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Introduction

The goal of the study is to undertake a comparative analysis of the development of media education in the Commonwealth of Independent States – CIS (1992-2020) at each stage (including theoretical concepts, goals and objectives, role, place, functions, organizational forms of media education in the mainstream education).

The object of the study is media education in the countries of the CIS.

The research’s subject is basic stages of development, theoretical and methodological concept of media education in the CIS countries over the past 25 years.

The research objectives are the following:

• to formulate and justify a set of theoretical stances that make up the methodological basis of research into the history of mass media education in the CIS (1992-2020);
• to analyze theoretical sources and practical experience of the leading figures of media education in the CIS countries;
• to determine the essential features, qualities and properties of media education in the CIS countries, to investigate the structure, main stages of historical development, directions, theoretical concepts, goals and objectives, contents, media education technologies in the CIS; in particular, the research based on the basic theoretical concepts (aesthetic, protectionist, practical, ideological, critical thinking, cultural studies, sociocultural, ethics) will be examined. Models of mass media education, developed in CIS countries, for various target audiences, will be studied;
• to carry out a comparative analysis and systematization of the material, to identify the main theoretical and methodological concepts of media education in the CIS countries, which may be a promising basis for further successful development in the Russian contexts;
• to synthesize key media education models applied in CIS countries with the help of comparative analysis;
• to implement the research results into the education process of the university (for teacher training departments).

The novelty of our research arises from the following contradictions:

- the contradictions that have arisen in connection with the great experience accumulated in the last two decades by media educators in the CIS countries and the inadequate degree of generalization, analysis and application of this experience – both in foreign and Russian pedagogy (with the identification of the most grounded media education models for possible adaptation in Russia);
- the contradiction between views on mass media education as a program of "journalism for all" and "media activity" (Dzyaloshinsky, Pilgun, 2011, p. 353; Zhilavskaya, 2009; Ivanov, 2010, etc.) and media education as a means of developing the media competence of an individual (our research team, etc.). At the same time, these contradictions are inherent not only to the views of Russian scientists and media educators, but also to the views of their Ukrainian, Belarusian, Kazakh, Uzbek and other colleagues (Abdurakhmanov, Beknazarova, 2011; Beknazarova, 2011; Gabor, 2002; Galzyrina, Kolbysheva, 2009; Golubtsova, Meiramkhan, 2003; Grinevich, 2008; Ivanov et al, 2011; Kazakov, 2007; Kirillova, 2005; Kolbysheva, 2009; Korkonosenko, 2010; Korochensky, 2003; Melnik, 1996; Naidionova, 2007; Onkovich, 2007; 2011; Potyatinik, 2004; Razlogov, 2005; Sharikov, 1991; Vozchikov, 2007; Zhilavskaya, 2009; Zhilinskaya, 2008);
- the contradictions that have emerged between Ukrainian and Russian scientists and media educators over the past 3-4 years due to the fact that some Ukrainian media
educators began using media education as a propaganda weapon in political struggle against Russia and its educational influence (see, for example: Emets-Dobronosova, 2014).

We assume that in the basis of a comparative approach to the development of mass media education in the CIS countries, we will lay out a detailed analysis of the peculiarities of the interpretation of key theories of media education (aesthetic, sociocultural, critical thinking, semiotic, etc.). Thus,

- a comparative analysis and systematization of the main research in the field of mass media education in the CIS countries will be undertaken, presented by leading scientific schools and individual scientists in the context of sociocultural problems of the development of society, globalization, state and corporate position in relation to the development of media education;
- the most promising trends (including theoretical models, concepts) will be identified in the subject matter of the project;
- the ways of further development of such research, areas of improvement, corrections are indicated.

Comparative analysis and interpretation of academic literature, government decrees, ministerial instructions, pedagogical documentation, curriculum materials, periodicals, government documents, resolutions, conferences proceedings on the problems of mass media education in CIS countries, in our view, complies with the tasks of the project. It will enable us to systematize, generalize, explore the main stages, directions, goals and objectives, the content, methodological principles of media models education in various states.

The interest in Russian and international models of media education, in history of their emergence and development has dramatically risen recently. The need to study the history of media education derives from the fact that looking into the past allows one to see the origins of a particular phenomenon and further perspectives, to comprehend the present, to reveal the essence that lies at its basis.

Regrettably, media education in the CIS countries has not yet become the subject of a full-scale generalization analysis up to now. Therefore, the choice of the theme of our project: "Mass media education in CIS countries (1992-2020)" is dictated by its relevance, scarce elaboration by academic community, and scientific contradictions noted above.

Scientific novelty of the study:
- for the first time on the international scale, the process of historical development of mass media education in the CIS countries between 1992-2020 (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, etc.) will be analyzed;
- the work of CIS educators in the field of mass media education, which had not previously been presented in the world science, will be analyzed;
- the analysis of theoretical concepts, models, technologies, organizational forms of media education characteristic for this period of mass media education's development in the CIS countries will be carried out;
- based on the comparative analysis, the key media education models used in the CIS countries will be synthesized (because the media education models are not everywhere explicitly, structurally present). By our assumption, the structural blocks of the basic media education models will include: the definition of the "media education" concept; conceptual theoretical basis of media education; goals, objectives, organizational forms, media education technologies; general contents of the media education curriculum; areas of use; possible outcomes of implementing the model;
- on the above basis, the ways of further development of such research, areas of improvement, correction, optimal ways of practical implementation of the best CIS practices in the field of mass media education will be outlined.

Academic controversies in media education tasks (comparison of approaches of
Western media educators and media educators of the CIS countries) lead us to the formulation of the problematic issue of our research: is it possible to synthesize the dominant media education models on the basis of generalizing the accumulated experience of mass media education in the CIS countries (1992-2020) and analysis of their main tendencies, the most relevant for implementation in Russian universities and schools? We believe that the synthesis of key media education models in the CIS countries can become the basis for theoretical substantiation and development of conceptual models that are most relevant for implementation in Russian universities and schools.

We are sure that media education can not be successfully and effectively developed without systematization and generalization of its existing trends and processes in foreign countries, without a "dialogue of cultures". It is necessary to fill the gap in the domestic science in terms of studying and comparing the structure, main directions, trends of media education in the CIS countries. That is why the problem of the project declared by us seems to be relevant.

One of the most prominent media educators and media philosophers Len Masterman outlined seven reasons for arguing that media education should be given urgent priority as early as in 1985: 1. The high rate of media consumption and the saturation of the contemporary societies by the media. 2. The ideological importance of the media, and their influence as consciousness industries. 3. The growth in the management and manufacture of information, and its dissemination by the media. 4. The increasing penetration of media into our central democratic processes. 5. The increasing importance of visual communication and information in all areas. 6. The importance of educating students to meet the demands of the future. 7. The fast-growing national and international pressures to privatise information (Masterman, 1985: 2).

European Parliament resolution of 16 December 2008 on media literacy in a digital world (2008/2129(INI)) also points out the relevance of the issue. In particular, it asserts that "media education should be an element of formal education to which all children should have access and which should form part and parcel of the curriculum at every stage of schooling"; recommends that "compulsory media education modules be incorporated into teacher training for all school levels, so as to enable the subject to be taught intensively; calls on the relevant national authorities to familiarize teachers of all subjects and at every type of school with the use of audiovisual teaching aids and with the problems associated with media education" (European Parliament Resolution..., 2008).

The Moscow Declaration on Media and Information Literacy developed by UNESCO Information for ALL Programme (2012) emphasizes the necessity to include media and information literacy in the priority directions of the national policy in the sphere of education, culture, and media; urgency of structural and pedagogical reforms necessary for enhancement of media and information literacy (MIL); its integration in the curricula including systems of assessment at all levels of education, inter alia, lifelong and workplace learning and teacher training; encourage an intercultural dialogue and international cooperation while promoting MIL worldwide (The Moscow Declaration..., 2012).

These premises are reflected in the text of the Long-term Concept of Social and Economic Development of the Russian Federation for the period up to 2020, approved by the Government of the Russian Federation, where the Concept among the prioritized directions of information and telecommunication technologies, places the expansion of IT for the new forms and methods of instruction, including media education. This shows that the necessity and relevance of media education and its final goal – the media competence of the population is recognized at the highest state level, becomes a task not only for enthusiasts in this highly-demanded by information society field, but also on a national scale. We see an additional relevance and significance of our research in that our
university, having achieved official registration of a new university specialization – Media Education by the Board of Educational Methodological Association of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, was one of the pioneers of its introduction into the educational process. The media education classes are being taught in our university at the present time.

We believe that the role of the expected results in deepening the existing system of knowledge about the development of mass media education in the CIS countries that make up this subject area of science will be very important for the further development of mass media education in various countries of the world, including Russia, because the comparative approaches we propose, synthesized media education models, generalized technologies will significantly improve the media competence of a wide audience (first of all – schoolchildren and students).

Presumably, the major scientific significance of the expected results of the research will be that (on the basis of comparative analysis) the optimal model for the development of mass media education in the CIS countries will be synthesized.

The contribution of the planned scientific results to the solution of applied problems will consist in the fact that the enhanced objective-settings (relating to the development of mass media education in the CIS countries, taking into account the scientific contradictions revealed) will be presented. Moreover, original provisions characterizing new outcomes of the task solving (conclusions, recommendations for implementation in institutions of various types – in universities, schools, in supplementary education establishments) will be provided.

We see the importance of the proposed study on the topic of the development of mass media education in the CIS countries, both from the point of view of the existing trends' development, and of expanding the possibility of practical application of scientific results. Specific opportunities for the practical application of scientific results: the results of the project will be introduced into the educational process of the university (for the future teachers training). The supposed scope of the project’s use is higher education institutions, Education, Social Sciences departments, above all; colleges and schools. The range of users comprises university teachers, post-graduate, graduate and undergraduate students, and secondary school teachers.

Materials and methods

Materials of our research are academic writings on media education, media literacy, and media competence published in a variety of countries, the CIS countries foremost, as well as Internet sites, and evidence of the practical application of media education in the CIS countries, accumulated from 1992 to the present day. Methodology is based on theoretical framework on the relationship, interdependence and integrity of the phenomena of reality, the unity of the historical and the logical in cognition, the theory of the dialogue of cultures by M. Bakhtin - V. Bibler (taking into account the theoretical concepts developed by such well-known sociologists and cultural studies researchers as M. Foucault, Y. Lotman, U. Eco, M. McLuhan, P. Sorokin, N. Luhmann, M. Weber, J. Gerbner, A. Mole, V. Yadov, and others). The research is based on a content approach (identifying the content of the process being studied, with due regard to the aggregate of its elements, interaction between them, their nature, access to facts, analysis and synthesis of theoretical conclusions, etc.) and a comparative approach.

The following methods are used: data collection (dissertations, extended abstracts of Ph.D. dissertations, monographs, articles, reports) related to the project’s theme, analysis of academic literature, theoretical analysis and synthesis; generalization and classification; content analysis, modeling.

The working hypothesis is: a comparative approach to scientific research in the project's field (the results of which are reflected in dissertations, abstracts, monographs,
scientific articles, reports, etc.) will allow for systematization and comparative theoretical concepts, goals and objectives, role, functions, technologies, organizational forms of media education in the general educational process); will help synthesize the most relevant media education models for the CIS countries. It is assumed that the structural blocks of these basic media education models will include: the definition of the concept "media education"; conceptual theoretical basis of media education; goals, objectives, organizational forms, media education technologies; multilevel tasks, their interrelationships, didactic means of substantive and organizational nature, practical technologies of pedagogical guidance / counseling, providing a diverse range of educational creative tasks, problem situations, etc., developing the media competence of the individual; main sections of the contents of the media education program; areas of application; possible results of the implementation of the model. On this basis, additional prospects for research and further practical action on the project will be outlined.
1. Aims and objectives, model of mass media education in CIS countries

Media have been playing increasingly important roles in people's daily life and in education. Therefore the significance of the intensive development of media literacy education is evident. "Big Russian Encyclopedia" defines media education as the process of a personality's development with the help of and on the material of media, aimed at the enhancement of media culture, creative, communicative skills, critical thinking, comprehensive perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts; teaching and learning of various forms of self expression through media technologies; gaining media competence. The main directions of media education are media education for future professionals in mass media industry; for future teachers; for school and university students (which can be integrated with traditional subjects or autonomous); at supplementary educational establishments and leisure centers; distance media education for various groups; independent lifelong media education. The positive outcome of media education is a personality's media competence - the sum of one's motives, knowledge, abilities, skills, facilitating the choice, use, critical analysis, evaluation, creation and transfer of media texts in various forms, forms and genres, analysis of complex processes of media functioning in society (Media Education, 2012: 480).

UNESCO defines media education as the prioritized sphere of cultural and pedagogical developments in the XXI century. Its resolutions and recommendations have repeatedly emphasized the significance and support of mass media education (UNESCO conferences in Grünwald, 1982; Toulouse, 1990; Paris, 1997; Vienna, 1999; Seville, 2002, Paris, 2007; Moscow, 2012, etc.). It is stated in UNESCO Recommendations that "Media Education is part of the basic entitlement of every citizen, in every country in the world, to freedom of expression and the right to information and is instrumental in building and sustaining democracy. While recognizing the disparities in the nature and development of Media Education in different countries, the participants of the Seville Seminar, following closely the prior definitions developed by the Vienna Conference in 1999, recommend that Media Education should be introduced wherever possible within national curricula as well as in tertiary, non-formal and lifelong education" (UNESCO, 2002).

In 2008 and 2010, the Moscow State University hosted conferences and roundtables on media education, where resolutions were adopted, that pointed out some negative trends in the development of the media education process, both in Russia and in the CIS countries: "the accumulated experience and research results remain insufficiently disseminated and are underused, due to the fact that media education has not yet moved from the stage of the experiment to the stage of wide practical application. The opportunities for additional education are poorly used ... The interaction between existing centers and numerous experimental sites in the field of media education is inadequate, the potential of teachers and researchers of leading faculties is not fully utilized" (Resolution ..., 2008).

The main difficulties in the wider introduction of media education in the educational process of higher education institutions and schools of the CIS countries are, first of all, connected: with the apparent shortage of media educators given targeted training; with a certain inertia of the leadership of a number of higher educational institutions (in fact, within the framework of the disciplines of the regional component and the elective courses in higher education institutions, there are possibilities for introducing new subjects, but most universities' management is still reluctant to allocate hours for media education disciplines); with the traditional approaches of the ministerial structures, which focus on supporting training courses in IT and computer applications literacy with much less
attention to the current problems of media literacy / media competence.

In the view of the above, the urgent need for intensive analysis of the media-pedagogical experience of the CIS countries is very important. Having received the results of the analysis of this experience, the media educators of the CIS countries will be able to more effectively develop their theoretical ideas, methodological / technological approaches, experimental work in schools and universities, in out-of-school education establishments and leisure centers.

Note that, unlike the western approaches to the development of media education (protectionist, theological, critical thinking, semiotic, cultural studies, etc.) (Buckingham, 2003; Hobbs, 2011; Masterman, 1985; Potter, 2012; Silverblatt, Zlobin, 2004; Tyner, 2010, etc.), the pedagogy of the CIS countries up to the end of the 1990s was based on the aesthetic concept. However, in recent years new approaches to media education models have been developed by Russian scientists I. Fateeva (2007), I. Zhilavskaya (2009), Ukrainian scientists G. Onkovich (2013) and V. Ivanov (2013). There has been further development of the ideas advanced by Len Masterman (the theory of critical thinking in media education), David Buckingham (cultural theory of media education), A. Sharikov (sociocultural theory of media education). However, there has been no attempt to accomplish a well-grounded comparative analysis of models of mass media education in post-Soviet CIS countries (neither by international researchers, nor in the CIS countries).

The analysis of the history of the development of media education in the USSR and Russia in 1919-2002 had been made by our team with the support of the grant of the Russian Foundation for the Humanities No. 01-06-00027a in 2001-2003, and a comparative analysis of the development of media education in the leading Western countries (from the 1920s to the beginning of the 21st century) had been carried out with the funding of the Russian Foundation for the Humanities No. 04-06-00038a in 2004-2006. As a result of these two previous projects, a series of articles and two monographs on this subject were published. This, undoubtedly, will serve as a solid foundation for the implementation of the current study - "Mass media education in the CIS countries (1992-2020)". Considering that media education is relatively young, about a hundred years old direction in pedagogy, and the CIS countries have developed as independent states only in the last quarter of a century, the chronological scope of our research will be limited to the period from the early 1990s to the present.

In the 1980s-1990s and the beginning of the 21st century, many books, articles, and studies devoted to the problems of education on the basis of various types of media were published in Russia (L. Bazhenova, O. Baranov, E. Bondarenko, E. Vartanova, A. Zhurin, L. Zaznobina, A. Korochensky, I. Levshina, G. Maximova, S. Penzin, E. Polat, G. Polichko, A. Spichkin, Y. Usov, I. Fateeva, A. Fedorov, A. Sharikov, N. Khilko, Y. Yastrebtseva, and others). The flow of media education researches has intensified, especially since the radical change in political and socio-economic life in Russia (since the early 1990s). However, works concerning the development of mass media education in the CIS countries are still relatively rare. On the one hand, foreign researchers (primarily L. Marsterman, C. Bazalgatte, A. Hart, D. Buckingham, J. Gonnet, B. Bachmayer, etc.) have investigated the problems associated with the history and theory of media education in Europe, however, always limiting their studies to West European experience, excluding the CIS countries.

On the other hand, the media educators- residents of the CIS countries (L. Akhmetova, S. Beknazarova, N. Gabor, T. Zhilinskaya, V. Ivanov, S. Kolbyssheva, O. Nechay, Zh. Meiramkhan, G. Onkovich, B. Potyatinik, etc.) generally, have not reached the level of a comparative analysis of the development of media education in neighboring CIS countries (except for references to the development of media education in Russia).

For example, Ukraine, being part of the USSR, until 1992 was in line with the overall media educational theoretical concepts of the time. In the 1960s-1980s, the aesthetic
theory of media education dominated here (Polikarpova, 1976, Silina, 1968, Chashko, 1979). In the first half of the 1990s, Ukraine was at a difficult stage in the formation of a new state status, including the educational context, which could not but affect the development of mass media education, which (against the background of numerous problems) was not recognized at the official level. Quite expectedly, in their theoretical approaches, Ukrainian media educators relied on foreign experience, primarily, Western and Russian. Hence, it is not surprising that the "Ukrainian Pedagogical Dictionary" (Goncharenko, 1997), published in this period, defining the concept "media education", in fact, reproduced the same definition from the "Russian Pedagogical Encyclopedia" (Media Education, 1993: 555).

Nevertheless, the 1990s brought to the forefront at least three Ukrainian theorists of communications and media education. G. Pocheptsov (Kiev) analyzed and developed media theories, including semiotic theories, theories of information influences, in his fundamental monographs, numerous published in Russia and Ukraine (Pocheptsov, 2001). Theoretical approaches to the development of media education on the material of the press were developed by the Kyivan citizen G. Onkovich (Onkovich, 2011), who had proposed the term "press didactics" and considered integrated media education in the context of language learning. Another theorist, the leader of the Lviv media education school, B. Potyatinik, asserted that "media education is a scientific and educational sphere of activity that aims to help the individual in the formation of psychological protection from manipulation or exploitation by the mass media and develop information culture" (Potyatinik, 2005, p.8), so in the 1990s the research team he headed concentrated on the protectionist theory of media education. In particular, as in G. Pocheptsov’s works, it was about developing a theoretical model of protecting the individual from negative media influences.

In the first decade of the XXI century, along with the active researcher G. Pocheptsov, another Ukrainian theorist of media and a media educator, V. Ivanov became well-known, he published a series of monographs, teaching aids dedicated to the problems of mass communications, journalism and media education. His works analyze in detail historical and modern trends in the development of the media studies, including theoretical concepts, models, problems of the information society and globalization (Ivanov, 2010). At the beginning of the 21st century, the development of theoretical concepts of media education in Ukraine developed more intensively. This is reflected by the sharp increase in the number of dissertations in the field (Buzhikov, 2007; Dukhanina, 2011; Kazakov, 2007; Kurlischuk, 2008; Onkovich; 2004; Roslyak; 2004; Sakhnevich, 2012; Chemeris, 2008; Shubenko, 2010; other).

