is closely connected with personal factors and qualities which makes it complex and cull-fledged and allows to plan different ways of identification of corresponding pedagogical situations and technologies of self-revelation.

N.F. Khilko singled out four blocks of the given model which I consider to be logically righteous:

- visual-media (consumption of audiovisual information);
- generally developing (creative cognition and use of audiovisual means from media center/media library);
- interactive (revelation of the artistic potential of a personality in audiovisual sphere);
- local (mastering of communicative culture in the environment of a media center and participation in media festivals) [Khilko, 2007, p.34]

Thus we can see that it’s oriented to the development of the artistic perception, spiritual determination of the creative potential of personality. These stages border with spiritually-personal dominants, the lines of personal development and various forms of audiovisual creation connected with different elements of newness.

Motivational, value and personal parameters of self-development are considered in this context. Not only the creative qualities of kinds of audiovisual creation but also the corresponding pedagogical possibilities revealed in spiritually-personal changes are determined here.

One can’t but mention the detailed analysis of the structure of creative abilities and skills realized for the first time by N.F. Khilko on the rich empirical material and confirmed by the data from pedagogical diagnostics.

Having revealed the system of the phenomenon of audiovisual culture in its static and dynamics the author successfully applied the theoretical system worked out by her as well when elaborating pedagogical fundamentals of the technology of audiovisual creation [Khilko, 2007, pp.34-39].

The analysis of the dynamics of abilities, skills, interests, motives of participation in screen creation from the point of view of manifestations of creation in viewer’s, educational and productive activity allowed N.F. Khilko to show the role of techno-sphere and the image-bearing component which found its expression in the deepening of personal needs.

Especially important is the aim at the development of the ecology of viewer’s perception (as the constituent part of viewer’s culture) which was put forward by N.F. Khilko. It presupposes “moderateness of views”, the control and age limits with respect to audiovisual production, the ability to critically analyze screen texts of different kinds and genres, the use of ecological strategy of counteraction to naturalistic depiction of violence on the screen, preservation of spiritually-aesthetic orientation within the bounds of viewer’s personal conception [Khilko, 2007].

Analyzing pedagogical and rehabilitation aspects of personal development in the process of audiovisual creation, N.F.Khilko relies not only on the extensive analysis of theoretical sources, but also on the results of her own experimental work with students (for example within the bound of such rehabilitation themes as “motherhood”, “mercy”, “friends”, etc.). He insisted that optimization of education and cognitive activity in the field of audiovisual culture may be realized only in dialogue forms connected with divergence and visualization of thinking. N.F. Khilko thoroughly analyzed methodical peculiarities of the development of the abilities of media creation [Khilko, 2007, p.34-35].

Great importance N.F. Khilko attached to rehabilitation and ecological direction of personal development which presupposes the following types of media creation: “spiritually-relaxation, perceptive-spiritual, spiritual-cumulative, animation-retrospective, hedonistic, ethnic-rehabilitation, play-interactive, interactive-communicative, interactive-ecological, social-reconstructive, post-communicative, social and moral-ecological” [Khilko, 2007].
On the whole N.F. Khilko managed to structure various possibilities for creative activity, based on the principles of multi-functionality and poly-media use of screen means of self-development of personality, cultural studies and pedagogical comprehension of the system of audiovisual media culture. The thesis by Khilko is the extensive research of phenomenology of the screen from the viewpoint of interaction between cultural and personal space. He examined audiovisual components of creation, socio-cultural technologies of screen creation in leisure activities of the youth, lined up the pedagogical system of socio-cultural screen technologies. The matter concerns theoretical fundamentals of the development of media creation of students taking into consideration the integration of ecological, socio-cultural and personal factors [Khilko, 2007].

In his generalizing research N.F. Khilko made an important step in theoretical and methodical comprehension of the phenomenon of audiovisual media culture, in the development of creative abilities on the material of screen technologies, media education of growing up generation with the emphasis on the synthesis of socio-cultural, cultural studies and practical conceptions of media education.