To date, in the media education process in Ukraine, several rival research groups can be distinguished: the development of the synthesis of media education and journalism (Academy of the Ukrainian Press: a team of researchers led by V. Ivanov); development of media ecology, protecting the audience from harmful media exposure (Institute of Media Ecology at the Lviv National University); development of media didactics (team of media educators and researchers under the guidance of G. Onkovich); development of the socio-cultural model of media education (the collective of researchers headed by L. Naydenova); development of aesthetic perception and taste of schoolchildren and students (National Association of Film Educators and Media Pedagogy of Ukraine headed by O. Musienko). However, since 2014, the researches conducted by the team led by V. Ivanov became visibly politically charged, propaganda oriented, which gave media education development an ideological, at times anti-Russian coloring.

Among the works of Belarusian media educators it is possible to single out the works of M. Zhbankov, A. Karpilova, O. Nechay, I. Sukmanov. The leading theoretical concepts of Belarusian researchers in recent years have been the theory of critical thinking
development, cultural, aesthetic, practical, and socio-cultural theories of media education. Belarusian media educators highly rank the tasks of the development of the audience’s critical thinking, aesthetic education of the younger generation by means and on the material of media culture, development of the socio-cultural field of media culture. These positions are quite close to the approaches of many Russian media pedagogues, who propose the synthesis of several theoretical media education concepts.

An important role in the media education process belongs to the development of critical thinking of the audience, the development of an understanding of the "possibilities of media effects and media manipulation" (Zhilinskaya, 2008). L. Glazyrina and S. Kolbysheva believe that "it is the person who should determine the direction, nature and content of the informatization process, act as the "consumer" of new information technologies and services. To do this, one needs to learn to think without losing in the technologies-dominated world one's intellectual, emotional, spiritual and moral tension" (Glazyrina, Kolbysheva, 2009: 216).

There are successful practices in the field of media education in Kazakhstan, too. For example, the research team under the leadership of L. Akhmetova won a research grant of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan on media education topics ("Developing Media Education Technologies for Building the Intellectual Potential of the Country") in 2012 and has been developing activities in this direction (Akhmetova, 2012).

The review of media education literature shows that in the CIS countries "preventive/inoculation" approach (i.e. learning to resist harmful media effects) and "aesthetic" (i.e. aimed at the development of aesthetic taste of the audience) approach is being currently replaced by "cultural studies" and "critical thinking" approaches. Mass media education is receiving increasing support from the ministries of education of the CIS countries (especially in Ukraine). In many ways, borrowing Russian experience, media education is developing in Belarus and Uzbekistan.

However, having analyzed a significant amount of academic publications, we find that, in general, a fundamental comparative analysis of historical stages and theoretical concepts of media education in the CIS countries is required. Moreover, there is a significant degree of disparity in research in the field of media education. Some researchers do not demonstrate a grasp of the major ideas and existing findings that pertain to the media education field.

At the present stage of our research, the following periods of the development of media education in the CIS countries can be singled out:

The first stage of the current phase of the mass media education development in the CIS countries (1992-1999): political reforms aimed at transferring from a socialist state system to a capitalist state system, inevitably associated with educational reforms and radical changes in media education approaches. We believe that at this stage there was an intensive reorientation of teachers from the dominant of the "aesthetic", "protective", "ideological", "practical" concepts of media education towards the Western European (L. Masterman, C. Bazalgette, and others) and North American (B. Duncan, J. Pangente, C. Worsnop, K. Tyner, etc.) critical thinking, cultural, semiotic and sociocultural theories. These changes were taking place along with the intensive development of new information and Internet technologies in the 1990s, with gradual entry into the information society, which also required significant adjustments to the process of mass media education - in schools and universities, other institutions.

On the one hand, the second stage of the current phase of the development of mass media education in the CIS countries (2000-2020) is connected with a new round of intensive development of media technologies (the Internet environment, digital audio-visual technology, interactive media, etc.), and on the other hand, with the new media
education initiatives of UNESCO, the Council of Europe, the gradual start of mass introduction of media education in the educational process of schools (this is especially true for Ukraine, where since 2011 a large-scale national experiment of mass introduction of media education in dozens of secondary schools has been going on), and universities. Ukraine, which is the most vigorous in this direction, following the lead of Canada, Australia, Hungary and the Czech Republic, sets the goal of making media education an obligatory component of school education of the 21st century.

The challenges of introducing media education courses in the educational process of schools and universities of the CIS countries, include: the low level of targeted media literacy training of in-service and pre-service teachers, discrepancies between theoretical and practical approaches to media education, the politicized approaches to media education that have emerged in Ukraine since 2014.

The prospects for applying the experience of the CIS countries in mass media education may be seen in the introduction of compulsory training courses of media education into classical universities and pedagogical universities (and as a consequence - in the broad introduction of media education in schools); in effective integrated media education based on the analytical thinking development, cultural and sociocultural approaches in mass media education.

As a result of our analysis of the development of mass media literacy education in the CIS countries (Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2018), we synthesized the media education model used in these countries (Fig. 1). Of course, in some of the CIS countries this model differs. For example, the model of mass media education used in Ukraine is now clearly tilted in the direction of propaganda and counter-propaganda (the search for and exposure of fake news, seasoned with a clear anti-Russian position (for example, Yemets-Dobronosova, 2014; Koropatnik, 2017, etc.). Some researchers highlight practical activities (they call it media activity) to create and disseminate media products for the development of civil communications (Działoszynski, Pilgun, 2011, etc.), others – ethical and aesthetic problems of media education (Baranov, 2002; Penzin, 2004), and others – the information component of media culture (Gendina, 2013; 2017, etc.).

Media education models developed in the CIS countries can be generally divided into the following main groups:

- models more focused on the analysis of the role and functions of media and media culture in society; on the analysis of media texts (with emphasis on aesthetic and ethical aspects: Baranov, 2002, Penzin, 2004, or the development of analytical thinking in general: Gendina, 2013; 2017; Korochensky, 2005, etc.);
- models focused on practical activities in the field of media culture (so-called media activity) (Beknazarova, 2011; Działoszynski, Pilgun, 2011; Zhurin, 2009; Muradyan, Manukyan, 2017, etc.);
- models focused on the ideas of a civil & democratic society (Działoszynski, Pilgun, 2011; Imankulov et al., 2018; Shturkhetsky, 2018, etc.), promoted in recent years by media agencies of the European Union countries in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan and Moldova;
- Journalism models, designed mainly to prepare young audience for admission to the faculties of journalism (Jalilov, 2010; Korkonosenko, 2004; Vartanova, 2015; Zhilavskaya, 2008, etc.);
- Counter-propaganda models, focused on the search for fake media messages and propaganda / counter-propaganda (Bucataru, 2018; Koropatnik, 2017, etc.).

This is why there is a need to develop a balanced model of media literacy education that takes into account all types of activities on media material – from analytical to practical.

So, on the basis of the analyzed theoretical, methodical works and practical
experience (Akhmetova et al., 2013; Baranov, 2002; Beknazarova, 2011; Bondarenko, 2009; Fateeva, 2007; 2015; Fedorov, 2001; 2007; Gendina, 2013; 2017; Gudilina, 2007; Imankulov, etc., 2018; Ivanov et al., 2011; Izmailova, 2016; Jalilov, 2010; Kirillova, 2005; Korkonosenko, 2004; Korochensky, 2005; Kovbasa, 2013; Muradyan, Manukyan, 2017; Onkovich, 2007; 2009; Sharikov, 2012; Shturkhetsky, 2018; Venediktov, 2015; Zhizhina, 2009; Zhurin, 2009, etc.) we synthesized the media education model used in CIS countries as follows:

Definitions of key concepts: generally consistent with UNESCO's position that "An inclusive concept of media education has three main objectives: to give access to all kinds of media that are potential tools to understand society and to participate in democratic life; to develop skills for the critical analysis of messages, whether in news or entertainment, in order to strengthen the capacities of autonomous individuals and active users; to encourage production, creativity and interactivity in the different fields of media communication" (UNESCO, 2007).

Conceptual framework: synthesis of socio-cultural and practical theories of media education, often complemented by the theory of critical thinking development.

Objectives: To develop media literacy / competence of the audience (i.e. analytical, creative, communicative abilities in relation to media, skills of interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, creation and dissemination of media texts in society).

Objectives: To develop the following skills among the audience:
- Practical activities (creation and dissemination of humanistically oriented media texts is carried out on the basis of mastering appropriate technologies);
- Analytical activity (on the basis of the obtained knowledge on the theory and history of media culture, the audience develops skills to analyze the role and functions of media in society, the analysis of media products, i.e. media texts of different types and genres);

Areas of application and organizational forms: development of media literacy / competence in educational institutions of different types and levels (integration into mandatory disciplines, specialized classes, elective courses, etc.), in cultural and leisure organizations, through distance learning, media agencies and self-education;

Possible results of the implementation of this media education model: a significant increase in the level of media literacy / competence of the mass audience.

Media literacy / competence development methods for mass audiences:
1) by sources of knowledge: verbal (lectures, talks, discussions about media and media culture, including the creation of problem situations); visual (demonstration of media texts, illustrations); practical (performance of various creative role-playing and game tasks of a practical nature on the media material) (Baranov, 2002; Fedorov, 2001; 2007; Ivanov, etc., 2011; Kovbasa, 2013; Muradyan, Manukyan, 2017; Onkovich, 2007; Shturkhetsky, 2018, Zhurin, 2009, etc.);

2) by cognitive activities: explanatory and illustrative (a teacher providing certain information about media culture and media education, perception and assimilation of this information by the audience); problematic (problem analysis of certain situations in the field of media culture and / or media texts to develop analytical thinking); research (organization of research activities of the audience related to media culture and media education) (Akhmetova et al, 2013; Baranov, 2002; Beknazarova, 2011; Bondarenko, 2009; Fateeva, 2007; 2015; Fedorov, 2001; 2007; Gendina, 2013; 2017; Gudilina, 2007; Imankulov et al, 2011; Izmailova, 2016; Jalilov, 2010; Kirillova, 2005; Korkonosenko, 2004; Korochensky, 2005; Kovbasa, 2013; Muradyan, Manukyan, 2017; Onkovich, 2007; 2009; Sharikov, 2012; Shturkhetsky, 2018; Venediktov, 2015; Zhizhina, 2009; Zhurin, 2009, etc.).

The main sections of the content of media education programs are based on the study of key concepts of media literacy education (media education, media competence,
media literacy, media category, media agency, media language, media technology, media representation, media audience, etc.):

- place and role of media culture and media education in the world; types, genres, language of media;
- main terms, theories, key concepts, directions, and models of media education (to a greater extent it concerns the level of higher education);
- the main historical stages of media education development in the world and in specific countries (more relevant to the level of university education);
- media practice technologies (including role-playing and playful activities).
- development of media literacy / competence ability to analyze the role and functioning of media culture (including media products, i.e. media texts) in society (hermeneutic, ideological, philosophical, iconographic, gender, ethical, aesthetic, semiotic, structural, content, stereotype analysis, cultural mythology analysis, character analysis, etc.) (see, for example, Akhmetova et al., 2013; Fedorov, 2007; Imankulov et al., 2018; Onkovich, 2007).

The media education model we have synthesized and applied in CIS countries includes the following structural blocks (Fig. 1):

1) **Initial Diagnostics Unit**: diagnostics of media literacy / competence levels of a specific audience in relation to the media culture before the beginning of training;

2) **Content Unit**: historical and theoretical component (study of media culture history and theory) and practical component (practical activity on the basis of media culture material, i.e. development of creative skills of the audience to create and disseminate humanistically oriented media texts; analytical activity: development of skills of the audience to analyze the role and peculiarities of media culture functioning (including media products – media texts) in the society);

3) **Final Diagnostics Unit** (block of final diagnostics of media literacy / competence of the audience at the final stage of training).

At the same time, depending on the age peculiarities of a particular audience, some components of these blocks come to the fore in the media education model (e.g., studying the history and theory of media culture is more typical for the university level, practical and playful activities on the media material become dominant for young children, etc.).

For the full implementation of this model, of course, indicators of media literacy / competence development of the audience are needed. Of all the CIS countries, this aspect of media education is most consistently developed in Russia. In particular, as early as 2007, we proposed the following media literacy/media competency indicators for the audience

- **motivational** (motifs of contact with media and media texts: genre, thematic, epistemological, hedonistic, psychological, moral, intellectual, aesthetic, therapeutic, etc.)
- **contact** (frequency of communication / contact with media and media culture works – media texts);
- **information** (knowledge of terminology, theory and history of media culture, mass communication process, role and functions of media in society);
- evaluation activity (ability to analyze of the role and functions of media in society and media texts);
- **practical activity** (ability to create and disseminate own media texts);
- **creative** (the presence of creativity in various aspects of activity – perceptual, analytical, game, artistic, research, etc., related to media and media culture) (Fedorov, 2007).
**Fig. 1.** Synthesized media education model, applied in the CIS countries.

**Conceptual theoretical framework:**
*synthesis of sociocultural and practical media education theories, complemented by a theory of critical thinking development*

**Objective:** To develop media literacy / competence of the audience.

- **Initial Diagnostics Unit**
  - Testing, questionnaires, enabled monitoring.
  - Analysis of creative works of the audience

- **Content Unit** (including media education technologies)
  - Audience study of the history of media culture
  - Audience study of media culture theories

- **Final Diagnostics Unit**
  - Final control testing of the audience on the subject of media culture; performance of final creative works of media education

- **History & Theoretical Component**
  - Audience study of the history of media culture
  - Audience study of media culture theories

- **Practical Component**
  - Audience’s practical activities of media culture material
  - Audience’s analytical activities on the basis of media culture

- **Diagnostics of media literacy / competence levels of the audience**

**Result:** increased media literacy / competence of the audience
Analysis of scientific monographs, articles and Internet resources allows us to conclude that there is no single concept of mass media education development in the CIS countries. Media educators in the CIS countries are generally oriented towards media literacy education as interpreted by UNESCO, however, in practice, there is often an imbalance when it comes to the development of competence in the field of information computer technologies, practical activities to create media texts or propaganda and counter-propaganda tasks.

Interest in media education at universities in the CIS countries is episodic: courses dedicated to the development of media literacy/ competence among students of non-media profiles are still very rare. Unlike many European Union countries, media education is still not integrated into school education. Vast opportunities of non-formal media education are not used everywhere.

That is why we have set ourselves the task of synthesizing a generalized model of mass media education based on the analysis of scientific monographs, articles, and Internet resources of the CIS countries, which can be used to develop media literacy / competence of the population. Media competence is in great demand all over the world today, so there is a whole range of tasks that should be solved at the state level and become the basis for the development of media education strategy in the CIS countries. When developing tools for implementing such a strategy, it may be useful to analyze the approaches, mechanisms, and experience of other European countries that are more successful in implementing policies in this area.
2. Development of mass media education in CIS countries in 1990s and the main trends of its development in the XXI century


Regarding the intensity and levels of development of media education, the CIS countries can be divided into three groups: 1) countries with a relatively high level of development of mass media education (theoretical researches, practical implementation): Russia and Ukraine; 2) countries with medium level of development of mass media education (Belarus, Kazakhstan, Armenia), 3) countries with low level of mass media education development (Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan). Being part of the CIS till August 18, 2009, Georgia also, in our opinion, belonged to the third group.

Our assessment of the current situation can be verified by the findings of researchers from the CIS countries. For example, K. Ismayilova notes that "in Uzbekistan the state of media education today can be characterized as being in the stage of formation. There is no concept of a national model for the development of media education; there is no single system of media pedagogy. Media education projects are more evident in informal education (trainings of non-state educational institutions, advanced training courses, etc.). There are not enough specialists capable of effectively educating media literacy" (Ismailova, 2016: 124). In the "Report on the results of the study of the level of media literacy in the Kyrgyz Republic" (a survey of the population over 16 in the Kyrgyz Republic was conducted from September 1 to November 30, 2017, 1200 urban and rural respondents from seven regions were interviewed) (Report..., 2018: 11) states that in Kyrgyzstan "the topic of media literacy is relevant and challenging. The existing activities to increase the level of media literacy as a skill and the development of media literacy as a science are both at a rudimentary stage" (Report..., 2018: 94). A similar situation is currently observed in Azerbaijan and Tajikistan (Tajidinov, Rustamov, Kosimov, Ibodova, 2010) and Turkmenistan...

In terms of practical implementation of mass media education in schools by the end of the second decade of the 21st century, the primacy undoubtedly belongs to Ukraine, where in 2010 the "Concept of introducing media education in Ukraine" was adopted (Concept ..., 2010), and in 2011 a large-scale experiment of integrating media education programs in dozens of Ukrainian schools. Nevertheless, since 2014, the process of media education development in Ukraine has acquired a specific character, as it will be discussed in more detail below.

Despite significant advances in research and publications in media education field (Baranov, 2002; Bondarenko, 2009; Chelysheva, 2008; Fateeva, 2007; Gendina, 2017; Gudilina, 2007; Hilko, 2007; Kirillova, 2012; Korkonosenko, 2004; Korochensky, 2005; Sharikov, 2012, Spichkin, 1999; Vartanova, Zasursky, 2003; Vozchikov, 2007; Zaznobina, 1998; Zhizhina, 2009; Zhurin, 2009, etc.), the practical implementation of mass media education in Russia is still of a sporadic nature and in many ways continues to depend on the efforts of enthusiasts.
Materials of our research are academic writings on media literacy education, and media competence published in a variety of countries, the CIS countries foremost, as well as Internet sites, and evidence of the practical application of media education in the CIS countries, accumulated from 1992 to the present day. Methodology is based on theoretical framework on the relationship, interdependence and integrity of the phenomena of reality, the unity of the historical and the logical in cognition, the theory of the dialogue of cultures by M. Bakhtin - V. Bibler (taking into account the theoretical concepts developed by such well-known researchers as Y. Lotman, U. Eco and others). The research is based on a content approach (identifying the content of the process being studied, with due regard to the aggregate of its elements, interaction between them, their nature, access to facts, analysis and synthesis of theoretical conclusions, etc.) and a comparative approach.

The following methods are used: data collection (dissertations, extended abstracts of Ph.D. dissertations, monographs, articles, reports) related to the project's theme, analysis of academic literature, theoretical analysis and synthesis; generalization and classification; content analysis.

Countries with a relatively high level of mass media education development

Russia

Since there is a special article devoted specifically to the state of media education in Russia (Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2018), in this article we only note that, unlike Ukraine, the relatively high Russian level of media and information literacy development is manifested mainly not at the level of practical implementation, but at the theoretical and methodological levels (Baranov, 2002; 2008; Bondarenko, 2009; Chelysheva, 2008; Fateeva, 2007; 2015; Fedorov et al., 2014; Fedorov, 2001; 2003; 2007; 2009; Fedorov, 2003; Fedorov, Chelysheva, 2002; Fedorov, Novikova, 2005; Fortunatov, 2009; Gendina, 2013; 2017; Gudilina, 2007; Hilko, 2007; Kirillova, 2005; 2012; Korkonosenko, 2004; Korochensky, 2003; 2005; Levitskaya et al., 2016; Polat, 2001; Sharikov, 2005; 2012; Silverblatt, Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2016; Soldatova et al., 2013; Spichkin, 1999; Tsymbalenko, Sharikov, Shcheglova, 2006; Vartanova, Zasursky, 2003; Vozchikov, 2007; Zadorin et al., 2017; Zaznobina, 1998; Zhizhina, 2009; Zhurin, 2009, etc.), although in recent years there has been a growing expansion into the practical field in this area.

After the collapse of the USSR, media education in Russia lost state support, which it received during the years of "perestroika". The Russian Cinematographers Union also stopped financing events that had taken place in the 1960s -1980s under the guidance of the Council for Film Education in School and University, headed by Professor of The All-Russian State Institute of Cinematography (VGIK), I.V. Weissfeld (1909-2003). Nevertheless, many significant events of the first half of the 1990s related to media education were financed by a private company headed by the then chairman of the board of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, G.A. Polichko (1947-2013). In particular, it was the activity of the film studies Lyceum and Higher Film Education Courses in Moscow (1991-1996). Having given up the business in the second half of the 1990s, G.A. Polichko organized a series of film / media education festivals for schoolchildren in Russian regions.

Another leader of mass media education in Russia in the 1990s, but in the field of research and curriculum design at school, was Chair of the Screen Arts Laboratory of the Art Education Institute at the Russian Academy of Education, Prof. Dr. Y.N. Usov (1936-2000).

A notable metropolitan center of media education activity was the laboratory of
technical means of education and media education of the Content and Methods of Education Institute of the Russian Academy of Education, which had existed until 2015 (in different post-Soviet years this laboratory was led by L.S. Zaznobina, A.A. Zhurin and E.A. Bondarenko).

On October 9, 2014, the Association of Media Education Specialists was established in Moscow under the leadership of I.V. Zhilavskaya, the head of the department Chair of citizens' media and information literacy and media education at Moscow State Pedagogical University. Unlike the Russian Association for Film and Media Education, membership in this organization has required fees since its foundation.

As for the regional centers of media education, in the post-Soviet space one can single out the research school "Media Education and Media Competence" at Anton Chekhov Taganrog Institute (where in 2002 the first in the Russian Federation a pedagogical specialization 03.13.30 "Media Education" was opened and then the Master's program "Media Psychology and Media Education"), media education centers in Tver Region (O.A. Baranov, V.V. Soldatov), Voronezh (S.N. Penzin), Perm (P.A. Pechenkin) and Yekaterinburg (N.B. Kirillova, A.R. Kantor). In particular, V.V. Soldatov has been organizing regular children and teen film festivals and conferences on cinema / media education since 2010.

Along with technical progress, the Russian Association for Film and Media Education in 2000 opened the first Russian websites on media education (http://mediaeducation.ucoz.ru - in Russian and English). In the same year, a similar site was created by the Laboratory of technical means of education and media education (www.mediaeducation.ru). In 2012, a new section - "Media Education" appeared on the Internet portal EvArtist (http://www.evartist.narod.ru/mdo/mo.htm). In the same year the site (http://www.stalpenzin.ru) dedicated to life, work, and heritage of one of the founders of media education in Russia - S.N. Penzin (11.11.1932 - 3.08.2011) was launched.

Over the past 25 years, dozens of research projects of Russian media educators have received support from Russian and foreign foundations (the Russian Science Foundation, the Federal Target Program in Education, the Russian Foundation for Humanities, the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, the Presidential Program "Support to Leading Research Schools in Russia", the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, Fulbright, DAAD, etc.). For example, in 2008-2009, with the support of the Russian Foundation for Humanities (RGNF, grant No. 08-06-12103v), the project "Compiling and launching the electronic academic library Media Education" was carried out (the project supervisor - A.V. Fedorov, the address of the open full-text electronic library "Media Education" is http://mediaeducation.ucoz.ru/load/). In 2011-2012, with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Humanities (project No. 11-06-12001v), an electronic academic encyclopedia "Media Education and Media Culture" was created (http://mediaeducation.ucoz.ru/news/ehlekrtronnaja_nauchnaja_ehnciklopedija_mediao_brazovanie_i_mediakultura/2014-01-12 -1).


Since 1992, over one hundred and fifty dissertations on media and film education have been defended in Russia, while the share of regional scientific research in media education has reached 70 %. Studies in the field of media education in 1992-2018 were published in over two hundred monographs and textbooks, and about two thousand
articles (Russian Science Citation Index, elibrary.ru).

On October 20–22, 2004, in Chelyabinsk, with the participation of the UNESCO Moscow Office and IPO "Information for All", a meeting of the Interregional Round Table "Media Education: Problems and Prospects" was held, where the idea of establishing and launching the regular issue of the journal *Media Education* was introduced. The journal has been published since 2005 (http://www.mediagram.ru/mediaed/journal/).

On 15–16 January 2008, the World Forum of the Alliance of Civilizations was held in Madrid - http://www.madridaocforum.org/, which included the work of the section "Media Education and Media Literacy". On October 29, 2008, the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation held hearings "Information Society: Technological Process or Social Progress?", where presentations on the role of media education in the development of the modern information society by A. Fedorov and N. Kirillova were made.

On November 17, 2008, the Government of the Russian Federation approved the Concept of Long-Term Social and Economic Development of the Russian Federation for the period until 2020. Among the priority directions of the development of information and communication technologies in the Concept, the expansion of the use of information and telecommunication technologies for the development of new forms and methods of instruction, including media education, was singled out. This meant that the need for media education was really recognized at the state level.

In the same year, 2008, the portal "Information Literacy and Media Education" (http://www.mediagram.ru) was launched, which received the aegis of the UN Alliance of Civilizations and was highly appreciated by the manager of Media and Information Literacy and Education initiatives at the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations (UNAOC) Jordi Torrent. This work was also noted by the then Director of the Division, Freedom of Expression and Communication Development, UNESCO, V. Gai, who expressed the opinion, that Russian portal has become an important tool in the development of information and media literacy education.

On May 5, 2009, the problems of media education were discussed in the Moscow City Duma: Moscow secondary schools were recommended to introduce media education classes. On August 6, 2009, the Plenum of the Board of the Russian Union of Cinematographers was held in Moscow, where mass media education issues were also discussed.

In October 2009, Anton Chekhov Taganrog State Pedagogical Institute with the support of the Federal Target Program "Scientific and Pedagogical Human Resources for Innovative Russia 2009-2013" hosted the first in Russia one week, full-time professional development course for young teachers and researchers "Media Education and Media Competence". The main goal of this school was to introduce young researchers and educators to the best theory and practice in the field of media education.

At the end of 2009 a collective monograph was published in the United States: *Issues in Information and Media Literacy. Criticism, History and Policy. Learning*, two chapters of which were devoted to the history and current state of media education in Russia (http://net-workingworlds.weebly.com/media-literacy.html).

In the spring of 2010, the conference "Educational Technologies of the 21st Century. Information culture and media education" took place in Moscow. Media education aspect at this conference was further strengthened in 2011-2014 (in 2014, the initiator of these conferences Svetlana Gu dilina organized the International Media Festival for schoolchildren, http://art.ioso.ru/mediafestival/2014/projects.htm ).

On April 15, 2010, Moscow State University hosted a meeting of the Council for the Quality of General Education in the Russian Federation under the Presidium of the General Council of the All-Russian Political Party "United Russia". The Council stressed the need to develop media education in schools and universities. Similar conclusions were
drawn on the results of the conference "Current Trends in the Development of Russian Media Education," held June 1-2, 2010 at Moscow State University.

In the resolution of the next plenum of the Board of the Union of Cinematographers of Russia "On Film Education of the Population" (Moscow, April 16, 2012), it was stressed to urgently create a federal state system of film education of the population and promote the prompt implementation of a new educational program "100 best films of Russia and world classics" for school students.

In the same year 2012 Moscow State Humanities University opened a master's program "Media Education". Now this program continues at Moscow State Pedagogical University.

In September 2012, the International Conference "The Current State of Media Education in Russia in the Context of Global Trends" was successfully held in Taganrog. Russian achievements in the field of media education and information literacy were noted in the report of the World Summit on the Information Society of 2012 (Report ..., 2012).

In January 2013 Russian Ministry of Education and Science supported the idea of film education of schoolchildren (RIA Novosti, https://minobarnauk.rf/presscentre/2986). This trend was reflected in the state program "Development of Education" for 2013-2020 (May 15, 2013 No. 792-r).

In 2014, Paris office of UNESCO published the overview on information literacy resources worldwide (Horton, 2014). The list of the authors of this publication includes members of the Russian Association for Film and Media Education: N.I. Gendina and A.V. Fedorov.

In 2015-2018, the Digital International Media Literacy eBook Project (DIMLE) was implemented, within its framework Russian researchers A. Fedorov and A. Levitskaya co-authored the Russian edition of the text book Media Literacy: Keys to Interpreting Media Literacy together with Art Silverblatt, professor of Media Communications and Journalism and the program facilitator for Media Literacy at Webster St. Louis, a world-renowned expert in media analysis (Silverblatt, Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2016).

On May 23, 2017 in the State Duma Committee for Education and Science held a parliamentary hearing on the topic: "Resources for the development of education and science: educational projects by cinema, television, media, and cultural organizations" (Experience ..., 2017), and November 1, 2017 Rostov-on-Don hosted the conference "Media literate teacher - a guide and guardian in the information world".

On April 3, 2018 Civic Chamber of the Russian Federation held the Round Table "Film Education and Media Pedagogy in Extra-Curricular Education for Children and Youth", at which A.V. Fedorov, E.A. Bondarenko, S.M. Gudilina and other media education experts participated.

While in the Soviet period the development of media education in Russia took place mainly within the framework of two leading concepts: aesthetic (oriented to bring up a "high" aesthetic taste mainly on the material of masterpieces of cinema art, in many cases there was also an ideological component) and practical (oriented to teaching practical skills of working with media technology and subsequent creation of media texts), since 1992 the situation has changed. Under the influence of Western media education theories (cultural studies, semiotics, critical thinking, etc.), various media education concepts began to spread in Russia.

Russian media educators, who studied the British experience in the field of media literacy education in the 1990s (Bazalgette, 1989; Bowker, 1991; Hart, 1991; Masterman, 1985, etc.), in particular, the main media education theories (development of critical thinking, protectionist, semiotic, cultural studies, etc.), tried to derive some kind of a universal concept. For example, I.A. Fateeva came to conclusion that only a practical approach (we define it as the theory of media activity) suggests a consistently competent
approach to the organization of the learning process, aimed at the final result of the mutual activity of students and teachers, whereby for both types of media education - professional and mass. The applied nature of media education, its focus on such a sphere of a personality, as experience, requires adequate theoretical positions and appropriate pedagogical tools. Thus, she considers the practical approach to be the starting point of the theory of media pedagogy and the basis for the preference of a particular pedagogical technology (Fateeva, 2007: 26). In this case I.A. Fateeva understands the practical approach (media activity theory) not narrow, only aimed at teaching the audience to use media technology and be able to create and distribute media texts, but as a much wider field of activity, including analysis of media messages / texts (Fateeva, 2007; 2015).

True, such an interpretation goes beyond the traditional understanding of a practice-oriented media education process that does not include an analytic component. Likewise, we can say that media activity lies at the basis of other known media education theories (for example, sociocultural).

But if we agree with the fact that the theory of media activity (including practice and analytics) is synthetic, we will see that it fully correlates with the final result of media education - the media competence of the individual, that is, the whole of its motives, knowledge, and abilities, (indicators: motivational, contact, information, perceptual, interpretative / evaluative, practice-operational / activity, creative), contributing to the selection, use, critical analysis, evaluation, and communicating media texts in different types, forms and genres, the analysis of complex processes of media functioning in society (Fedorov, 2007: 54).

However, this interpretation of "media competence" is challenged by some media educators. So, having examined the above indicators of media competence, I.M. Dzyaloshinsky and I.V. Zhilavskaya made, in our opinion, an unproven conclusion, that "all the authors, analyzed by A.V. Fedorov, and he himself, speculating on the indicators of media competence, confine themselves exclusively to the media sphere. As if the ability to consume and produce media texts are needed solely to consume and produce media texts" (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008: 88; Zhilavskaya, 2009: 109).

In this case we are dealing with an absolutely incorrect interpretation of our research, since the above-mentioned indicators of media competence are directly related to various processes (political, economic, etc.) that occur not only in the media sphere but also in society. For example, motives of preferences and / or creation media texts by a person are inevitably connected with his/her moral, political, civic and other attitudes, with a sociocultural context. A similar situation with the evaluation indicator of media competence, as evaluating media texts, people are always relying on their initial moral, religious, political, civic and other positions. Moreover, without analyzing social problems, in our opinion, in general, one can evaluate neither the processes of media functioning nor specific media texts.

However, I.M. Dzyaloshinsky insists on secondariness of the development of media competence of an individual, asserting that the social significance of media education is not so much to increase media competence of an individual, as to form the setting for media activity, controlling the individual's actions aimed at finding (or producing) the information in media space (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008: 90-91). He lists 6 media activities' "main types": search, acquisition, consumption, communication, production, and distribution of mass information" (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008: 93; Dzyaloshinsky, Pilgun, 2011: 357-358).

We believe that these six types of a person's media activities, mentioned by I.M. Dzyaloshinsky, obviously lack such an important activity as the analysis of information / media texts, which reduces the media activity of a person to only the practical-utilitarian sphere, that is, to the significantly diminished version of Fateeva's "theory of media
activity" (Fateeva, 2007: 34).

Among the media activity types I.M. Dzyaloshinsky includes "consumption", "communication", "distribution of mass information", however, they have never been considered to be the key ones in mass media literacy education (Bazalgette, 1989; Buckingham, 2000; 2003; Gonnet, 2001; Hart, 1991; Kubey, 1997; Masterman, 1985; 1997; Silverblatt, 2001; Potter, 2016; Voznikov, 2007; Zhurin, 2009; Zaznobina, 1996; Kirillova, 2012; Korkonosenko, 2004; Korochensky, 2003; 2005; Fedorov, 2001; Silverblatt, Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2016; Fateeva, 2007; 2015; Sharikov, 1991, etc.).

Of course, "communication" and "distribution" are pivotal activities for media agencies, but as the leading experts in the field of media education rightly believe (Bazalgette, 1989; Buckingham, 2003; Gonnet, 2001; Hart, 1991; Kubey, 1997; Masterman, 1985; 1997; Silverblatt, 2001; Potter, 2016), they are secondary to the development of media competence of the mass audience. A "media active" individual who can create, receive and share text messages (often (deliberately) illiterate), photos, and videos in social networks, nonetheless might be unable to analyze even a relatively simple media text (and as a consequence - in no way can be considered as a media competent person). Numerous sociological surveys of young people is a vivid proof of this fact (Sobkin, Adamchuk, 2006; Soldatov, Nestik, Rasskazov, Zotova, 2013; Tsymbalenko, Makeev, 2015; Tsymbalenko, Sharikov, Shcheglova, 2006; Fedorov, 2007, etc.).

In our opinion, media activity (as interpreted by I.M. Dzyaloshinsky) is an important part of a broader concept - "media competence". Therefore, in this context, the statement that "the social meaning of media education is not so much an increase in the media competence of an individual as in the formation of an attitude toward media activity, ... the further development of media education is associated with the development of a civic approach that is aimed not just at improving the students' media competence, but at enhancing media activity of the population" raises some doubts (Dzyaloshinsky, Pilgun, 2011: 353, 365).

In fact, the aspiration to increase the level of citizens' media competence means (among other things) the need to increase the media activity level, and media competence organically includes media activity as an important indicator of the complex result of media education process.

We also find the following I. Dzyaloshinsky's assertion unsubstantiated: the "traditional pedagogical approach to media literacy education, which is limited to analyzing the link "individual - media text", cannot answer the main questions: What is the reason for the existence of such a configuration of the information and media space in modern Russia? Why do media produce such, and not other texts? What should an individual do to not only be protected from the "corrupting influence of the media, but also to seek information necessary to succeed?" (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008: 99).

In our opinion, this statement is far from the real state of affairs: pedagogical media literacy education technologies have never been limited to media texts, but have always contributed to the analytic process of differential relationships between media and society (Bazalgette, 1989; Buckingham, 2003; Fedorov, 2003; Gonnet, 2001; Hart, 1991; Kubey, 1997; Masterman, 1985; Potter, 2016; Silverblatt, 2001; Zaznobina, 1996; Fedorov, 2001; Fedorov, 2007; Sharikov, 1991, etc.).

Moreover, whilst I.M. Dzyaloshinsky is convinced that the "traditional" pedagogical "approach to media education" cannot answer the main questions, then how can one be sure that solely the theory of media activity can give the same answers to the same questions (difficult and complex)?

Probably, these and other questions connected with the process of media education and media activity may prompt answers of varying degrees of validity and depth, regardless of whether they are answered by journalists, sociologists, teachers, cultural
In our opinion, I. Dzyaloshinsky's point that the "pedagogical approach" is supposedly directed mainly at protecting from media influences and does not touch upon the topic of finding the information necessary to succeed in life (in fact, the "protectionist/inoculatory" approach is just one of the branches of media education that has long since retreated to the background, naturally giving way to social, cultural, and other approaches) (Bazalgette, 1989; Buckingham, 2003; Fedorov, 2003; Gonnet, 2001; Hart, 1991; Kubey, 1997; Masterman, 1985; Potter, 2016; Silverblatt, 2001; Fedorov, 2007; Sharikov, 1991, etc.).

I. Dzyaloshinsky also argues that the further development of media education is associated with the development of a civic approach that focuses not just on improving the media competence of students, but on increasing media activity of the population. "That, in turn, will stimulate the development of civil communications, ensuring the formation and development of civil society" (Dzyaloshinsky, 2008: 99). Similarly, I.V. Zhilavskaya insists that "media education is the activity in the field of media, the work of consciousness and subconsciousness, the analysis and correlation of self and society with global problems of the media-saturated environment. In fact, media education is a form of civic education. It allows young people to become responsible citizens, who understand how their country, hometown, and the rest of the world lives" (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 75).

Definitely, media education includes teaching and learning about democracy and civil responsibility (Buckingham, 2000; Gonnet, 2001: 24; UNESCO, 2001: 152; Korochensky, 2003; Fedorov, 2001; 2003; 2007: 370, etc.). At the same time, if from among the whole variety of media education tasks one puts forward primarily a "civic approach", then it is more logical to engage in civics or social studies, political education, because the tasks of media literacy education (Potter, 2016; Silverblatt, 2001, etc.) are much broader.

The erroneous approach of I. Dzyaloshinsky and I. Zhilavskaya, in our opinion, stems from the fact that both researchers "forget" that the multifaceted notion of media competence, although being based on the core ability of an individual to analyze the relationship between media and society and media texts of various kinds and genres, nonetheless seamlessly integrates media activity.

Consistently proceeding from the priority of "media activity", I.V. Zhilavskaya once again groundlessly claims that "the overwhelming majority of scientific articles and dissertations that somehow affect the issues of media education are related to the field of pedagogy and practically do not investigate the productive function of media education in relation to the phenomenon of media" (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 104-105). Most likely, I.V. Zhilavskaya's statement is due to her clearly insufficient knowledge of the history of media education development - both globally, and in Russia. After all, it was precisely the "productive function of media education" that the pedagogical models of Russian media educators were built on in many respects both in Soviet and post-Soviet times (Baranov, 1979; 2002; Zaznobina, 1998; Penzin, 1987; Spichkin, 1999; Usov, 1989; Sharikov, 1990; 1991, etc.).

However, disregarding this successful experience, I.V. Zhilavskaya (co-authored with D.A. Zubritskaya) writes that in the USSR "active practical work was carried out in schools, universities, film clubs by experts in film education Y.N. Usov, I.S. Levshin, Z.S. Smelkov, Y.M. Rabinovich, S.N. Penzin, O.A. Baranov, S.M. Ivanov, E.V. Gorbulin, E.N. Goryukhin" (Zhilavskaya, Zubritskaya, 2017: 50), turning Elvira Goriukhina (1932-2018), Inna Levshina (1932-2009), Zinaida Smelkova, Svetlana Ivanova and Yevdokia Gorbulina into male persons. This fact raises some serious doubts if I. Zhilavskaya and D.A. Zubritskaya have really studied the work of these prominent Russian media educators.

It should be noted that the above errors appear on the pages of the textbook for
universities "The History of the Development of Media Education" (Zhilavskaya, Zubritskaya, 2017), which briefly (unfortunately, not always accurate) render the contents of three our monographs on media literacy education (Fedorov, Chelysheva, 2002; Fedorov, Novikova, 2005; Fedorov et al., 2014).

Regrettably, insufficient investigation of the history of the development of Russian media education is characteristic of many representatives of the journalists' media education approach. For example, in the book "Media education in school: a collection of syllabi" (Media Education ..., 2010), published by a team of authors affiliated mainly at the Faculty of Journalism of Moscow State University, there is not a single reference to the works of such well-known Russian film/ media educators of the 1960s - 1990's as OA. Baranov, L.S. Zaznobina, S.N. Penzin, L.P. Pressman, Y.M. Rabinovich, Y.N. Usov, et al.

And even on the whole very useful monograph by A.A. Zhurin, devoted to integrated media education in secondary school, contains some avoidable inaccuracies. Thus, A.A. Zhurin asserts that "media education according to S.N. Penzin, the so-called Kurgan experience..." (Zhurin, 2009: 285), whereas the well-known media educator S.N. Penzin (1932-2011) worked in Voronezh and had nothing to do with the film / media education process in Kurgan. But unmentioned Y.M. Rabinovich (1918-1990) was actually the head of the film education movement in Kurgan (Rabinovich, 1991).

Let's go back to the so-called interactive (journalist) model of media education suggested by I.V. Zhilavskaya, "which should be distinguished from the pedagogical model. The basis for distinguishing these models is the spatial and role arrangement of participants in media education activities in the existing coordinate system" (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 106). Justifying this model, I.V. Zhilavskaya (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 177) relies on the concept of the Russian module of media education (Vartanova, Zasursky, 2003: 5-10), which lists the key aspects of media education (media agencies, media categories, media technologies, media language, media audience, and representation). Meanwhile, the Russian module of media education" of 2003 is actually a translated from English concept developed in the UK in the 1990s (Bazalgette, 1991: 8; Bazalgette, 1995; Hart, 1991: 13; 1997: 202), that was introduced to Russian media educators personally by C. Bazalgette who presented her report at the Russian-British seminar on media education in Moscow (Bazalgette, 1995).