Another remarkable work of the period of 2000-2010 is the doctoral thesis by A.A. Zhurin [2004]. His work is written in vivid language. It is dedicated to the integration of media education into the course of Chemistry at general schools. I are familiar with many scientific works of A.A. Zhurin so I can conclude that theoretical importance of the research (the development of terminology of integrated media education, which consists in substantiation of key concepts and specification of the meanings of the terms; the development of conceptual fundamentals of media education of schoolchildren within the course of Chemistry at general schools; further development of the theory of creation and use of training aids: formulation of regularities of the inclusion of media into the system of traditional means of education) and practical value of the research (working out of the system of bifunctional training aids: workbooks, collections of tasks and exercises, demonstrational tables, educational compact discs, methodical recommendations for teachers, aimed at the solution of the tasks of teaching of Chemistry and media education which are didactic images/models of knowledge of Chemistry and mass media) [Zhurin, 2004, p.8], the result of his long-term research activity in the field of theory and methods of teaching of Chemistry as well as in the field of media education.

One of the advantages of A.A. Zhurin’s theses is the boldness of confession that one of his hypotheses was groundless [Zhurin, 2004, p.31], which can rarely be found in pedagogical researches. He notes that it was planned that pedagogues involved in the forming experiment after familiarization with the principles of construction of training aids of teaching of Chemistry and integrated media education would actively develop their own means of education and try to use them at the lessons, however the achieved result was unequal to the expended time and energies. A.A. Zhurin thought that the cause of failure consist in the fact that the teachers were involved into the activity unusual for them, as a result they found themselves the state of constant informational stress.

For reasons given A.A. Zhurin concluded that it is necessary to intensify the work on the creation of individual kinds of training aids means of integrated media education in accordance with the above worded theoretical theses [Zhurin, 2004, p.31].

I consider the principles of integration of media education developed by A.A. Zhurin (the principle of priorities: the submission of aims and tasks of media education to the aims and tasks of the school subject; the principle of addition and development – to select from all aims and tasks of media education only those which supplement and develop the aims and tasks of teaching of the specific subject; the principle of embedding into different methodical systems: aims and tasks of integrated media education can be accomplished within the bounds of and pedagogical technology) to be logical and applicable not only to teaching of Chemistry, but also of other subjects [Zhurin, 2004, p.17].

In our opinion the disadvantage is that the terms are not always formulated correctly. For example, in the beginning A.A. Zhurin proposed the following definition: “Media text is the text that’s translated by means of mass communication and mass media”. At first glance this seems to be quite convincing, however mass communication (broad concept) includes mass media (narrower concept). Then this definition in A.A. Zhurin’s thesis acquired more laconic and adequate wording: “Media text is the information translated by means of mass media” [Zhurin, 2004, p.41].
I don’t consider the paragraph concerning the conception of foreign media education to be well turned as well. Unfortunately it lacks the analysis of key/fundamental monographs, textbooks, school-books on media education of well-known foreign scientists and experts in media education (C.Bazalgette, C.Worsnop, B.Duncan, D.Considine, L.Masterman, J.Pungente, J.Potter, A.Silverblatt and others). Even when the author refers to the truly leading western media pedagogues – D.Buckingham and K.Tyner, he analyzes not their main works (monographs, school-books in media education), but small articles from the Internet…

Because of the narrowed spectrum of the analysis of western media educational experience A.A. Zhurin categorically concluded that in these media educational conceptions miss “the most important element of educational system, the means of education” [Zhurin, 2004, p.36].

I can’t agree with this statement because in Canada, the UK, Australia and France great importance is attached to the means of education in the system of media education (for the past 10-15 years many textbooks, school-books, compact discs, video cassettes for media education, etc. were published there). For example in the USA in 1990s and in the beginning of XXI century the development and production of the means of media education (printed, computer and audiovisual) increased as a snow-ball. Their authors (D.Considine, A.Silverblatt, J.Potter, K.Tyner) worked out media educational conceptions and systems as well.