As one of the main advantages of the journalist model of media education developed by I.V. Zhilavskaya, the focus on a broad audience is positioned (Zhilavskaya, 2009). However, pedagogical media education models are aimed not only at schoolchildren and students, but as well at different groups of population, people of different ages and professions (Baranov, 2002; Zaznobina, 1998; Lazutkina, 2015; Kirillova, 2005; Penzin, 1987; Saveljeva, 2017; Spichkin, 1999; Usov, 1989; Fortunatov, 2009; Hilko, 2007; Sharikov, 1991; Chelysheva, 2008, etc.), therefore the journalist model of media education does not take precedence over the pedagogical one in this aspect.

Moreover, we believe that I.V. Zhilavskaya artificially shares communicative strategies aimed at "impact" (pedagogical models of media education) and "interaction" (journalistic model of media education) (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 107), because pedagogy (incl. media pedagogy) has long ago shifted from the traditional teacher-centered to the student-centered paradigm. In "pedagogical media education", active learning strategies aimed at cooperation, interaction, creativity and critical thinking development, have been implemented for over several decades (Baranov, 1979; 2002; Bondarenko, 2009; Gudilina, 2007; Zhurin, 2009; Zaznobina, 1998; Penzin, 1987; Polat, 2001; Spichkin, 1999; Usov, 1989, etc.).

Zhilavskaya’s comparison (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 107) of motivation levels in pedagogical and journalistic media education models also seems quite controversial. The assumption that the subjects of the journalistic media education model (i.e. journalists,
directors, camera men, media managers, etc.) have (in contrast to teachers) a high level of media education motivation, is questionable, and, unfortunately, not confirmed by real actions / work of the vast majority of these representatives of the media community.

Following the western model, most Russian media structures are guided mainly by commercial and/or political goals, not by media education goals, when creating media texts (Sharikov, 2005: 100-105, 137-140). The "boomerang effect" seems to take place: "a poorly educated audience negates all efforts in the field of improving the quality of the functioning of the media and vocational training institutions. The reason for this is the phenomenon of "communicative aberration", a lack of the recipients' understanding of the messages intended for them, which forces professionals to lower their aesthetic, moral, intellectual level. This trend is most clearly manifested in the current commercialization of national media" (Fateeva, 2007: 35).

Certainly, in a wide range of modern media channels, there are such as "Russia-Culture" (a channel specifically broadcasting culture, history and arts-oriented shows) but overall, international media agencies (and Russian media are not exception), are very long way away from the genuine media education motivation and effectiveness.

I.V. Zhilavskaya asserts that the effectiveness of the journalistic media education model is manifested in "the formation of a communicative environment on the basis of mutually beneficial cooperation with the audience, the formation of media's positive image, attracting the audience, increasing their circulation, ratings, and profit" (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 107), which, allegedly, is much more effective than pedagogical models of media education aimed at creating a "society of media-competent citizens".

Let us divide the above claim in two parts. One can concede that "media agencies shape a communicative environment" and media's image, wishing to lure the audience in various ways, and thus to raise the ratings, box office and circulation (although, the humanistic tasks of media education do not have anything to do with this). But the assertion that this process is preferable to the aspiration of supporters of pedagogical models of media education to create a "society of media competent citizens" seems on more dubious ground.

Thus, the journalistic media education model suggested by I.V. Zhilavskaya, in our view, is rather far from reality and is utopian in nature. Idealism of the model is realized also by I.V. Zhilavskaya herself, she recognizes that "today not all media CEOs are ready to set themselves the task of increasing the level of the audience's media competence and to provide targeted input into media education activity. Moreover, many media pursue different goals: with minimized costs, they will get a quick and maximum profit. This is possible in the case of exploiting human weaknesses and basic needs. Media education not only does not contribute to this, it also hinders" (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 108).

It seems that such a situation in the global media will continue not only today, but tomorrow, and beyond, and this, alas, concerns the vast majority of media agencies in the world. We agree with A.P. Korochensky that "the practical implementation of the tasks of forming a rationally critical citizens' communication culture on the basis of the development of independent rational-critical thinking encounters a number of significant hindrances and difficulties. This cannot be explained only by the underdevelopment of the institutions of media education or by the incompleteness of conceptual elaboration of the goals, methods and content of activities in this field of pedagogy (although both of these phenomena actually take place). Large-scale "achievements" of the mass media in manipulating the consciousness and behavior of the audience for political and commercial purposes; progressive irrationality of the images of "media reality" formed by the means of mass communication; intellectual passivity and emotional infantilism of a significant part of citizens in the face of negative media influences - all this is being observed both in Russia, other countries where mass media education passes the stage of formation, and in
the countries where it has already become an obligatory component of the educational process at various levels" (Korochensky, 2005: 37-38).

One way or another, the subject of media education and media culture attracts a growing number of researchers, not only because media culture is the dominant culture of the information society, where traditional and electronic media are recreating the sociocultural picture of the world through verbal, and visual images; culture-universe, having absorbed the functional diversity of mass, folk, elitist cultures and their modifications, ontologically rooted in human life; culture-meta-message about the worldview of mankind (Voznikov, 2007: 61-62). Continuing the discussion with his major policy article "On the Need for Reconceptualization of Media Education", A.V. Sharikov (Sharikov, 2012: 61-76) argues that it is not enough to consider only the processes of mass communication, ... because there are non-mass forms of media as well (Sharikov, 2012: 66-68).

Hence, researchers appreciate the interdisciplinarity of media literacy education that uses a wide range of developments in pedagogy, psychology, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies, arts, linguistics, political science and other sciences. This accounts for the attempts to include media education and media culture in a generalized scientific context. After R. Debray (Debray, 1991) N.B. Kirillova (Kirillova, 2012: 6-7) began to promote medialogy as a synthetic science based on the foundations of media, cultural, social, philosophical, semiotic, political, pedagogical, psychological and other theories of the humanities.

Recently, media education has received support of representatives of the Christian church. Thus, nun Sofia, the president of the annual International Orthodox Sretinsky Film Festival "Meeting", conducts a large-scale film education activity, targeted primarily at young generation. Within the framework of this work, a teaching manual "Using the Potential of Spiritually and Morally Charged Films in Modern School" (Atrihalova, Ksenofontov, 2010) and a DVD collection for schoolchildren and young people was produced.

Media literacy education in the XXI century is generating great public interest throughout the world. For example, the European Parliament resolution of 16 December 2008 on media literacy in a digital world maintains that "media education should be an element of formal education to which all children should have access and which should form part and parcel of the curriculum at every stage of schooling; calls for media literacy to be made the ninth key competence in the European reference framework for lifelong learning set out in Recommendation 2006/962/EC; recommends that media education should, as far as possible, be geared to practical work and linked to economic, political, literary, social, artistic, and IT-related subjects, and suggests that the way forward lies in the creation of a specific subject – "Media Education" – and in an interdisciplinary approach combined with out-of-school projects; recommends that educational establishments encourage the development of media products (printed page, audio/video new media) in a manner involving both pupils and teachers, as a way of providing practical training in media literacy; calls on the Commission, when, as announced, it lays down the media literacy indicators, to take into account both the quality of school tuition and teacher training in this field;...maintains that media education is a matter of particular importance in special schools, given that, when people have disabilities, the media can often do a great deal to overcome obstacles to communication; recommends that compulsory media education modules be incorporated into teacher training for all school levels, so as to enable the subject to be taught intensively; calls on the relevant national authorities to familiarise teachers of all subjects and at every type of school with the use of audiovisual teaching aids and with the problems associated with media education" (European Parliament Resolution, 2008).

In recent years, UNESCO has begun to connect the tasks of developing media
competence with information literacy. The Moscow Declaration on Media and Information Literacy developed by UNESCO Information for ALL Programme (2012) emphasizes the necessity to include media and information literacy in the priority directions of the national policy in the sphere of education, culture, and media; urgency of structural and pedagogical reforms necessary for enhancement of media and information literacy (MIL); its integration in the curricula including systems of assessment at all levels of education, *inter alia*, lifelong and workplace learning and teacher training; encourage an intercultural dialogue and international cooperation while promoting MIL worldwide (The Moscow Declaration..., 2012).

The synthesis of media education and information literacy / culture has been investigated in dozens of articles by Russian researchers (Gendina, 2013; 2017, etc.). The process of media education development in Russia has also become the subject of research by some foreign authors (Burke, 2008; Petzold, 2008: 17-18, 45; Yoon, 2009: 189-213). However due to the language barrier, unable to read authentic Russian-language sources, their research is limited by brief rendering of our research team's works published in English.

I.A. Fateeva (Fateeva, 2007: 144-145) reasonably identifies a number of problem areas for the development of mass media education in the Russian Federation:

- the underdevelopment of mass media education in formal media education institutions (secondary and professional), except for media departments at universities;
- weak media education programs for the adult population;
- lack of proper attention to the issue of teacher training in media education;
- excessive isolation of different levels of education and different thematic educational programs that do not meet modern requirements of transparency and flexibility of education;
- weak partnership relations between education institutions, media business and other interested parties.

In our opinion, one can add some more difficulties in the development of mass media education, such as: the reluctance of the universities' administrations to take concrete steps to introduce media education courses (although there are ample opportunities in the spectrum of the disciplines of the regional component and elective courses approved by universities); traditional approaches of the structures of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, actively supporting training courses in IT and computer applications with much less attention to media literacy.

Meanwhile A.P. Korochensky raises a number of acute problem issues that go beyond the usual framework of organizational and capacity difficulties:

Whether the idea of forming a rational, critical media culture is an illusion that disguises the impossibility of realizing in this socioeconomic and cultural contexts the declared humanistic concepts of preparing citizens for life and activity in the information age?

Is it possible to advocate for a rational, critical communication culture in a social environment where there are powerful tendencies working specifically to reduce the level of critical awareness of recipients of media information? Under these circumstances, does the attempt of a local social design (what the project of educating media literate audience actually is) have a chance to succeed?

Furthermore, he points out that for individuals as well as for human communities at large, the instincts, unconscious impulses and emotions play a very significant role. And the effective use of modern mass media technologies aimed at influencing the collective unconscious, suppressing the rational reaction of people, is a vivid confirmation of this. In this regard, it is legitimate to ask whether the ideal of rational-critical communication culture is a phantom, a purely speculative goal, unattainable due to the immanent
characteristics of the human personality and human communities?

Finally, the researcher questions whether the critical autonomy of an individual in communicating with the media is the myth that conceals the failure of real emancipation and self-emancipation of citizens from manipulative media influences and other harmful effects of the media (Korochensky, 2005: 41-42).

The questions raised by professor A.P. Korochensky are really thorny. But if to accept the illusory of the very aim of media education, the implementation of which is hampered by the powerful forces of commercial media, human instincts, etc., one will probably have to recognize the futility of education in general. And with all of its, if not irreproachable development, human civilization has proved, that all its achievements are the result of education process, which has always faced a lot of difficulties.

Yes, the task of raising masses' media competence, no doubt, may seem utopian, however, we are convinced that we should strive for this.

The research group ZIRCON for a number of years conducted mass surveys of Russian population in order to reveal the levels of media and information literacy: All-Russian representative sample of at least 1600 respondents - in the studies in 2014-2015 (1602 respondents); regional, using representative samples in 10 regions of the Russian Federation with at least 500 respondents in each (total 5011 respondents) (Zadorin, Maltseva, Shubina, 2017: 126). As a result, it was revealed that in 2015 "a low level of media literacy is characteristic for 26 % of Russia's population" (Zadorin, Maltseva, Shubina, 2017: 128). However, the levels of media literacy / media competence vary widely by region, so, for example, in the Astrakhan region, a low level of media literacy is 44 % (Zadorin, Maltseva, Shubina, 2017, p. 134). At the same time, according to ZIRCON, about 40 % of the population lacks the ability to verify and critically evaluate information using alternative sources of information (Zadorin, Maltseva, Shubina, 2017: 128).

However, due to the fact that ZIRCON surveys are largely based on the results of individuals' self-assessment, the real state of affairs with media literacy / media competence in Russia is likely to be even more alarming. In any case, our local ascertaining studies of media competence in the student environment (Fedorov, 2007; Levitskaya, Fedorov, and others, 2016) show that with an in-depth analysis of the audience’s knowledge and skills in the field of media culture, the percentage of low media competence is much higher, while the percentage of high media competence level is, alas, much lower than the results of ZIRCON’s surveys.

Ukraine


Comparative studies were also attempted. For example, levels of media literacy of Polish and Ukrainian students were compared: 54 students from Wroclaw University and 42 students from Lviv National University participated in the experiment (Trohanyak 2009: 41). The findings showed that 71% of Lviv students do not know anything about media education, identifying it with distant education; they did not take any courses on media education at the university. Polish students, on the contrary, had the opportunity to attend the media education course, so 78% of the respondents in this group were able to correctly identify the tasks of media education (Trohanyak 2009: 45).

A similar analysis was made upon detecting the levels of media literacy of the youth in Slovakia and Ukraine in 2004-2008. The authors of the study used quantitative methods - questionnaires and written tests with subsequent meaningful analysis. The Slovak sample consisted of 674 respondents, of which 206 were university students, 188 were graduate students and 180 were students of other years of study. In Ukraine (in 2004), the sample was 2003 respondents aged 14 to 35. The related study with a slightly modified toolkit was conducted in 2007. The results of the research attested to the fact that Ukrainian youth lagged behind Slovak peers in terms of media literacy (Afanasyev, 2010: 45-47).

In connection with the experimental introduction of media education in Ukrainian schools, 93 teachers of primary, secondary and high schools were surveyed (the majority of the respondents were female - 78%) (Mokroguz 2013: 426).

Therewith, the interviewed Ukrainian teachers prioritized media education objectives as follows:
- protection against harmful media influence, for example, from the impact of violent scenes on the screen, from propaganda of “bad taste”, from works of low artistic quality, etc. (74.5%);
- development of critical thinking of the individual in relation to media (62.8%);
- preparing people to live in a democratic society (61.6%);
- development of “good” aesthetic taste, evaluation of aesthetic qualities of media texts, appreciation of masterpieces of media culture (58.8%);
- development of the audience's ability to conduct the moral values, psychological analysis of various aspects of media, media culture (55.8%);
- teaching the audience practical skills to use media technology (38.1%);
- development of personal communication skills (37.3%);
- development of skills of self expression with the help of media, media texts creation (31.7%);
- development of the audience's ability to perform political, ideological analysis of various aspects of media, media culture (31.3%);
- development of the audience's ability to analyze media texts in a broad cultural and sociocultural context (28.5%);
- satisfaction of various audience’s needs in the field of media (16.1%);
- development of the audience's ability to perceive, understand and analyze media language (audiovisual level, composition, stylistics, symbols, etc.), to "decode" media texts (11.9%);
- teaching the theory of media and media culture (9.8%);
- teaching the history of the media, the history of media culture (3.8%) (Mokroguz, 2013: 427-428).

Since this survey was conducted on the basis of the questionnaires developed by our research team (Fedorov, 2007), we can compare the results obtained in Ukraine with the similar results of the questionnaire survey of Russian educators (Fedorov, 2007: 170-180), where teachers from Russia ranged the most crucial objectives of media education as
follows:
- development of critical thinking (the main task is: development of critical thinking, autonomy of an individual in relation to media / media texts) - 63.2%;
- development of aesthetic perception, taste, abilities for competent evaluation of aesthetic quality of media texts, understanding; propaganda of masterpieces of media culture - 57.9%;
- development of the audience's ability to political, ideological analysis of various aspects of media / media culture - 50.9%;
- development of the audience's ability to analyze media texts in a broad cultural and sociocultural context - 43.8%;
- teaching the audience practical skills to use media technology - 43.8%;
- development of the audience's ability to perceive, understand and analyze media languages - 36.8%;
- protection of the audience from harmful media influence - 35.1%;
- equipping people to live in a democratic society with the help of media / media culture - 35.1%;
- satisfying the needs of the audience - 33.3% (Fedorov, 2007).

A comparative analysis of the opinions shows that while the Ukrainian teachers prioritize protective tasks (74.5%), their Russian colleagues appreciate the development of students’ critical thinking (63.2%), and meanwhile only 35% of them attach more importance to innoculatory approach. However Ukrainian teachers (as, in fact, Western European countries) appreciate the task of preparation people for participation in a democratic society (61.6%), whereas only one in three Russian educators share this priority.

But with respect to the need to develop a good aesthetic taste, assess the aesthetic qualities of media texts; understand media texts, masterpieces of media culture, the viewpoints of Ukrainian and Russian teachers are very close (58.8% and 57.8%).

It was revealed that the interviewed teachers believe that media education of schoolchildren should be compulsory (65% in Ukraine, 63% in Russia) as integrated in basic school disciplines (44.9% in Ukraine, 45.6% in Russia), as a separate subject (32.3% in Ukraine, 24.5% in Russia) or as the synthesis of autonomous and integrated lessons (20.2% in Ukraine, 50.8% in Russia). Approximately one third of teachers (28.8% in Ukraine, 34.8% in Russia) think that the media education of schoolchildren should be optional or extra-curricular. Only 3.6% of teachers - in Ukraine and 14% - in Russia resist the idea of schoolchildren’s media education (Mokroguz, 2013: 430; Fedorov, 2007). As one can see, there are very similar trends.

It was found that only 3.2% of Ukrainian teachers used elements of media education in each lesson. More common were the following answers: at 1-2 lessons on the topic (24.2%), at 1-2 lessons per quarter (32.3%), at 1-2 lessons a semester (16.4%), at 1-2 lessons a year (22.2%). Only 1.7% of teachers stated that they have never integrated media education in their lessons (Mokroguz 2013, p. 434). In Russia, 28.2% of teachers said that media education is used to a greater or lesser extent in the classroom, but the percentage of teachers not involved in media education was much higher - 25.6% (Fedorov, 2007).

Among the obstacles to using the elements of media education in the lessons, the teacher mentioned the following: little knowledge on the theory and methodology of media education (65.8% in Ukraine, 54.3% in Russia), time consuming lesson planning (42.5% - in Ukraine), lack of own media skills (33.1% in Ukraine, 24.5% in Russia), lack of school officials’ support and guidance (28.3% in Ukraine, 77.2% in Russia), absence of financial incentives (3.6% - in Ukraine, -89.4% in Russia) (Mokroguz, 2013: 435; Fedorov, 2007). As we can see, with the relative similarity of some points, Russian teachers demonstrated more interest in opportunities of fundraising and more sensitive to authorities’ impact.
Of course, during this period it is possible to distinguish some authentic scientific and methodological developments of Ukrainian colleagues: G.G. Pocheptsov and V.F. Ivanov published many works devoted to mass communications, media influences and information wars (Ivanov, 2009-2010; Pocheptsov, 1999; 2000; 2001; 2011, etc.). B. Potiatynik and N. Gabor tried to find their way in media education with an emphasis on media ecology (Potiatinik, 2004; Gabor, 2002), G.V. Onkovych developed the concept of media didactics (Onkovych, 2009; Onkovych, 2013: 79-89; Onkovych et al., 2013). Thus, in Ukraine in recent decades there have developed several directions for interpreting the goals and objectives of media education. The most prominent are Kiev group, which we conventionally refer to as the group of "media didactics" (G. Onkovych, V. Ivanov, etc.), Lviv school of "media ecology" (B. Potiatinik, N. Gabor, etc.) and Mariupol school of "media criticism" (G. Pocheptsov and others). These three centers can be attributed to some degree to the "enlightening effect" of media education. In contrast to them, Kharkiv National University adopted an alternative media education model, in which the emphasis is on the aesthetic component of media and visual communications (Bakirov, Starodubtseva, 2013: 51).

Taking into account the Russian and Western experience, media pedagogues of Ukraine began to develop teaching manuals (especially vigorously upon the beginning of a large-scale experimental introduction of media education in Ukrainian schools) (Basics..., 2014; Cherepovska, 2010; Media culture..., 2009; Practical ..., 2013; Sakhnevich, 2010; Media education ..., 2012; 2014, etc.). More and more scientific-methodical conferences were organized to involve Ukrainian educators in the media education process (Collection of ..., 2013; 2015; 2017; Materials..., 2013; Media culture..., 2008, etc.).

However, since the spring of 2014, especially in connection with the formation of DNR (Donetsk People's Republic) and LNR (Lugansk People's Republic) military operations on their borders, mass media education in Ukraine has increasingly assumed an ideological color. The early signs of these changes were visible in the article by Y. Emets-Dobronosova with the eloquent title "Media Education" according to the Kremlin's recipe" (Emets-Dobronosova, 2014). The author declared substantially unsupported claims that "a vivid example of the multidimensionality of the Kremlin's technologies" was the "negative influence" of Russia on the development of media education in Ukraine: "Ukrainian scientists' embeddidness in the Russian context of the development of media education is impressive. They regularly and in sufficient scale speak not at international forums on media education, but at Russian conferences. Immediately after the start of the program on the development of media education in Ukraine, seminars and trainings were launched, with only one nuance - under the paternal leadership of Russian specialists. Even the history of media education worldwide most Ukrainian pioneer scientists in this field have studied with the mediation of Russian publications" (Emets-Dobronosova, 2014).

It is unclear how the studies of Russian acknowledgement of international theory and practice of media education, and Russian experience in media education in itself, can do any harm to Ukrainian researchers in the field.

It should be noted that the above criticism was promptly taken into account by Ukrainian media educators. For example, textbooks on media education, published in Kiev in 2017 (Authors' ..., 2017; Parents..., 2017; Media Literacy..., 2017), are mostly based on Western resources, they have almost no references to the Russian experience.

Moreover, as early as in 2015, in Ukraine, a number of articles were published which message was to change the media education concept in Ukraine, giving now the priority of ideological and information confrontation. So M. Koropatnik in the article "Peculiarities of media education in the conditions of the "hybrid war" of Russia against Ukraine" expresses indignation that media education in Ukraine "continues to be based mainly on traditional
positivistic educational principles without taking into account the mass media’s propaganda pressure on the consciousness of people of different age categories with a sufficiently powerful manipulative potential. But in response to the aggressive information environment, there is a need for a deeper analysis of the characteristics of information, disinformation and propaganda wars in order to consider them in the practice of media education, especially in terms of increasing its effectiveness in the process of socialization of the individual. ... There is the basis for this - the Ukrainian model of media education that integrates the best world experience: Canadian (development of critical thinking), French (civic education), American (priority of creativity vs. authoritarian approach in education), British (combination of protective model of "vaccination" and aesthetic development). The prerequisites for achieving one of the most important tasks of media education in the current conditions is to develop critical thinking, the ability to understand the hidden meaning of messages, and to resist the manipulation of the individual’s consciousness by the media-create an ideological theory of media education and the theory of media education as a means of critical thinking development” (Koropatnik, 2015: 18-21).

Similar ideas were developed by M. Koropatnik and in his article "Problems of forming media competence of the population in Ukraine regarding the events in the Crimea and Donbass in the context of Russia’s information and propaganda aggression“ (Koropatnik, 2015: 357-372), in which the author for some reason does not provide analysis why Ukraine, having become the victim of the "aggressor" in the opinion of the Kiev regime in 2014, has not only maintained diplomatic relations with Russia for four years, but does not withdraw from the CIS (although there are projects of the cessession), does not cut the "hostile" gas pipe passing through its territory; does not require the immediate return home of millions of Ukrainian labor migrants who work in Russia, etc. And if we go back from politics to the topic of media education, one can witness that in 2018, in spite of the position of Kiev’s authorities; a lot of Ukrainian media educators continue to submit their articles to Russian academic journals.

Anti-Russian attitude also permeates the article by N. Cherepovska, categorically asserting that "information aggression aimed at Ukraine from the hostile state is aimed at ceizing the consciousness of the society, exercising control over it and managing the public opinion of Ukrainians according to its imperial goals. The adequacy of the perception of hostile propaganda and the corresponding resistance to media informational influences on the part of our citizens is a serious social and psychological problem. Its essence lies in the disparity of a large-scale, professionally prepared, purposeful hostile indoctrination as an attack on the identity of Ukrainians, on the one hand, and the lack of an effective tool that can provide the opportunity to provide psychological resistance to harmful information to the general public, on the other hand" (Cherepovska, 2015: 60).

Thus, some Ukrainian media educators and ideologists decided that "war is a high time for media education" (Dorosh, 2014) and began to turn it into an instrument of anti-Russian propaganda.

And thus, media education manual for librarians in the spirit of standard propaganda of the Ukrainian pro-Western regime established in 2014, states that "dramatic events in our country connected with the revolution of dignity, the death of the heavenly hundred, further armed aggression of Russia and the annexation of part of the territory of Ukraine, firmly riveted millions of people to news reports, forced them to monitor information around the clock - almost live, in order to constantly be aware of, to make relevant conclusions and act. Many of our fellow citizens, perhaps for the first time in their lives, became so dependent on news. Therefore, as never before, the question of journalistic standards, responsible media and, at the same time, competent, literate
reflection of everything that we learn about from various media has emerged in Ukrainian society. Often their goal is not to inform, but on the contrary - to misinform, to broadcast false, so to speak, fake information, as, for example, in the notorious reports on the Russian Channel 1" (Gumenyuk, Potapova, 2015). At the same time, the authors of the manual seem to seriously believe that false and unverified information only comes from Russia, whereas Western and Ukrainian leading media sources allegedly always tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth...

Another Ukrainian publication exhibits the similar approach: "Media literacy of citizens. The teaching manual for coaches" (Training ..., 2015).

Needless to say, Russian media are not perfect, however, at the present time almost every central television channel in Russia broadcasts live political and sociocultural discussions on a daily basis with the participants of American, German, Polish, other European countries and Ukrainian journalists and political scientists who openly express their anti-Russian views, sharply criticize Russian authorities, etc. Thus, there is much more freedom of speech on Russian television than in the Ukrainian one, where Russian journalists and political scientists of non-liberal orientation are not allowed to take part in television debates or political talk shows.

Another textbook for teachers published by the Academy of the Ukrainian Press - "Media literacy in Civics lessons" - has been largely compiled as counter-propaganda: teachers are taught to resist Russian media propaganda (Media Literacy..., 2016: 56-60). In particular, in this manual, in our opinion, it is cynically asserted that "the theme of World War II is deliberately politicized today and is used with a manipulative goal to split Ukrainian society. This is dangerous, because often people, who use the Soviet concept of historical memory of the WWII, believe that the Ukrainian state is building the different history, where the heroes are those whom they have always considered enemies. The mythology of World War II is now actively used by Russian propaganda, attempting to discredit Ukraine, declaring a pro-European course and attempts to go beyond the Soviet and post-Soviet mentality and ideology" (Media Literacy..., 2016: 133).

In fact, at the present time the Ukrainian regime is trying to create the different history, claiming heroes those who earlier (in the USSR) were considered enemies. Hence dozens of monuments to the "heroes" of the so-called Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) - nationalists, most of whom served the Hitler regime, especially in 1941-1942. Biography of one of the leaders of Ukrainian nationalists - R.I. Shukhevych (1907-1950) is a striking example: in 1941-1942, he, together with thousands of Ukrainian nationalists, served in the Nazi army (Lisenko, 2008: 27).

Of course, thousands of Russians served in Hitler’s armies, and the commander of the so-called Russian Liberation Army (ROA), General A.A. Vlasov (1901-1946) was no better than R.I. Shukhevych and his associates. But in Russia, the Vlasov activities have been officially condemned, they have never been considered, are not considered, and, hopefully, they will never be considered heroes; whereas today in Ukraine 35 streets are named after Shukhevych, 11 monuments are erected (Shukhevych, Wikipedia). Dozens of monuments are installed in Ukraine in honor of many other Ukrainian nationalists who collaborated with the Nazis ... Can this be called the "pro-European course" of the Ukrainian government?

Even further, regarding lies and manipulations, in our view, goes a similar manual for teachers "Media Literacy and Critical Thinking in Social Studies", also developed and published by the Academy of the Ukrainian Press. Some of its units have clearly anti-Russian orientation (Media Literacy..., 2016: 106-109).

To address the issue in more detail, we’ll look at the sample paragraph of this manual, where its authors assert that "working with the images of Stepan Bandera, we saw in practice how the negative image of one of the symbols of the Ukrainian liberation
struggle is being formed and the corresponding myths are emerging. They can be decoded only through critical thinking and a comprehensive analysis of the authentic sources. ... Soviet, and then Russian propaganda from the second half of the 1940s has interpreted the personality of Stepan Bandera as a Nazis' (fascist's) accomplice. In accordance with this, since 1946, the supporters of the Ukrainian statehood began to be labeled by Soviet propaganda as fascists-Bandera" (Media Literacy..., 2016: 13-14).

Following the guidance of the textbook's "Media Literacy and Critical Thinking in Social Science Lessons" authors (2016); using critical thinking, let's turn to the analysis of original primary sources. Supporters of S.A. Bandera (1909-1959) and the so-called Act of the Proclamation of the Ukrainian State (1941), usually as the main argument, appeal to the fact that after the signing and promulgation of this act on June 30, 1941, S.A. Bandera was arrested by the Nazis and sent to a concentration camp, he was released only in 1944, and therefore did not take part in military operations (Marchenko, 2018, etc.).

In fact, the Nazi leadership did not like the actions of S.A. Bandera's associates related to the proclamation of the so-called "independence" of Ukraine. But if one carefully reads the original text of the Act of the Proclamation of the Ukrainian State (1941), one can easily find that S.A. Bandera and his supporters did not in the least assume the true Ukrainian "independence", arguing that "...3. The newly formed Ukrainian state will work closely with the National-Socialist Greater Germany, under the leadership of its leader Adolf Hitler which is forming a new order in Europe and the world and is helping the Ukrainian People to free itself from Moscovite occupation" (Act ..., 1941: 1) (to be substantive, the full text of The Act of Proclamation of Ukrainian Statehood (1941) is attached in the annex). I wonder if the full text is provided by Ukrainian teachers to their students and whether they are ashamed to acknowledge the Ukrainian nationalists wanted to live according to Nazis laws, and, consequently, to accept and welcome all their actions (for example, Holocaust)?

The prominent Ukrainian theorist of media and information wars G.G. Pocheptsov pertinentally identifies the following parameters of the intensity, and hence the artificiality of propaganda campaigns:
- "a simultaneous sudden beginning and a similarly simultaneous completion of the entire campaign or its individual stages,
- the use of all genres, not just news, for example ... talk shows,
- a rigid selection of representatives of the single viewpoint of view on screen,
- involvement of all sorts of communicative "allies" (in other countries, in different strata of society),
- preparation of strategic communication projects in the form of documentary and feature films, as well as a series of books on this subject,
- linking schools, which are the tool of the Ministry of Education, which, as is known, in modern societies performs the functions of the Ministry of Propaganda,
- the use of the descriptive language, which was previously banned,
- a sharp overstatement of the emotional tone of such messages" (Pocheptsov, 2015).

All the above is accurate, but it should be deplored that some Ukrainian media educators (Gumenyuk, Potapova, 2015; Media Literacy..., 2016, etc.) understand this kind of mechanisms, unfortunately, is a very biased way, applying it solely to Russian propaganda, excluding Ukrainian and Western one.

It should be noted that to his credit, G.G. Pocheptsov precisely sees the omnitude of media propaganda laws, because "intensive changes in the physical space require the same intensive changes in the information space (for example, the volume of communications on this subject is dramatically increasing both in public and in non-public spheres) and virtual space (for example, "fraternal peoples" from Soviet rhetoric belong to the virtual level, because they describe sacred values). Ukraine in return also
uses a virtual reference to the "imperial ambitions of Russia" ... the opposite sides see, as a rule, absolutely different realities, reasonable for each side involved" (Pochtso, 2015).

Moving on to the modern practices of introducing media education in Ukraine, in recent years, it has been implemented in ten Ukrainian regions. In doing so, 84% of the 90 interviewed teachers, currently teaching media literacy, were trained in formal media education courses, 16% were self-taught. In secondary schools the introduction of media education takes place in various forms, as a result of which various aspects are enhanced and developed - from the psychological (including the development of critical thinking) to the practical (the creation of media products). Ukrainian teachers see the future of media education in including it in school curricula and in the development of integrated learning (Implementation..., 2015: 6-7; Concept ..., 2010; Naydyonova, 2013: 63-79).

With the onset of an active confrontation between Ukraine and Russia, the development of media education in Ukraine generated serious interest among American (and European) politicians. In this regard, it is very significant that when the 6th International Scientific and Methodological Conference on April 20th and 21st in Kyiv, organized by Internews and the Academy of the Ukrainian Press, was held, it was opened by M. Yovanovitch, USA’s Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ukraine (Dorosh, 2018). It is clear that in the context of sanctions directed against the Russian Federation, American politicians are very interested in seeing media education in Ukraine develop with a propaganda bias, with a tangible flavor of anti-Russian orientation.

Countries with an average level of mass media education development

Moldova

Moldova joined the process of mass media education relatively recently and, without its own financial resources for the development of media education, immediately found itself under strong influence of Western projects in this field (Lang, 2015; English for Media Literacy Project in Moldova, 2017; International recognition for Moldovan librarians as Media Literacy Trainers, 2018, etc.). In April 2014, the Independent Journalism Center (IJC), in partnership with Radio Free Europe launched the project "Media Literacy for Young Moldovan People" (Suryapin, 2016). The project "Promoting media literacy among Moldovan citizens" was implemented by the IJC between March 2013 and April 2014 with the financial support of the United States Embassy in Moldova.

The main thrust of the development of mass media education in Moldova, as many Western politicians want to see it, is best explained by V. Bucataru in the following recommendations: "Publicly address topics such as critical media consumption, fake news, propaganda and disinformation through examples that relate to daily life and take into account professional, religious, ethnic, and linguistic background; ... Set up institutional partnerships that engage with the strategic communication centers of the EU and NATO, and thus interact in platforms that address information war on a multinational level" (Bucataru, 2018: 5-6).

One has to admit – it’s an unexpected twist in media education recommendations for the development of democracy - to establish a partnership with NATO. Clearly, Moldovan media education is directed towards the ideological platform. Moreover, there is a clear instruction, who/what it is necessary to "media educate", the population against: "Not a member of EU or NATO but still at their frontier, Moldova remains ever vulnerable to foreign influence. Russia will continue to target the country and attempt to deepen societal divisions by, among other means, undermining institutional trust. For Russia, this approach highlights both frustration over its lost sphere of influence and intentions..."
to be seen as a strong actor in the regional and international arena. ... Russian TV channels in Moldova have become a means of delivery for fake narratives and propaganda, a highly controlled and centralized “golden pipeline.” (Bucataru, 2018).

**Armenia**

A lot of academic publications on media education are being currently published in Armenia (Kazdanyan, Chilingaryan, 2016; Muradyan, Manukyan, 2017, etc.). The main media education resource of Armenia is the Media Education Center (www.mediaeducation.am); its organizers develop various teaching materials and conduct events (including conferences) that promote the development of media competence of the population. Media programs of the Yerevan educational complex "Mkhitar Sebastatsi" are moving in the same direction.

The activity of the Media Initiatives Center (www.mediainitiatives.am), which develops media literacy in Armenia, should also be noted. The Media Initiative Center develops lesson plans, recommendations and educational games for schools, and works closely with the Ministry of Education to integrate media literacy into the school curriculum (in particular, the Ministry of Education of Armenia approved the Media Literacy Teacher’s Manual prepared by this center). The Media Initiative Center also collaborates with libraries and museums, using an integrated approach to implement the UNESCO-promoted concept of media and information literacy (MIG) (Grizzle, 2017). The project of the "Media Initiatives Center", entitled "Educating the public about media literacy," is of interest. Within the framework of this project, about twenty videos about the role and functions of media in modern society were produced (Suryapin, 2016). In 2017, the Armenian Media Initiatives Center together with the Media Support Center (Kyrgyzstan) received the Media and Information Literacy (MIL) Award from the Global Alliance for Partnership on Media and Information Literacy (GAPMIL).

However, recently the development of media education in Armenia is sometimes associated with an anti-Russian attitude. For example, G. Vardanyan is convinced that "the pro-Russian position is the result of intensive and effective Russian propaganda. Russian media in Armenia, in particular TV channels, are broadcast in free access. ... What can be done to counter propaganda in general and Russian propaganda in particular? One of the recipes is media literacy. Starting from school one needs to teach children critical thinking and correct media consumption. This will reduce the chances of the propaganda's impact. Fact checking is part of media literacy. And if you repeatedly imagine how a Russian propaganda machine is lying, it will help people to distinguish between the truth, a half-truth and lies" (Vardanyan, 2017).

**Belarus**


However, in the Republic of Belarus "in recent years there has been a significant increase in interest in media education - both in the academic community and in the pedagogical environment. ... The most active theoretical development of problems of media education is carried out in Belarus State University, Grodno State University,
Mogilev Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and some other universities of the country. In the school curricula, as a separate academic subject, media education is not included, its implementation in the system of secondary and higher education in Belarus is carried out through the introduction of media components in the academic disciplines" (Venidiktov, 2015: 192-193). One can agree that "in connection with the theoretical and methodological underdevelopment of issues of media education in Belarus, research in this area is relevant" (Kovbasa, 2013: 40).

In 2016, the first textbook for educators was published in Belarus, "Media Education in a Modern School: Developing Media Literacy of Students" (Media Education..., 2016), which contains units related to the role of media in the modern world, types, genres and language of media, analysis of media texts, media manipulation, the development of critical thinking, the tasks of media education, media competence, media education, integrated into various school disciplines, extra-curricular activities of children and youth, in the work of film clubs, etc.

The authors are convinced that this textbook "has a number of peculiarities that, without exaggeration, make it a unique publication: it is innovative in form and content, since manuals for teachers on the problem of media education of students in our country have not been published; the texts are structured in such a way that, in addition to highlighting the relevant aspects of the topic of media education, readers are invited to complete the tasks themselves, answer questions and, thus, experience media literacy development or suggest these assignments to their students; the book contains many examples, ready-made scenarios for classes" (Media Education..., 2016: 10). True, it's a little embarrassing that sometimes the Internet links offered to readers of this manual lead ... to the anti-Russian site StopFake: Struggle against fake information about events in Ukraine (Media Education..., 2016: 240). I would not want to think that Belarus media educators will take up the ideological trend of Ukrainian media pedagogy of recent years, but the trend in itself is rather alarming ...

It should be noted that in the same year in Belarus, a review of this training manual was published, stating that "all the chapters included in its structure have a single basis: an orientation toward the formation of liberal thinking, the essence of which is the orientation towards a single individual autonomy of a student and anthropocentrism (a person is the measure of everything). It is no coincidence that the goal and product of media education in the peer-reviewed publication is an independent subject capable of resisting the temptations of the media world at the expense of a personal resource and creatively using its potential for cultural, social and personal development. This concept can become the basis for the development of the national concept of media education, which is argued as necessary by one of the authors (article by Alla Lozitskaya)" (Polonnikov, 2016: 46).

It is to be hoped that the national concept of media education in Belarus will be balanced and comprehensive, since there are good reasons stated in recent articles of Belarus media educators (Bogdanova, Petrova, 2017; Dubrovskaya, 2013: 91-95; Gubarevich, 2017: 19-32; Kurachenko, 2012: 60-62; Venidiktov, 2015: 190-196; Zhilinskaya, 2008).

**Kazakhstan**

Back in 2010, "the only school of journalism in Kazakhstan was in Kazakh National University (KazNU) named after al-Farabi, the largest university in the country. It is this faculty that develops state curriculum standards, that is, it actually forms the standards of media education. Other universities that train journalists have only departments and chairs"(Jalilov, 2010: 111). It has been repeatedly noted that there is a need in Kazakhstan
for organizing media education trainings and seminars for teachers, since most of them "have never worked in the media and prepare their lectures based on textbooks and books published in the Soviet Union" (Kulinsky, 2010: 159).

As in Belarus, the process of mass media education in Kazakhstan began with the adaptation of Russian experience, but then, thanks to the efforts of the research group headed by L.S. Akhmetova, quickly became equipped with an analysis of foreign media education theories (Akhmetova, Verevkin, Lifanova, 2017). In 2014, L.S. Akhmetova noted that "the issues of media education in Kazakhstan today are rather debatable among researchers, bloggers, participants of social networks, and general public, especially in the field of new technologies. Everyone understands that this is necessary. However, not enough attention is paid to such issues yet" (Akhmetova, 2014: 37). Over the past four years, the situation has changed for the better - media education literature is being published more and more often (Akhmetova, 2011; 2012; 2013; 2014; 2016; Akhmetova, Verevkin, Lifanova, 2015; 2017; Akhmetova, Verevkin, Lifanova, Shorokhov, 2013; Akhmetova, Shorokhov, Niyazgulova, 2015).