A.A. Zhurin also claimed that “scientific researches in the field of media education in Russia are limited by the three institutions: State Scientific Institution “Institute of Contents and Methods of Education of Russian Academy of Science” (the laboratory of technical means of education and media education), Scientific Research Institute of Artistic Education of Russian Academy of Education (the laboratory of screen arts) and Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute”. But he forgot about the researches on media education in Voronezh State University conducted by S.N. Penzin, as well as monographs and school-books by N.F. Khilko from Omsk branch of State Institute of Cultural Studies, the works of professor O.A. Baranov form Tver State University, of S.M. Odintsova, N.A. Legotina and others from Kurgan State University, of professors G.A. Polichko (State Institute of Management), N.B. Kirillova (Ural State University), V.A. Monastyrsky (Tambov State University), A.P. Korochensky (Belgorod State University) and other Russian media pedagogues…

However in spite of the drawbacks the thesis by A.A. Zhurin [2004] is a bright example of contemporary research based on practical conception of media education which is traditional for Russian pedagogical science.


In our opinion the research of A.P. Korochensky is a very structured work in which the most important phenomenon in the life of modern “informational society” is deeply analyzed for the first time in Russia – media criticism. This term which has become quite ordinary in the West is unusual for Russian readers. So realizing it A.P. Korochensky proves this term thoroughly. In the Western literature the term “media criticism” is used for scientific analysis of the activity of mass media in the academic works as well as for the “operative analysis” of actual problems of mass media, so the author concentrates on the second variant [Korochensky, 2003, pp.2-3].

Unfortunately great influence of mass media on social life paradoxically combines with the relative lack of development of Russian media criticism, whereas it is aimed at the analysis of relevant creative, professionally-ethical, legal, economical and technological aspects of media. A.P. Korochensky wrote: “Taking into consideration the unprecedented increase of social role of print and electronic press, the specifics of its functioning in contemporary conditions, media criticism must constantly keep various relations of mass media with the society and its institutions in the field of vision”. In these relations print and electronic press can appear not only in the role of the supplier of actual social information, knowledge on the constantly developing environment, but also as the instrument of mental control over society, the means of ensuring feedback between citizens and the government. All this allows to determine the subject of media criticism as actual multifold social functioning of mass media” [Korochensky, 2003, p.15].
Reasoning from this definition A.P. Korochensky clearly formulates the main tasks of media criticism: cognition of informational production; studies and changes in social perception of media contents and notions about outer world which are formed in the minds of media audience; influence on the public’s attitude to media, forming of a definite social culture of studies and evaluation of mass media, the development of the spiritual world of man; assistance to the development and perfection of creative and professional culture of the creators of media texts; social environments of functioning of mass media, etc. The latter acquires special importance owing to the fact that Russian audience treat mass media with lesser and lesser confidence. In the middle of 1990s 70% of Russians trusted mass media, but nowadays it is twice lesser [Vartanova, 2002. p. 23].

The author also clearly singled out basic functions of media criticism (informational-communicative, cognitive, correction, social-organizational, enlightening, commercial) [Korochensky, 2003, pp.19-25]. The author’s viewpoint regarding the analysis of manipulative possibilities of media is also convincing. On the basis of the analysis of numerous sources A.P. Korochensky systematizes the most widespread manipulative elements of modern mass media: sketchiness, simplification; identity of logical and illogical; deformity of reflection; absence of neatly expressed criteria of distinguishing of superficial and deep-laid intercommunications; references to traditions, authority, precedent, normativity, divine will; syncretism of aesthetic-imaginative, ethic-regulative and cognitive elements of myths; claims to the solely correct out-of-historical explanation of the phenomena of reality and absolute correctness of practical actions, implied by this explanation; evaluating and orienting character of media texts; premeditation of creation, etc.