L.S. Akhmetova's team published collective monographs "Media Education in Kazakhstan" (2013), "Media Education and Media Literacy: Theory, Methodology, Practice" (2015). Having received a grant from the Ministry of Education and Science of Kazakhstan on the theme "Development of media and information literacy of the youth in the context of ensuring national security and the implementation of the State Program "Informational Kazakhstan - 2020 ", they produced another significant work - "Media and Information Literacy: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations" (2017), which took into account the current UNESCO recommendations on the synthesis of information and media competence of the individual.

And although media education has not entered Kazakhstan schools on a massive scale yet, it can be hoped that in the coming years Kazakhstan will be able successfully implement media education programs at different levels.

**Countries with a low level of mass media education**

**Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan**

Media education in Uzbekistan for a long time was in the phase of protracted formation (Abdurakhmanov, Beknazarova, 2011: 20-24; Beknazarova, 2011; Ismailova, 2016: 121-126). The textbook "Uzbekistan on the path to the development of media education" (Mamatova, Sulaimanova, 2015) serves a vivid example, because, contrary to its title, it contains almost no information about what is actually going on in the field in Uzbekistan. However, the training manual contains a brief adapted rendering of UNESCO's recommendations on the development of media and information literacy, and it is a progressive step.

Moreover, "in 2015-2017 on the initiative of the UNESCO Office in Uzbekistan and the National Library of Uzbekistan named after A. Navoi, the project "Development of information culture and media literacy of specialists of information and library institutions of Uzbekistan in the period of deepening reforms in the information and library sphere" was realized. The goal of the project is to train specialists of information and library institutions of Uzbekistan in the promotion of the ideas of UNESCO and IFLA on media and information literacy through the training course "Fundamentals of the Information Culture of a School Student", as well as to adapt these training materials in order to facilitate their perception by schoolchildren in Uzbekistan" (Gendina, 2017: 37).

As a result, the authors of the project prepared a number of useful recommendations on the development of media and information literacy in Uzbekistan: first, "to compare the
UNESCO curriculum with the existing national curricula on information and/or media literacy, to determine the contents of the missing information and/or media components. Then add the missing component (media or information), thereby ensuring a balance between media and information competencies. Further, it is necessary to analyze the definitions borrowed from the UNESCO curriculum in accordance with the terms and concepts accepted in the country and, if necessary, to supplement the composition of the glossary. In addition, the information and media resources recommended in the UNESCO curriculum should be selected and replaced with appropriate national information and media resources, and then a list of literature in the national language(s) should be compiled. After that, it is required to analyze the educational text with the help of ethnomarkers and replace the identified precedent phenomena by analogues corresponding to the realities of the country (geographical, literary, folklore and historical objects, political associations and organizations, laws, etc.) (Gendina, 2017: 41).

Active processes that promote the development of mass media education have begun in recent years in Kyrgyzstan, where "the existing activities to improve the level of media literacy as a skill and the development of media literacy as a science are in a rudimentary stage" (Report..., 2018: 94). These conclusions were drawn based on the results of a study assessing the levels of media literacy of the population (over 16 years) in the Kyrgyz Republic. It was held in September - November, 2017, 1200 urban and rural respondents from seven regions were interviewed (Report ..., 2018: 11).

The main lever for the development of media education in Kyrgyzstan is the non-profit Foundation "Media Support Center", established in 2002. The first project to develop media and information literacy in Kyrgyzstan was launched by the Foundation in 2012 in partnership with IREX Europe and the Deutsche Welle Academy. Through the efforts of the Media Support Center Foundation in Kyrgyzstan, 25 schools have already piloted the media literacy lessons developed by the Foundation in cooperation with the Kyrgyz Ministry of Education and Science and the Kyrgyz Academy of Education. In Kyrgyzstan such an experiment is being conducted for the first time. The project has already covered about three hundred children in Bishkek and its suburbs. ... The first thing that the teachers teach the course is not to take any information for granted. Regardless of where it publicized - everything needs to be checked by other sources. Those who have taken the course say that they watch daily news reports with a different attitude now" (Begalieva, 2017).

Most recently, in 2018, Kyrgyzstan published the first textbook for teachers on media and information literacy (Imankulov et al., 2018), which, seems to provide significant help in developing the media competence of both the teachers and their students.

Unfortunately, the development of media education in Azerbaijan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan still lags far behind Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan.

In general, modern development of media literacy in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan is supervised by Western organizations IREX Europe and Albany Associates. In 2018, with the support of the British Embassy in Kazakhstan and the British Embassy in Kyrgyzstan, in the framework of IREX Europe, a series of teaching aids in Russian was published (which remains the language of cross-ethnic communication of the CIS countries). Note that "Media literacy: a practical textbook for higher education institutions on media and information literacy" (Sturkhezky, 2018) and "Media literacy. A practical manual for librarians" (Kozitska, 2018), unlike many of the Ukrainian analogues of recent years, are sustained in a politically neutral manner. The first of them (pp. 97-101 and 133-135) cites the research of our scientific school, and contains links to the Internet resource "Information Literacy and Media Education for All" (www.mediagram.ru) also created with participation of Taganrog media
education research team (Russia).

Unfortunately, the publication "Propaganda, deepening the abyss in mutual understanding. Monitoring of the media of the Eastern Partnership countries and Russia" lacks the balanced representation of views (Propaganda ..., 2016). Media monitoring of the six countries of the Eastern Partnership and Russia was held from June 6 to July 3, 2016 within the framework of the project "Joint Efforts and Professional Knowledge to Counter the Propaganda", supported by the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Secretariat of the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum and implemented by the Yerevan Press Club in partnership with Internews Ukraine, MEMO 98 (Slovakia), Independent Journalism Center (Moldova), the Charter of Journalistic Ethics of Georgia, the Belarusian Association of Journalists and the Azerbaijani expert group" (Propaganda ..., 2016, p. 4). Meanwhile, “this study was focused on monitoring and detecting the potential impact of, so to speak, "migrating" propaganda messages (stereotypes, narratives), often falling into the information space, including media of the Eastern Partnership countries, specifically of Russian federal channels or under the influence of their content” (Propaganda ..., 2016: 4).

Thus, the authors of the study seem to have "forgotten" that propaganda is not a one-way street, and if we are to investigate the mechanisms of propaganda, then we should consider examples of propaganda produced by different countries, rather than consider that propaganda exists only in Russia, and in other countries (for example, the United States, Britain, Germany, France) everything is so democratic that propaganda and “migrating ideological stereotypes” are out of the question.

In this context, it is very significant that in 2018 the US authorities, disturbed by the "excessive influence of Russian media on public opinion" in the countries of Central Asia, “allocated $ 15 million to support independent journalists and raise the level of media literacy in this region” (US ..., 2018).

The origins of media literacy education in the CIS countries date back to the traditions of the Soviet school. Once a single educational space united by the common idea of educating the younger generation in the spirit of communist ideology has received new vectors in the post–Soviet period that are closely connected with the identity of each sovereign state of the former Soviet Union. Media literacy education approaches in Central Asia, the former Soviet republics of the USSR – Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan – were no exception. Their development after the collapse of the Soviet Union can be conventionally divided into two periods.

The first stage (1992–1999) is connected with the period of transformation of all state and socio–cultural spheres of society, significant changes in education and culture.

The second stage (2000–2019) of media literacy education development is the modern stage of the post–Soviet space closely connected with globalization processes, general world tendencies: the advent of the digital era, the transition to medialized communication, etc. Computerization, the rapid development of the Internet, and social media, the emergence of new risks and challenges that have arisen in society in connection with the need to ensure the media security of the younger generation, entailed significant transformational changes in all areas of modern society.

At present, media literacy education around the world is becoming more and more widespread, as all spheres of communication, education, and creative implementation of modern society are inextricably linked to the media. Nowadays, people of various ages, professions, and social strata are actively involved in this process. In this regard, the development of media competence with the help of media literacy education is one of the most urgent tasks in the world.

The problems of media literacy education development in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan are being studied by many modern researchers (Abdurakhmanov and Beknazarova, 2011; Ablazov, 2013; Allagurov, 2016; Imankulov et al., 2018; Izmailova,
Considering the modern media literacy education in Central Asia as an independent direction in education, providing the process of socialization of the individual, E.E. Ablazov emphasizes that its prospects are directly related to the process of social modernization, the problems of formation of the foundations of civil society and media culture of the XXI century (Ablazov, 2013). Therefore, it is no coincidence that one of the trends in the development of media education in the CIS countries is the actualization of the development of mass forms and methods of media education activities of the population of different age and social groups (Chelysheva, 2018).

Presenting the history of media literacy education in the Soviet Uzbekistan, K.P. Abdurakhmanov and S.S. Beknazarova (Abdurakhmanov and Beknazarova, 2010; 2011) address the problems of practical media education and the use of media in the educational process. In addition, the works of these researchers consider the process of development of an integrated media education approach in the study of a number of academic disciplines that were born in the wake of the creation of educational films and have been further developed at the present stage, proving the effectiveness of integration of media literacy education not only in achieving the learning objectives of the material, but also in the development of information and communication competence.

S.S. Beknazarova (Beknazarova, 2011) is devoted to the analysis of the introduction of media education elements into the educational process. The subject of the author's research is the analysis of the possibilities of integrated media education component in the structure of the modern lesson. Among the main factors contributing to the inclusion of elements of media literacy education in the educational process of S.S. Beknazarova are the following: activation of cognitive interests of the audience to the topic under study; optimization of students' performance at different stages of studying a particular subject (Beknazarova, 2011).

In particular, when studying physics with students, the integrated curriculum includes analysis of media education approaches in the pedagogical context and considers the best domestic and foreign media literacy education practices. The main emphasis is placed on the development of analytical skills of the audience to work with media information.

In the structure of an integrated media education lesson, special attention is paid to the organization of independent work of students in the context of the implementation of a personality–based approach: for media education to be successful, i.e. to fulfill its purpose and prepare new generations for life in a mediatized society, it must be, first and foremost, accessible. And this applies equally to professional and non–professional types (Beknazarova, 2011).

The main objectives of media education in Uzbekistan, according to K. Izmailova, are aimed at educating the population, and mainly young people, in working with information, interacting with the media, forming a critical perception of media products and on the basis of this improvement of the media culture of the audience as a whole (Izmailova, 2016). K. Izmailova believes that the following aspects can be considered as positive trends in media education:

– gradual awareness of its importance by the public of the country and the adoption of media literacy education as a topical area of education;
– interaction between state structures and public organizations in an effort to raise the status of media literacy education in the country;
– appealing to the best international practices of the leading countries in media literacy education;
– expanding the range of forms and approaches to media education activities, taking into account regional and national peculiarities;
– growth of the movement of initiators and enthusiasts of mass and professional media literacy education (Ismailova, 2016).

E.E. Ablazov notes similar trends in media literacy education in developing countries, including Central Asian countries. Modernization processes related to the education system and modernization of the socio-cultural environment cannot be considered outside the modern information space. Accordingly, among the main challenges facing media literacy education in these countries, the author singles out the problems associated with the expansion of the media field of modern society, increasing the level of media security of the younger generation. According to E.E. Ablazov, the following aspects can be singled out among them: computerization of mass libraries, museums and archives; creation of public databases and data banks in the field of humanities and social sciences; creation of a wide network of cultural and information centres in the regions of the country; creation and development of the national sector on the Internet; ensuring information security for individuals, society and the state (Ablazov, 2013).

In recent decades, with UNESCO's support, several major media literacy education projects have been implemented in Central Asian countries. Their results are reflected in textbooks, dissertations and scientific articles. For example, if we talk about media literacy education in Uzbekistan, one of the key ones is the textbook Uzbekistan on the Way of Media Education Development (Uzbekistan..., 2015), where media and information literacy is viewed as a tool of democracy, including all media resources (media, libraries, archives, etc.).

One of the key factors in media and information literacy is the methods for assessing media information. This handbook includes several training modules on the essence of concepts; youth-media interactions; value conceptions of media; analysis of basic approaches to media interpretation; and the role of media and information literacy in communication cooperation. All modules include theoretical sessions, training workshops on media education topics on press, television, radio, Internet, etc.

A number of higher education institutions in Uzbekistan have launched media literacy education web resources. For example, since 2011, the Tashkent University of Information Technologies has initiated the Media Education Portal project (http://mediaedu.uz). K. Abdurakhmanov was the head of this project, and S. Beknazarova was the developer. The creation of this portal, according to its creators, is closely connected with the need for students to study educational courses or modules, using elements of media education as an effective means of developing a creative, independent and critically thinking personality in the face of an intensive increase in information flow (Beknazarova, 2011). The importance of this portal for mass media education is that the materials presented are aimed not only at training media professionals (journalists), but also at developing media literacy among the general public.

The development of media literacy education in the Asian CIS countries in the post-Soviet period was focused primarily on the development of new information flows, the spread of which around the world has led to the development of media technologies. Media literacy education process has been particularly active in Kyrgyzstan over the past two decades. For example, in early 2012, the first major research project aimed at studying the media literacy of the younger generation was implemented there. The Media Literacy project (http://newreporter.org/2012/05/07/konkurs-na-uchastie-v-media-literacy-cource-v-bishkekskom-lofte/#sthash.6pscociP.dpuf) was educational in nature and included a series of classes aimed at mastering the basics of media literacy among schoolchildren and students.

The media and school movement is currently being actively developed in Kyrgyzstan. Professional cameramen, directors, and journalists are trained in filmmaking, photography, and reporting in Kyrgyzstan’s media schools, which have a practical
educational character. For example, in April 2019, the Kloop media school (https://kloop.kg/blog/2019/03/26/nauchis-snimat-i-montirovat-video-nabor-na-kurs-mediashkoly-kloopa/) started its work, the subject of which is dedicated to videotaping of thematic videos. Theoretical classes at the school are accompanied by mandatory practice: video tests and recording of small video fragments, the best of which are published on the online resources of Kyrgyz media editors.

In addition, by participating in the work of this media school, students can get acquainted with modern video recording technologies, video genres, audiovisual series design, the basics of modern editing computer programs, etc. By participating in the classes, the audience has the opportunity to expand their knowledge in the field of professional media sphere, as the classes include familiarity with the professions of cameramen, journalists, including the legal framework of this activity, the features of the choice of topics and conducting interviews, reports, etc. After mastering the theoretical course, the students start shooting their own videos under the guidance of experienced cameramen, directors and video editors.

Another practice-oriented media school in Kyrgyzstan, which is open to both amateur photographers and newcomers, is dedicated to the study of photography. The Media School "Photography Workshop" (https://kloop.kg/blog/2019/03/18/masterskaya-fotografii-uchim-vystravat-kompozitsiyu-i-delat-horoshie-snimki/) is built on the same principle as the school of cameramen. There is also a practice of combining theoretical classes devoted to the basics of professional photography with a practical block of tasks and exercises, including the creation of a series of photographs on specific topics.

The best graduates of media schools of video footage, photography, basics of journalism, courses for reporters, etc. have the opportunity to undergo an internship in the editorial offices of the Kyrgyz media after the classes.

At the same time, despite the development of practice-oriented forms of media literacy education, the development of media competence, the formation of an academic base for mass media education, the inclusion of media education in the educational programs of educational institutions at all levels, and the holding of scientific forums and conferences on media education remain an open question in Kyrgyzstan's media education. This is evidenced by the results of a survey to assess the level of media literacy in Kyrgyzstan. The implementation of this media education project, this time a sociological one, was organized by the Public Foundation Media Policy Institute in 2017. This survey included qualitative and quantitative data on such indicators as evaluation, analysis, access, creation and dissemination of media content.

The results of the survey were reflected in the recommendations addressed to state authorities, civil society, donor agencies and representative offices of international organizations, mass media. The recommendations note that despite the integration into the modern information society, the population of Kyrgyzstan have not been prepared for the changing realities, especially with regard to the availability of competencies that allow them to be effective and information responsible citizens. In particular, it is a set of knowledge, attitudes and skills that allow access to information and knowledge, to analyze, assess, use, create and disseminate them with maximum productivity in accordance with legal and ethical standards and respect for human rights (Report, 2018: 94). In other words, the modern mass media education of Kyrgyzstan is focused on critical thinking and assessment of media information, i.e. development of media competence.

The development of media literacy in Turkmenistan has very similar positions to Kyrgyzstan in terms of the priority of practice-oriented development of media resources (Yildiz, 2010). In Turkmenistan, the problem of media development (in particular, cinema, television and radio) is being developed at the Turkmen State Institute of Culture. In
recent years, Turkmenistan has hosted several thematic exhibitions and scientific conferences dedicated to the latest achievements in science, technology and innovative technologies. However, the development of media literacy education in Turkmenistan is less intensive than in other Asian CIS countries.

An analysis of recent academic literature on the development of media literacy education in Central Asian countries (Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan) shows that media education is becoming more and more popular, as almost all age and social categories of the population of the former Soviet republics are involved in interaction with the media. A special target group of interaction with the media is the younger generation. As in other countries, media literacy education in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan is acquiring an interdisciplinary character, including cultural, pedagogical and technological approaches.

Analysis of the scientific literature shows that the priority theoretical platform for the development of media literacy education in Uzbekistan for almost two decades has been the development of critical autonomy and creative development of the media space. Kyrgyzstan has the strongest position in terms of practical accents in mastering media literacy.

The consolidation of efforts to develop media literacy is facilitated by the exchange of experience and study of best practices in Russian and European media literacy education. In recent years, Central Asian countries (Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan) have maintained close ties in the field of media education with the Media Development Fund (Moscow), UNESCO, MediaNet (Almaty), and IREX Europe organizations, and have actively cooperated with the Association of Librarians in the field of media literacy development.

On the basis of these studies, the following aspects have been identified as the main reasons for teaching media literacy to the general public in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan, in particular the development of media education for the younger generation:

– the media define the political and cultural life of modern society;
– the media form values and models of behaviour;
– the media have a significant impact on modern society, including the formation of types of perception and understanding of information;
– media development requires not only passive but also active participation of the audience (Kozinska, 2018).

In recent years, with UNESCO's support, several large-scale media literacy projects have been implemented (Kozinska, 2018; Shturhetsky, 2018, etc.), including surveys and the development of methodological tools. These projects address the theory, methodology and practical use of media resources in the educational activities of the younger generation.

For example, the recent IREX Europe project in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, launched in 2017, aims to increase the capacity of people in these countries to recognize false reports and misinformation, to make informed decisions and to promote understanding of the role and responsibility of the media in a democratic society (Sturkhetskiy, 2018: 3).

A number of training manuals have been published on the basis of the project materials. These manuals are presented in a modular form, which allows for partial use of the materials presented or for their variation depending on the readiness of the audience and the specific objectives of each session.

In the process of studying media education classes, the audience is offered several modules on media literacy: 1) basic concepts, 2) information security, 3) information and propaganda, 4) quality control, 5) news factory, 6) content creation (Sturkhetskiy, 2018).
Theoretical material on media literacy education development is presented in the series of lectures and discussion workshops/trainings. The manuals also contain practical exercises on the topics under study. In addition to studying the basic concepts of media literacy education issues, the audience is offered sections on information wars in the media, problems of media hygiene, the study of media consumption, including the study of the propaganda function of the media and the study of the basics of critical thinking, etc. The Workshop section presents a variety of practical exercises and assignments for developing media competence. The technology of these classes, such as exercises for creating media texts, perception of media texts, critical analysis of media texts, and study of media texts, is based on the books and articles of A.V. Fedorov (Fedorov, 2001).

The manuals also contain thematic plans for integrated and specialized courses: "Media and Information Literacy (MIL)" (108 hours); courses for students: "Media Expertise", "Media Consumption", "Media Production" (each of which is designed for 72 hours); a three–day training program; a distance learning program for a wide audience "Media Education through Media Creation" (72 hours), etc.

These manuals are especially important for working with media texts and recognition of fake news, problems of classification indicators of modern media audience, formation of media content and assessment of the quality of media products with an emphasis on the practical development of media resources, including the creation of media texts on a given topic, presentations for lessons and thematic classes, etc. As the analysis has shown, these topics are reflected in almost all media literacy programs.

At the present stage, media literacy segments are being intensively developed for Central Asian countries and for librarians. In particular, training courses on media literacy are being implemented in Kyrgyzstan for library stockholders, the aim of which is to develop media competence. These courses include several main sections: familiarity with the functions of the media; assessment of the impact of media information; the possibility of using the media in the professional activities of librarians; definition of their citizenship in relation to media texts of various types and genres; understanding, analysis and interpretation of texts in the media, etc. (Kozinska, 2018).

The situation of involving libraries in the process of mastering the media sphere is also characteristic of other Central Asian countries, which may indicate the inclusion of these countries in a single socio–cultural field of mass media education, as the practice of working with libraries to master media literacy is now actively developing around the world, including in Europe and the CIS.

Leading universities in Central Asia, such as the Tashkent University of Information Technologies, the Andijan State University and others, are involved in media literacy projects. The leaders in this area are Uzbekistan, where a large number of media literacy education projects have been implemented in recent years, including those based on the work of Uzbek researchers.

The development of media education in general and higher education institutions in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan is closely linked to ensuring the information security of the younger generation and the ability to work with media information and analyse and interpret it from the point of view of civic position, critical, aesthetic, creative and other approaches. Thus, in the process of forming media literacy, students acquire the skills of effective and safe use of media, as well as an adequate, professional vision of the state of affairs in a particular area of public life, the formation of an independent civic position, and assistance in the formation of civil society (Mamatova, 2015).

One of the pressing problems remains the task of information security for the younger generation in the media space. With these goals in mind, recommendations are being developed for teachers and the parents' community in Central Asia to reduce the risk of children and young people turning to undesirable media content. Analysis of these
recommendations allows us to highlight several key points, among which we can highlight the following:

– monitoring of the younger generation's access to social media;
– selection of media resources for the younger generation according to the following criteria: safety, attractiveness and usefulness for learning and development;
– use of reliable websites targeted at children's audiences.

A project entitled "Promoting stability and peace in Central Asia through increased media literacy, effective reporting and regional cooperation", aimed at developing critical thinking and countering extremism, is currently being implemented by Internews, an NGO supported by the European Union. The project is being implemented for a year and a half in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. The project involves university, college and school teachers, media trainers and media literacy experts from Central Asian countries. As a result, projects are being developed and implemented to support and disseminate best practices that promote media literacy, digital literacy, and critical thinking, targeting journalism students, schoolchildren, civic activists, and media workers (Second..., 2018). In our view, these methodological events are of great importance for the exchange of experience in the field of media literacy education in Central Asian countries and can contribute to the consolidation of the efforts of states in the process of developing media and information literacy among the general public.

Thus, the study of the development of media literacy education in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan in the post–Soviet period, allows us to identify two main stages of development of this process. For the first stage, the chronological framework of which can be defined from 1992 to 1999, the most typical tendencies were the processes related to the restructuring of the state structure of the sovereign republics of Central Asia, the formation and strengthening of innovation processes in the economy, politics, culture and education. Simultaneously with these processes, in this period, in accordance with global trends, information technologies began their development.

The next stage in the development of media literacy education in the CIS countries (2000–2019), accompanied by globalization processes and rapid information shifts, can be considered as a period of digital society development, and the emergence of new social media. As a result of this process, the emergence of global threats related to the development and interaction with the media: dangerous media content, excessive immersion in the virtual world, etc. At the same time, at the present stage, it is already becoming clear that not every single country is faced with the problem of interacting with the media. Media literacy education is becoming universal, and its relevance is becoming indisputable.

As a result of this research, the main theoretical platforms for media literacy education in the countries under consideration in Central Asia can be identified. Among them, practical, critical, and socio–cultural approaches have become most widespread. The practical approach related to the use of media to support the educational process is most characteristic of Kyrgyzstan. The utilitarian nature of media education is related to the practical use of media technologies, although in recent years there has been a significant shift towards a critical media literacy education paradigm.

One of the actively developing theoretical platforms for media education is the development of critical understanding of media information and the development of independent analytical thinking in working with information resources. It is becoming obvious that it is extremely important for the younger generation to learn to assess the quality and reliability of information, to be selective in its consumption, to select the necessary information, systematizing it in certain areas of science, to fit it into the knowledge provided by an educational institution, and to be critical of any information. All of the above will be the key to the formation of a modern educated personality.
Modern media literacy education in the Asian CIS countries is becoming more and more in line with global trends: it puts the task of analytical thinking in the process of mastering media information, including its independent evaluation and selectivity in relation to information flows at the forefront. Particular importance in the modern media literacy education of Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan is attached to the issues of the security of the younger generation related to the media, such as the abundance of inaccurate information, the spread of media dependence, access to sites containing violence, etc.

E.E. Ablazov singles out the systematization of information and the identification of metaproject links in the information flow as priority tasks facing modern media literacy education in Central Asian countries. These tasks predetermine the pedagogical vectors for the development of the media education process: each teacher is faced with the task of not protecting the students from massive flows of various information, but teaching them how to use them, choosing the useful and reasonable. Ultimately, this helps to reveal the talents of each person (Ablazov, 2013).

In general, we can conclude that the goal of mass media education in Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan (Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2018; 2019) is to develop and increase the level of media literacy/media competence of the population (i.e., the culture of communication with the media, creative and communicative abilities, analytical thinking, skills of creation, dissemination, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of the role and functions of media in society, media texts of different types and genres).

**Georgia (was a member of the CIS until August 2008)**

Having gained independence in 1991, Georgia strongly pursued a pro-Western direction in terms of foreign and national policy, including policies and practices of the European Union countries in the field of education. Today it builds its educational system in accordance with the Bologna doctrines, recommendations of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe and the principle of lifelong learning. In accordance with this approach, the development of media competence at all educational levels is of particular relevance.

Media education worldwide is connected with the development of information technologies and, above all, the global Internet. It is the ubiquitous distribution, universal accessibility and absolute freedom in posting any information in the Internet space that is making specialists - teachers, journalists, church representatives, etc. reflect on the development of knowledge and skills that contribute to the selection, use, critical analysis, assessment, creation and distribution of media texts, analysis of media functioning processes in society (Fedorov, 2010: 24), i.e. the media literacy. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the peculiarities of the development of media education in Georgia from 1992 to the present.

The development trends of media education in the countries of the former republics of the Soviet Union have been of research interest for many researchers (Fedorov, 2014: 14; Chelysheva, 2013). Some issues of media education in Georgia - formal, informal, within the national curriculum, supplementary, self-education throughout a person’s life, have been covered in the 2010s (Chelysheva, 2013; Santeladze, 2012; Natelauri, 2018 and others).

In 2006, professor A.Fedorov conducted an expert survey among Russian and foreign educators on media education development trends in 9 countries. One of the respondents was a Georgian teacher, director of the College of Media, Advertising and Television Arts, and a documentary film director Zurab Oshkhneli, who pointed out the
absence of any achievements in media education in Georgia “because of the lack of a concept as such”. Oshkhneli complained about the lack of literature on media education, in the Georgian language in particular. The few books available in English or Russian cannot satisfy the needs of either students or teachers, since the students do not learn Russian any more, and teachers have not mastered English yet (Fedorov, 2007).

Apparently, the issues of media education, aimed at the development of media literacy of the Georgian citizens, were not relevant up till the beginning of the 21st century because it is difficult to talk about media literacy in the absence of media diversity. In European countries, the problems of critical thinking, the ability to make sense of the huge flow of information from different sources make it necessary to prepare the population for interaction with the media. In Georgia, the level of development of the media sphere in large cities and rural areas is drastically diverse. In the latter, the number of TV channels is limited to one to three, only Tbilisi news are broadcast, the number of newsagents’ is minimal, for example, there are only four in Akhaltsikhe, there is one weekly newspaper for the whole Samtskhe-Javakheti district, there is no local radio station but there are some providers of the Internet (Mchedlidze, 2010).

In spite of the fact that there was no formal concept of “media education” in the discourse of Georgian teachers, media education activities did take place. As early as in 1989, the Youth Television was created on the state channel, later renamed the Media Education Center of the Ministry of Education and Science in accordance with the Israeli model, then taken as a model. Soon, due to financial difficulties, the Center was abolished and renamed as the College of Media, Advertising and Television Arts, which, nevertheless, did not solve the funding problem. The 1990s turned out to be a difficult period for Georgia as a whole, including the education system. The result of the economic crisis in which the country descended into, was the decline in the quality of the education. As N. Natelauri notes, schools had problems with elementary teaching aids, textbooks, etc., the payment to teachers went down, as a result they simply quit their jobs, schools closed down, which resulted in less students overall, but at the same time, more students in each class (Natelauri, Saghirishvili, 2018).

Fundamental changes in the education system occurred in 2005, when Georgia joined the European Bologna Process and signed the Lisbon Convention, which necessitated bringing the entire education system in the country into line with European standards of education. The European education system, according to the “Resolution on media education and new technologies” of 1989, suggests that media education should start as early as possible and continue throughout school years as a compulsory subject for study (Council of Europe, 1989).

The 2002 UNESCO recommendations emphasize that “Media Education is part of the basic entitlement of every citizen, in every country in the world, to freedom of expression and the right to information and is instrumental in building and sustaining democracy. ..., it should be introduced wherever possible within national curricula as well as in tertiary, non-formal and lifelong education” (Recommendations..., 2002).

In this regard, Z. Oshkhneli recognized the development of media education in Georgia as an inevitable natural process: “We are joining the Bologna and Copenhagen agreement. Therefore, if Europe needs the media education system, it will be necessary for all countries that are going to integrate their education system into the European one. First, we need to accumulate information about European media education, practice, programs, including educational television broadcasting and its effectiveness”. The author also considers it important to introduce mandatory integrated or specialized media education courses in the curricula of secondary schools (Fedorov, 2007).

The need for the development and implementation of integrated and special media education courses in the programs of Georgian secondary schools was also pointed out by
I.V. Chelysheva in 2014, who singled out a practical approach as the leading theoretical platform for media education. The researcher also noted an active interest in the practical use of media technologies in the educational process of schools and universities, Georgia’s participation in large-scale projects on the introduction of media technologies in education, the main purpose of which is the development and use of media in various spheres of life including educational process. I.Chelysheva draws attention to the active participation of Georgia in various international educational projects of the European Community (Horizon 2020, Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST) actions, Joint Research Center), which opens up significant prospects for Georgian media education (Fedorov, 2014). Z.Oshkhneli also hopes for a positive impact of foreign experience on the Georgian government (Fedorov, 2007).

Among other issues of media education in Georgia, experts highlight the problems associated with the development of the information society, the organization of media centers, the development of methodological and technological platforms for media education models, and the further development of media educational tools (Chelysheva, 2017).

Despite the importance of media education, its place in the education system of Georgia has so far remained uncertain and in most cases is almost exclusively supported by the international community of sponsors. Today there have been significant changes in this issue, which determines the significance of theoretical studies of various aspects of media education and media competence in the post-Soviet space.

Despite the fact that the educational systems of the EU countries and former Soviet republics differ significantly, the common European space of higher education, ensured by the ideas and mechanisms of the Bologna process, has become a definite guideline and perspective for the development of education systems for post-Soviet countries, including Georgia. The need to reform the higher education system has led to fundamental changes at all levels of the educational system: preschool, general secondary (primary 1-6 grades, middle 7-9 grades and secondary 10-12 grades), secondary vocational, higher and the post-graduate level.

According to the data provided by GlavExpertcenter, published on the website of the National Information Center, the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia developed the so-called Restructuring Program introduced by the Education Act of June 27, 1997 (Zakon Gruzii ob Obrazovanii, 1997). The Program emphasizes improving the quality and effectiveness of primary and general secondary education, strengthening institutional capacity and mobilizing public and private resources. The implementation of this program and the strengthening of the education system began in 2001. The priority areas include the professional development of teachers and the development of educational standards.

As one of the main strategic documents on school education, the “National goals of general education” should be mentioned, approved by the Decree of the Government of Georgia of October 18, 2004 No. 84. On the basis of this document, educational standards or so-called National Curricula (hereinafter referred to as NC) were developed for different levels of education (Natelauri, Saghirishvili, 2018).

Over the past 10 years, the substantive aspect of NC in terms of media literacy, as one of the key competencies in the schoolchildren training program, has undergone significant changes. Whereas the first-generation NC 2006-2009 (National Curricula, 2019) there was no reference to media literacy at all, in the modern NC, media literacy ranks with digital literacy among the top target competencies within the framework of the general educational program.

Society of the 21 century is unthinkable in isolation from information technology, and in this connection, Georgia, as some other post-Soviet countries, is developing media education on the basis of digital technological education. NC for secondary schools 2008-
2009 provided for the integration of information and communication technologies (hereinafter referred to as ICT) in all academic disciplines in order to develop students of the following skills:

- use ICT tools, information and software in compliance with ethics and existing legislation;
- show a positive attitude towards ICT tools as an important tool for cooperation, deepening one’s knowledge, realization of one’s interests and aspirations, fruitful work;
- use ICT in publishing and other creative activities, for publishing various messages, posts to communicate with peers, teachers, and for sharing the information with the wider community;
- use ICT tools to obtain information from various sources, its further evaluation and analysis, as well as information storage, data processing and analysis, and sharing with other users.

The goal of an integrated ICT course in NC 2008-2009 was to educate “a person who can independently find information, manage it, evaluate, analyze and, relying on it, make decisions independently... in order to realize their responsibility to the interests and traditions and the values of their country; create values yourself and contribute to the development of society” (National Curriculum, 2019). It can be correlated with the goal of modern media education, aimed at the development of creative, communication skills, critical thinking, perception, interpretation, analysis and evaluation of media texts, teaching various forms of expression with the help of media technology (Fedorov, 2001: 38).

In the 2011-2016 NUP media literacy competencies are emerging along with digital information competencies. ICT stands out as a separate mandatory subject within the subject group of technologies. According to Article 43 of Order No. 36 / N. dated March 11, 2011 “On approval of the National Curriculum 2011-2016”, the goal of this group of disciplines is to help students increase the level of media and digital competence; mastering specific technologies in various fields and developing the skills necessary to apply these technologies both in integrated training with another subject and through autonomous training (Order of the Ministry..., 2011). In this context, the formation of media competence comes down to elementary computer literacy. The Article 48 of the same document deals with the nine so-called cross-disciplinary priority competences, the development of which is defined as critical for self-realization and integration in the modern world. The second place is taken by “media erudition” - the ability, on the one hand, to perceive, interpret, apply and create multimedia texts of different types and forms, and on the other hand, the ability to orient in the media space, select and critically evaluate the information received contributes to the development of critical thinking. The development of priority competences is provided along with specific ones within the framework of various subjects. Meanwhile the NC 2011-2016 emphasizes the importance of media in the modern world as the most powerful cultural weapon that encompasses all spheres of human life (National Curriculum, 2019).

Continuing the process of reforming the education system, in May 2018, the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia presented a new National Curriculum 2018-2024, which provides for the introduction of NC at the elementary level in the 2018-2019 academic year, and in the 2019-2020 academic year - at the middle level of school education. Among the target competencies within the educational program, digital literacy and media literacy are identified. The latter is regarded as a combination of knowledge and skills necessary for media analysis, methods of their production, as well as critically evaluating their impact on the recipient of information. This knowledge and skills will provide the ability to create media products of all genres and forms in the media space (National Curricula, 2019).
Along with media literacy, the new NC involves the development of digital literacy - knowledge of social, ethical and safety standards in the use of information technology. According to the plan, by the end of Grade 2, students should know that the texts they have created - verbal texts, drawings, music pieces, photo and video materials - are their intellectual property. By the end of grade 4, students should learn to respect texts created by other people and use them with the permission of the author, for example, their classmate, and publish their own texts in a protected media environment. At the final stage of primary general education, by the end of grade 6, students should realize that when using any materials, it is necessary to refer to their author and to avoid plagiarism.

It should be noted that Article 76 of the NC 2018-24 in the ICT standard specifies free educational electronic resources recommended for use in teaching and learning. Among them, there is Scratch (Scratch, 2019), an educational non-commercial project of the Lifelong Kindergarten research group aimed at educating children, providing resources for learning and self-expression using information technologies in 150 countries around the world in 40 languages. With Scratch, you can create your own interactive stories, games, and animations, and then share your creations with other people in the online community. To date, the project has about 36 million registered users.

Since 2013, another international project, Code (Code, 2019) has been successfully developing, recommended for Georgian schoolchildren and teachers. In collaboration with the ministries of education of many countries, with international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the project’s developers and partners are trying to make IT the part and parcel of the international educational discourse so that schoolchildren could be taught to do intellectually complex things communicated to them in an entertaining way.

The purposeful search for teaching methods in the context of globalization and technical progress of the modern level is fully justified. However, moral education should be an integral part of the learning process. In his interview to Sputnik Georgia magazine, Paata Amonashvili, an outstanding Georgian teacher, doctor of psychological sciences, a writer and developer of school programs, rightly notes that any technique is a tool for achieving certain goals, and any tool requires some skills to use it. The introduction of additional technologies in schools is, of course, the right direction, it cannot be otherwise. But it would make me happy if students were taught how to properly manage these tools. For they also have the power to destroy a person, a soul. It is necessary not only to equip children with technology, but also to empower them how to use this technology in a humanist, constructive way (Amonashvili, 2019).

In 2019, according to the current Minister of Education of Georgia, Mikhail Batiashvili, the Model of New School was tested in 50 schools - an educational environment that will give every student the opportunity to realize their personal potential and provide the knowledge and skills needed in the 21st century. “The new education reform is aimed at ensuring the development of integrated thinking among schoolchildren. It is important not only to provide students with knowledge, but also to develop their analytical and critical thinking. The development of creative abilities is just as important” (Minobrazovaniya Gruzii..., 2019). At the first stage computer classes have been updated in these schools, equipped with Internet and Wi-Fi. Further on it is planned to introduce electronic educational resources with the support of Microsoft and Tallinn University (Estonia) and thereby ensure that children from an early age can get involved in the field of programming and technology.

Thus, since 2019, in schools participating in the pilot project, primary school students have begun to learn IT using the Finnish textbook Hello, Ruby, translated into Georgian. In addition to the textbook, a board game and a special online application
designed to inform students about threats in the media space and the rules for safe use of the Internet will be created.

*Hello, Ruby* is just one of five planned for the 2019-2020 school year media education projects. At the end of 2018 in Georgia, the Department of Media Literacy headed by H. Ivanishvili was established. The Department’s priority task is to develop a national online platform on media education. With the support of the British expert Martina Chapman, a media literacy strategy has been developed, aimed at developing skills such as “the basics of computer science; evaluation and analysis of the information received (online content); recognition of false information (misinformation, propaganda, harmful information); critical assessment of the source of information and determination of the possible motivation of the author; effective and safe participation in activities based on electronic resources” (Kako budet..., 2019).

By 2023, 2 thousand schools in the country should be transferred to the new model of school education. The obvious fact is that any reform involves appropriate financial funding. In 2019, it is planned to allocate a significant part of the country’s budget (about 10% of GDP) to education: 750.5 million lari (more than $281 million) for school and preschool education, 167 million lari (more than $62.5 million) for higher education (Kako budet..., 2019). By comparison, in 2017, the budget of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia amounted to 3.1% of GDP (Georgien, Daten & Analysen, 2017). Significant financial support is also provided by foreign partners. Thus, in the framework of the US *Millennium Challenge Account* program (http://www.mcageorgia.ge), in 2014 alone, 140 million dollars were invested in the Georgian education system, of which 76.5 million in schools, 16 million in secondary vocational education and 30 million in higher education programs, namely, cooperation programs between American and Georgian universities, including three Tiflis (Tbilisi) state universities (Georgien, Daten & Analysen, 2017).

The reform process in Georgia has also involved preschool education. The reform is aimed at personal development of preschoolers, the introduction of new curricula, retraining of teachers and the creation of electronic resources for parents. The main purpose of early and preschool education has become the preparation for school.

In response to challenges in the field of higher education in the General Strategy for Education and Science for 2017-2024, three strategic objectives are identified: modernization and quality of higher education, lifelong learning and universal access to quality education (Unified ..., 2017: 32). It seems to be impossible to ensure the quality of higher education in modern conditions outside of media literacy education. Speaking of professional media education, American experts state that “media educators in Georgia lack resources, in-depth knowledge of emerging multimedia platforms, the latest tools, and subject-matter expertise to provide quality training in journalism. This lack of capability and skills, coupled with scarce resources mainly in the field of new technologies, impede the creation and utilization of comprehensive, cross-disciplinary, and relevant curricula based on fundamental journalistic competencies” (Georgian Media Education Program, 2019). In this regard, on the website of the US Embassy in Georgia in July 2018, the program “Strengthening journalism education in Georgia” (Media educational program, 2019) was announced. $250,000 has been allocated for the implementation of this program to support the professional development of Georgian media educators in state and non-state universities.

Despite the fact that Georgia lacks the latest technologies, traditional ones are being implemented, namely, future journalists are actively involved in professional activities from their student hood. So, on the basis of the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA), the radio station employs graduate students of the university.