At that theoretical reasoning are always fortified by convincing examples which help to penetrate into the essence of this or that function of media criticism. For example, speaking about the role of media criticism in revelation of failure to mention in media texts, A.P. Korochensky marks the “white spots” which appear in print and electronic press regarding violations of professional ethics of journalists over and over again (publication of ordered materials, the turning of journalists into mouthpieces of politicians or businessmen, the use of “secret agents” which report “confidential information”, etc.).

I can’t but agree with the author’s aspiration to emphasize maintenance of healthy psychological and moral climate in the society, especially in terms of demonstration of blood and violence on the screens. In spite of all the good intentions and promises Russian television still hasn’t dared to exclude the endless documentary scenes of disfigured corpses, the films and serials with the scenes of brutal murders, tortures, fights, etc. from prime-times. Everything that is broadcasted after 10-11 pm in the Western countries is translated at daytime in Russia and is available for children. After all, their psyche hasn’t developed yet, on the contrary, their emotional receptivity and aspiration for non-critical imitation, etc., are still high. It was said many times that broadcast of any film must be accompanied by the special rating sign that tells about the age to which age group the media texts is meant. In France or for example Canada such ratings are ordinary and normal, but in Russia the films rated “R” in the West (for adults only) are still broadcasted at any time without any warnings.

A.P. Korochensky is also right that thorough psychological, cultural studies and sociological analyses of media texts belonging to entertaining mass culture are needed (for example, TV shows like “Behind the Glass”, “The Last Hero”, “The Weak Unit”, etc.) to reveal any built-in socially declining ideas, cultural and behavioral stereotypes. These shows consolidate in mass consciousness the ideas about fundamental impossibility of perfection of supposedly mean human nature, about the reducing of the motivation of all human actions to mere satisfaction of primary instincts, about social permissibility of the use of immoral methods (calumny, baiting, backstage scheming) for suppression and removal of those people who are on the way to success [Korochensky, 2003]. By the way, 5 years later another thesis was defended in Russia in which for the first time such media texts were used as media educational material [Grigorova, 2008].

I am media pedagogue with 30 years of seniority, and I think that the chapter in A.P. Korochensky’s thesis, in which the connection between media education and media criticism is highlighted, is very important. Indeed, though UNESCO proclaimed media education to be the priority branch of educational process of the XXI century, as a rule Russian journalists don’t hurry to establish contacts...
between their corporative community and media education (though there’s some progress, for example see the thesis by I.V. Zhilavskaya [2008]).

In accordance with the recommendations of UNESCO A.P.Korochensky proposes to broaden the concept of media education as long-term social and enlightening activity aimed at not only schoolchildren and students, but also at the grown-up audience, i.e. to talk about the constant development of the culture of adequate perception of media messages (articles, radio/TV programs, films, websites, etc.) in society and about self-dependent evaluation of the work of mass media taking into consideration democratic and humane ideals and values.

Basically it is clear why the development of media criticism and media education didn’t receive official support in the Soviet period. The government wanted mass audience (both adult and student) not to think about the aims and tasks of the creation of this of that (especially “state-significant”) media text. The absence of media literate audience has always opened the broad space for manipulations in the press, on the TV/radio in the direction favorable for the government. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then, but the situation is almost the same… And here A.P. Korochensky reasonably notes that the participation of journalists in the propaganda of the ideas of media education in Russia is not sufficient nowadays though media criticism has great potential in terms of support of the efforts of educational and enlightening institutions in the development of media culture of the audience.

Again A.P. Korochensky is right: the’re is point in broadening of participation of academic circles, scientists, different specialists (sociologists, psychologists, pedagogues and others), institutions of culture and education, public organizations and foundations with the object of the development of media literacy of citizenry, in the creation of organizational structures capable of accomplishing of the whole spectrum of tasks of media education in cooperation with media critics.