In addition to traditional media, new digital media are rapidly developing in
Georgia today. This process is directly related to providing access to the global network in the country. Today, there are more than 755 thousand Internet subscribers and about 160 Internet providers in Georgia.

Since 2013, the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) has helped Georgian professional journalists and youth, interested in mass media, to explore new media technologies based on the capabilities of the global network as part of the G-Media program, funded by the USAID - US Agency for International Development. According to the head of one of the directions of the G-Media IREX program, Dachi Grdzelishvili, you do not need an expensive computer and a sophisticated software to work on the Internet, the main thing is the ability to use the appropriate tool. In the framework of the New Media Initiative (INM) program, employees of 13 regional media were trained to work with the latest Internet technologies. IREX also financed the educational courses of journalism for schoolchildren, which, on the one hand, allowed the regional media to act in a new capacity - as a media education organization, and on the other hand, the students were able to get an idea of the real work of the media (Keshelashvili, 2013).

Last year, the Georgian National Communications Commission (GNCC) launched the Media Literacy project. To begin with, in May 2018, an American media expert, professor at the University of Long Island, Mitch Semel, held a two-day workshop for journalists. On the eve of this event, the chairman of the National Commission, Kakha Bekauri announced the creation of Media Academy in Georgia to increase media literacy in the country. The commission plans to develop media literacy in four directions: 1. A 3-6-month course for media managers, producers and journalists. The goal of the course is to assist media representatives to increase the knowledge and qualification of multimedia content. 2. The development of media criticism that will help journalists and producers in their work and to function as a guide for consumers to choose which media products to use. 3. Raising awareness of consumers in order to help them distinguish real and fake news and good and poor quality products. 4. Creation of Media Lab, which will support and fund start-ups in digital media. Start-uppers who develop interesting projects in the direction of digital media will be given a chance to receive funding from Media lab (Morrison, 2010).

It should be noted the close cooperation in the field of media education of the National Cinema Center of Georgia with the Ministries of Education and Justice. Since 2013, the project “Cinema at School” has been implemented with the purpose of enlightenment through films and the development of creative abilities of schoolchildren, in which 211 schools, including rural ones, schools in borderline and remote regions of Georgia, have demonstrated films for children with further discussion and analysis with experts’ participation. In 2015, in addition to schools, the Crime Prevention Center joined the project. Film expert Nino Mkheidze ran film screenings for troubled teenagers (Project..., 2015). On the website of another project of the Georgian National Film Center "Cinema at School" reports on its work from 2014 to 2018 are published (Project..., 2015). The goal of the project was to teach young people to analyze audiovisual texts. The project involved hundreds of Georgian schools (altogether about 4,5 thousand film screenings were attended by over 46 thousand students), students not only watched and discussed films, got acquainted with famous cinematographers, but also filmed short videos, drew posters, took photographs, etc. The project also promoted the creation of school film clubs.

Some regional initiatives also produce interesting projects. The Discussion Club Gori funded by the municipal authorities, set up the two day festival of documentary films “Art for Human Rights”. As the title suggests, topics ranged from human rights and political regimes to racism, migration, etc. After each film, the discussion of specific social problems in Georgia with guest speakers, experts and public activists, school students, took place (Aptsiauri, 2013).

Georgian media education activists encourage schoolchildren not only to discuss films, but to produce them as well. At the art school in Nikozi, children create animated films. In this frontier village, on the initiative of Metropolitan of Nikozsk and Tskhinvali
Isaiah, an annual festival of animated films is held. During the period of his secular life, Metropolitan Isaiah studied animation at the University of Theater and Cinema named after Shota Rustaveli (Svanidze, 2014).

As part of the ongoing educational reform, it is planned to create new and develop existing electronic educational resources. For example, upon the initiative of the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport of Georgia and with the support of LEPL - Educational Management Information System, a web portal EL (EF Portal, 2018) was created, which provides educational and cognitive resources created and provided by its partners aimed at simplifying the teaching process, fundamental study of the issues, development of creative thinking, raising motivation. The portal contains such educational and edutainment resources as e-books, video and photo materials, etc. In addition to receiving information, users can participate in discussion, ask questions, leave comments, and suggest new topics for discussion. The Caucasus Network for Children (CNC), founded in 2013 by the Education Support Program of the Open Society Foundations initiated the "Introduction in Media literacy" and "Media literacy for teachers" courses. "Introduction in Media Literacy" is an open, free access course intended for high school pupils, students, and everyone interested, aimed at learning the theories of media literacy, how the media affects human opinion, attitudes and behaviour. According to their data, more than 90 people have accomplished this course. The distance learning blended course of "Media Literacy" is intended for teachers and equips them with methodical material and use practice (The Caucasus Network, 2018).

The educational foundation portal Educare Georgia (Educare Georgia, 2018) as the main goal defines the activities to ensure the availability of world-class education through the Internet and modern technologies for everyone. The project is aimed at creating electronic educational resources, translating them into Georgian and popularizing in Georgia, teaching schoolchildren, students and teachers to use modern technologies, expanding access to the Internet. The authors of the project are convinced that it is education that is the main means of reducing poverty and developing the country; that everyone can get a quality education regardless of gender, age, nationality, place of residence, financial and physical capabilities, and make all possible efforts to acquaint Georgian students and teachers with international resources and online platforms that allow them to listen to lectures by specialists from leading universities in the world.

On the way to its goals, Educare Georgia initiates various projects. For example, under the leadership of Georgy Dzhibladze, the social platform Charte.ge (Charte.ge, 2018) has been operating since August 2017, where anyone can donate some money to pay for the Internet connection in rural areas or buy a computer for students who cannot afford it. According to the authors of this project, in Georgia today there are about 78 thousand children in need of such support. The project started in the Tsilkan settlement and Tserovani and today has about 470 participants.

One of the most popular trends in media education in Georgia is teaching to identify fake news. For example, Georgian, Moldovan and Ukrainian students participated in media literacy camps, as part of the Strengthening Independent Media project in 2016. While declaring their mission as “to increase citizens’ access to reliable information about local, regional, and international issues of public importance”, in fact, the thread that runs through this course is “defense” against “Russian propaganda”, - “all 3 countries are affected by propaganda and fake news, especially from the Russian government,” Angela Sirbu, Project Director of the Strengthening Independent Media in Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine project says (Gugunishvili, 2018). “We expected students to learn how to recognize quality media content as well as manipulative and fake news, and how to react if the press misinforms the public”. The project director’s words are very symptomatic for current political situation when Russian media are being labeled as “biased”, and
“manipulative”, while labeling is, in fact, one of the media manipulation techniques, and according to Cultivation media theory (Gerbner, 1998), repetition of the same message, does lead to imposing certain attitudes and beliefs in the audience’s minds. Thus, cultivating just one issue of media literacy (such as critical evaluation of information) using just one case study (“Russian soft power”, “Kremlin propaganda”) the authors of such courses deliberately limit media competence development of their students, using the manipulative technique of mainstreaming the audience’s thinking into one direction, and misguiding them to believe that media propaganda is only inherent to Russian media. The organizers of the camp proudly declare that by the end of the course “students were better able to identify the functions of different web tools and how to use them; demonstrated a better knowledge of how Russia uses the information space; and proved that they learned some practical information on internet security” (Gugunishvili, 2018). The legitimate question arises, why Russia becomes the one and only target of their research? Why are other countries’ media not analyzed? Does it mean all of them are unbiased and do not produce politically engaged media messages? Significantly, media education theory reminds us that one of the most important questions when analyzing a message is “What is omitted from the message? Why? How does this selection affect the message’s impact?” The above selection is obviously biased against a single country’s media.

As a result of the analysis of the development and main perspective directions of media education in Georgia (1992–2019), the following conclusions can be drawn.

Georgia seeks to adapt the country’s education system to the global community and to fully integrate into the European educational space. At the state level in Georgia today we can witness the awareness of the stipulation of providing media education as an integral constituent of quality education at all levels. However, it is not enough to realize the need for the media education skills among the population, it is necessary to create conditions for this. According to the General Strategy for Education and Science for 2017-2024, there is a significant difference and lag between the various socio-economic strata within the country, as well as between urban and rural, Georgian and non-Georgian schools. Most teachers use information technologies only for simple communication and conduct lessons in traditional way, which only confirms the unsatisfactory level of competence in the field of media education and ICT (United Strategy...2017).

The process of the development of media education in Georgia as a whole proceeds according to the same scenario as in other countries - former republics of the Soviet Union. At the first stage, the need for IT-technologies is formed, which becomes an integral part of all spheres of social activity. Then comes the understanding that the introduction of technology alone is not enough, it is necessary to prepare the population for its use. Thus, the need for technologically competent users is shaped. Then, naturally, a need for obtaining the next level of competence - media competence arises, which is formed in the process of media education. It can be argued that at the moment in Georgia, with the support of the state and the international community of sponsors, media education is developing in all major directions, as distinguished by A. Fedorov (Fedorov, 2014).

1) media education of future professionals - journalists, cinematographers, editors, producers, etc., for example, the 2018 Strengthening Journalism Education in Georgia program, the G-Media 2013 International Research and Exchanges Program (IREX), GIPA radio on the basis of the Georgian Institute of Public Development;

2) media education of future teachers in universities, pedagogical institutes, in the process of advanced training of teachers of universities and schools in media culture courses - mandatory advanced training programs for teachers of all levels of education according to the General Education Strategy 2017-2024, National Curricula, etc.;

3) media education as part of the secondary and higher education, which, in turn,
can be integrated with traditional disciplines or autonomous (special, elective, club, etc.) - ICT, integrated across the disciplines in the NC 2008, and the standard of mandatory self-discipline ICT in the NC 2011 and 2018, the project of the National Cinema Center of Georgia *Cinema at School* 2014-2018;

4) media education in institutions of additional education and leisure centers (community and youth centers, art clubs, drama and music centers, etc. - Festival of animated films in Nikozi 2014;

5) distant media education of schoolchildren, students and adults through television, radio, mass online courses - projects of the Georgian public television and radio broadcasting (GPB); the Georgian National Communications Commission (GNCC) Media Literacy 2018;

6) independent / continuous media education (lifelong learning) - projects of the Educational Foundation Georgia Education, the festival of documentary films *Art for Human Rights* in Gori, 2013.

More and more structures are becoming interested in raising the level of media literacy of all segments of the population of Georgia. Notably, the most significant projects are initiated and funded by foreign agents, such as the U.S.Embassy (Media Literacy project, Georgian Media Partnership program, Emerging Filmmakers Training, English Language Training for Media in Georgia, Media Educational program, etc. (U.S.Embassy in Georgia, 2018), Open Society Foundation (The Caucasus Network for Children), Stiftung für Internationale Rechtliche Zusammenarbeit e.V.Ubierring (Media Societies - Georgia 2018), Embassy of the Netherlands in Tbilisi (Program Promoting Media Literacy and Critical Thinking in Schools (The Media Development..., 2018), Deutsche Welle Akademie (Myth Detector Lab for Media Literacy), The German Marshall Fund of the United States (Kremlin Influence Index, 2017). Against this background, we just have to hope that new Georgian media educators are aware that educational initiatives funded by foreign foundations act as a “soft power” tool. The role of authentic media education resources and curricular should be strengthened as an effective tool for ensuring effective lifelong education of citizens and sustainable development of the independent democratic State of Georgia.

**Dissertation Researches on Media Literacy Education in Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)**

From 1960 to 2019, about six hundred theses on media literacy education were defended in the USSR and in the CIS countries, of which about five hundred theses were defended in the XXI century. Meanwhile, the dynamics of the research defense on media literacy education is as follows: from 1960 to 1969 – 15; from 1970 to 1979 – 22; from 1980 to 1991 – 37; from 1992 to 1999 – 38; from 2000 to 2009 – 151, from 2010 to 2019 – 324. Therefore, with the exception of some stagnation (explainable by the general decline in the number of scientific research in the CIS countries in all sciences) in the 1990s, it is possible to trace a consistent increase in the number of dissertations of media education topics (moreover, in the second decade of the XXI there were twice as many as in the first).

The CIS countries are significantly lagging behind Russia in the number of dissertations on media literacy education, where 364 dissertations were defended in the post-Soviet era. In Ukraine, from 1992 to 2019, 128 dissertation researches were carried out. In the rest of the CIS countries (except the Russian Federation and Ukraine) together, their number is much lower: 21.
Table 1. The number of dissertations on media literacy education defended in the USSR and CIS in 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The USSR</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CIS countries</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009, we examined the content of dissertation research on media literacy education topics carried out in Russia, and eventually we made a forecast for their further intensive growth (Fedorov, 2009: 56). The data in Table 1 irrefutably indicate the forecast’s correctness: from 2010 to 2019, in the Russian Federation alone, there were defended 2.7 times more dissertations on the topic of media education than from 2000 to 2009. Our assumptions that, after 2009, social studies and cultural studies theories will prevail in the media literacy education research field (Fedorov, 2009: 55) have also been affirmed: there were forty theses in 2010–2019, while 2010–2019 – 127, that is, three times more (see data in Table 2).

However, T.B. Isakova argues that her “content analysis of dissertation abstracts shows that the hypothesis (put forward by us in an article in 2009 – A.F.) that the number of dissertation research on media education will grow steadily – has not been confirmed. The share of research in the scientific specialty 10.01.10. Journalism devoted to the problems of media education is less than 1 %. The hypothesis that dominant approaches to media education will be social and cultural studies theories and the corresponding tasks has not been confirmed either. Nor have we identified a convergence of research topics in the field of media education, media criticism and journalism, which had been suggested by A.V. Fedorov. Only one study is devoted to media criticism” (Isakova, 2019: 113–117).

As we see, the research approach implemented by T.B. Isakova contains a significant methodological mistake: in our 2009 article we explored the entire pool of Russian dissertation research on the subject of media education (the largest group traditionally belonging to dissertations on Education/Pedagogy), while T.B. Isakova is trying to refute our conclusions only on the basis of the content analysis of the theses on journalism, thus overlooking the fact that the dissertations of the media education defended in these years could be (and were) attributed to Pedagogy/Education and Philology, also Art Studies, Sociology, Philosophy and other sciences.

In addition, in the 2009 article, we did not predict a sharp increase in the number of dissertations synthesizing media pedagogy, media criticism and journalism. We only assumed that “the tendency of rapprochement of research topics in the field of media pedagogy, media criticism and journalism” will be continued (Fedorov, 2009: 55). Our content analysis of 246 Russian dissertations of media literacy education topics of 2010–2019 shows that this is exactly what happened: the number of dissertations synthesizing media pedagogical, media critical and journalistic approaches accounted for 4.5 % of the total number of studies.

Unfortunately, a superficial approach to studying the development of media literacy education in the USSR and the CIS countries in recent years is not uncommon. For example, consistently proceeding from the priority of “media activity”, I.V. Zhilavskaya, in our opinion, precipitously asserts that “the overwhelming majority of scientific articles and dissertations that somehow affect issues of media education are in the field of pedagogy and practically do not explore the productive function of media education in relation to the
media phenomenon” (Zhilavskaya, 2009: 104–105). Most likely, this statement is connected with a clearly insufficient awareness of the history of media literacy education development both in the USSR, Russia, and worldwide. After all, it was the “productive function of media education” that provided the foundation for pedagogical models in both Soviet and post–Soviet times (see, for example: Bozhkov, 1983; Genkin, 1985; Khilko, 1999; Petrova, 1995; Shkolnik, 1999; Simakov, 2008; Zatuchny, 1993, etc.).

However, apparently lacking time to study this fruitful experience, I.V. Zhilavskaya (co–authored with D.A. Zubritskaya) writes that in the USSR “active practical work in schools, universities, and film clubs, was carried out by film educators Y.N. Usov, I.S. Levshin, Z.S. Smelkov, Y.M. Rabinovich, S.N. Penzin, O.A. Baranov, S.M. Ivanov, E.V. Gorbulin, E.N. Goryukhin” (Zhilavskaya, Zubritskaya, 2017: 50), thus turning Elvira Goryukhina (1932–2018), Inna Levshina (1932–2009), Zinaida Smelkova, Svetlana Ivanova and Evdokia Gorbulina into male researchers. The question arises if I.V. Zhilavskaya and D.A. Zubritskaya have actually studied their work.

The above awkward mistakes occur on the 85–pages–long teaching manual for university students “History of Media Education Development” (Zhilavskaya, Zubritskaya, 2017), which actually is the rendering of three monographs, published by our research team (Fedorov, Chelysheva, 2002; Fedorov, Novikova, 2005; Fedorov et al., 2014).

Sadly, publications on media literacy education that are being published in Russia in recent years, do contain cases of conscious plagiarism. Thus, the textbook for universities “Media Education and Informative–Communicative technologies in Higher Education” (Kulikova, Narzissova, 2018) was checked by a Plagiarism Detection Software and showed an upsetting result: 49.5 % of the text is “borrowed”. Most of this illegally borrowed half of the text is taken from our works, published long before this “textbook”. Meanwhile, plagiarizing our texts, S.V. Kulikova and S.Y. Narzissova carefully preserved all references to the works of foreign and Russian media educators that had been used in these texts. To its credit, Moscow Publishing House of International Independent Environmental and Political University promptly responded to our criticism of the book by S.V. Kulikova and S.Y. Narzissova, sent an official letter of apology declaring that the above mentioned authors will no longer be allowed to publish works in their publishing house.

On the other hand, it is gratifying that the Russian media educational research and practical experience has been in demand as the practical training aid for media literacy developed by IREX Europe project in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan for media and information literacy (Shturkhetsky, 2018: 99-101; 133-135), which ethically correct refers to our research of previous years. This tutorial was included in the pool of publications recommended for use in the CIS countries and posted on the online media and information literacy platform in the CIS countries MediaSabak (Online ..., 2019), including, among other things, links to our team’s articles in the journal Media Education.

Our research group’s contribution to media education development also receives acclaim in the monograph “Conceptual Relationship of Information Literacy and Media Literacy in Knowledge Societies” (2013), published by UNESCO (Gendina, 2013: 102–128). But in general, it should be noted that there is very few research analyzing the development of media education in the CIS countries, is published in Western European countries.

Theoretical models and theories of media literacy education

In relation to research in the field of media literacy education, we proposed the following conventional classification system for theoretical models of media literacy education:

– socio–cultural, cultural models (social, cultural development of a creative person in terms of perception, imagination, visual memory, interpretation, analysis, critical thinking
in relation to the media texts of any types and genres, etc.);
  – practical–utilitarian models (practical study and use of media equipment as technical means of teaching and / or creating media texts of various types and genres);
  – educational and ethical models (consideration of moral, ethical, psychological, ideological, religious, philosophical problems on the media material);
  – aesthetic models (focused primarily on the development of artistic taste and analysis of the best examples of media culture).

Certainly, the proposed classification of media literacy education models (Tables 2, 3) is rather conditional, since the studies often observe diffusion processes of combining models of several types.

The content analysis of dissertations on the subject of media literacy education, defended in the USSR, Russia and the CIS countries from 1960 to 2019, shows that until the beginning of the XXI century there was a parity between practical–utilitarian and aesthetic models used in dissertation research on media literacy education. But in the 21st century, aesthetic models in accordance with worldwide trends (but with a delay of about twenty years) began to lose their positions, while social and cultural studies models began to dominate, marginalizing even such popular practices as hands–on/practical ones.

A surge of interest in social and cultural studies approaches to media literacy education (they account for about 44 % of the total number of studies on media education in 2000–2019), which happened in the CIS countries only in the 21st century, can be associated with intensive international exchange of scientific ideas, significant growth of the share of interdisciplinary research related to a broad social and cultural contexts.

An analysis of media education dissertations (1960–2019) from the point of view of media literacy education theories used in them shows that they generally fit into the previously identified (Fedorov, 2001, 2009) dominant theoretical media literacy education models (with dominating social, cultural, practical, and aesthetic theories). Reliance on the ideological and semiotic theories of media literacy education and the theory of the development of critical thinking has manifested itself in the dissertation research of the USSR and the CIS countries to a minimum degree, although these theories have been used in many dissertations as auxiliary.

We believe that a low percentage of dissertations of the theory of the development of critical thinking is due to the fact that the development of analytical thinking in relation to media culture in the Soviet period was not encouraged by the ruling regime, as well as the use of semiotic approaches.

In our opinion, a small number of dissertations on media literacy education, relying on ideological theory, can be explained by the fact that most of the Soviet media educators in 1960–1991 sought to distance their research from the ideological component, and based, primarily on practical and aesthetic theory of media education. Intensive disruption of socialist life format in the 1990s also diminished the role of the ideological theory in media literacy education research in the CIS countries.

The quite popular among