Indeed, media criticism and media education have much in common. After all one of the main tasks of media education is just to teach the audience not only to critically evaluate media texts of any kinds and genres, but also to understand the mechanisms of their creation and functioning in society. Moreover, British media pedagogues (C.Bazalgette, A.Hart and others) among the six key concepts of media education emphasize just “agencies” (meaning overall studies and the analysis of the way the structure which creates media messages works as well as the aims with which this or that media text is created, etc.), “language of media” (studies of the peculiarities of the language of media texts), “representation” (understanding how this of that “agency” represents reality in a media text) and “media audience” (the analysis of the typology of perception of the audience, its susceptibility to the influence on the part of the “agencies” etc.). In fact the same key concepts of media are studied by media criticism as well, at that it turns to both professional and vast audience. That’s why it is important to establish firm ties between media criticism and media education.

In Russia there’re many talented experts in media critics, however not all of them are able to make serious theoretical generalizations. Being familiar with the works of prominent foreign scientists in the field of media (M.McLuhan, D.McQuail, L.Masterman, A.Hart, K.Tyner, C.Worsnop and others), I can claim that the doctoral thesis of A.P. Korochensky is highly competitive with the best world’s analogues. A.P. Korochensky integrates media education with journalism and not in the least worse than western masters analyzes the phenomenon of media criticism both on the level of theoretical generalizations and on the level of concrete materials.

Doctoral thesis of V. A. Vozchikov [2007] is also original in its approach. As a matter of fact for the first time the philosophical basis of media education was substantiated on such solid level. The author researches ontological meanings and aims of media education as the means of comprehension of media through overall understanding of media activity as the special type of cultural, educational and creative environment [Vozchikov, 2007, p.9].

V.A. Vozchikov wrote that “media culture is the dominating culture of informational society, existing in the activity of traditional and electronic mass media which recreate socio-cultural picture of the world with the help of verbal, audio and visual images; the culture-universe which includes functional variety of mass, public, elitist cultures and their modification, ontologically accelerated in human vital activity; the culture - meta-message about world outlook of mankind at a certain stage of its existence”
[Vozchikov, 2007, p.17]. He gives the detailed and thorough description to this phenomenon, in many respects expanding and deepening the previously proposed definitions of other researchers.

Doctoral thesis of N.B. Kirillova [2005] is written in a similar key with the orientation on cultural studies theory of media education. In this work she speaks about the role of “media culture as the intermediary between government and society, between society and personality, as the integrator of the new media environment” [Kirillova, 2005, p.5]. At that she gives the detailed analysis of functions and models of media culture [Kirillova, 2005, pp.12-15], legal bases of media managementa [Kirillova, 2005, p.28-30] and the problems of media education as the factor of socialization of personality [Kirillova, 2005, p.39-43].

As a result N.B. Kirillova comes to the well-grounded conclusion that “one of the important branches of media education as the basis of the formation of informational society can become the introduction in the leading state universities, teacher-training institutions, institutes of culture, of the new specialization “Medialogy” which will allow to unite such subjects as “History and theory of media culture”, “Theory and practice of journalism”, “Intercultural communications”, “Media education”, “Fundamentals of media criticism”, “Media management” and others. Such complex training will let the graduates to enter the info sphere as full-fledged specialist of the XXI century: theorists and pedagogues, managers and sociologists, methodologist of cultural and leisure centers and experts-analysts on the problems of mass media” [Kirillova, 2005, p.43].

I mentioned above that the significant part of theses, successfully defended in the first decade of the XXI century, was dedicated to media education of university students [Zmanovskaya, 2004; Ivanova, 2004; Konovalova, 2004; Legotina, 2004, Ryzhikh, 2006, Stobnikova, 2005; Chicherina, 2008 and others]. Thus in their theses N.V. Zmanovskaya and N.A. Legotina worked out and approved the indexes and the levels of the development of media education / media literacy and the readiness the future teacher to realize the process of media education [Zmanovskaya, 2004; Legotina, 2004], the models of organization of the process of media education of humanitarian institutions of higher education [Znamovskaya, 2004; Legotina, 2004]. Similar indexes and models of education concerning the audience of the future librarians were worked out by O.P. Kutkina [Kutkina, 2006].

Of course the researchers of media education couldn’t pass the accumulated problems by. In particular, E.I. Khudoleeva [2006] worked out rather detailed classification of typical problems (social and political, administrative, organizational, didactical, corporative, professional, social, personal), which encounter the development of media education in Russia (Table 11).

Table 11. Pedagogical problems of media education in Russia [Khudoleeva, 2006, p.19].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of media education</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>– inner psychological problems, fear of new equipment and technologies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– unwillingness to make efforts and study the possibilities of the use of new equipment in one’s professional activity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>– insufficiently high level of informational development of society;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– inaccessibility of electronic informational means for many orders;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– technical impossibility for everybody to get remote education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogue</td>
<td>– lack of media competence of teachers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>– unwillingness and impossibility for experienced teachers to do professional studies;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporative

- the problem of the development of electronic and educational space of educational institutions;
- insufficient use of remote forms in education;
- lack of exchange of experience in terms of the development of new technologies through the system of raising the level of one's skill, and seminars;

Educational institutions

- absence of modern computer equipment in most educational institutions;
- absence of free access to computer equipment for teachers and students;
- absence of qualified media pedagogues;
- small number of didactical materials and recommendations for lessons with the use of media;
- absence of motivation of teachers and students;

Didactical and organizational

- the concept "media education" is unknown for vast pedagogical community;
- absence of public opinion concerning the importance of media education as the component of education;

Society

- absence of the official state inquiries for preparation of media pedagogues;
- media education is not a compulsory subject;
- absence of the specialization “Media education”;
- absence of purposeful and systematic state coordination of the development of theory and methods of media education;
- the “super-task” of media education is not defined yet.

Managerial

I think that on the whole Table 11 rightly reflects the main problems which media education in Russia faces in the beginning of the XXI century, though individual wordings (they are marked with asterisks), in my opinion, could have been formulated in less categorical way. For instance, instead of the word “absence” (of media pedagogues, motivation, etc.) such words as “lack of” could have been used… Besides, most problems mentioned by E.I. Khudoleeva are peculiar to the contemporary educational process in Russia in general.

**Russian scientific researches on media education: perspective tendencies for the future**

I try to define the most perspective tendencies (incl. theoretical models, conceptions) in Russian researches on media education, to reveal the directions of further development of such researches in the context of correlation with foreign analogues.

Our analysis allows us to assume that in foreseeable future socio-cultural and cultural studies models and corresponding aims and tasks will prevail in Russian media education. With the predominance of the orientation to the synthesis of media material in conditions of schools and institutes of higher education I can expect the broadening of such research bases as pre-school institutions, institutions of specialized secondary education, libraries and media libraries. One may also forecast the appearance of such theses on media education (incl. the remote one) of the adult audience. There’s no doubt that the tendency of drawing together of the topics of the researches on media education literacy, media criticism and journalism will continue to increase.

Due to expanding access to electronic media and archives, intensification of scientific exchanges with foreign countries, the spectrum of philosophical basis, methods of media education will most likely broaden. At the same time it is likely that the changes of the balance in the spectrum of specializations on which the researches are conducted will occur due to the appearance of works on media educational methods.

On the whole our forecast concerning the intensity of the development of researches on media education in Russia is quite favorable: there’re good reasons to assume that the number of researches connected with the problems of media education, media competence, media literacy will continue to increase in number mainly owing to regional scientific collectives.
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**Appendix 1**

*The list of theses on media education of Russian authors*

**The theses of 1950-1959:**


**The theses of 1960-1969:**


The theses of 1970-1979:


The theses of 1980-1989:


The theses of 1990-1999:


The theses of 2000-2010:


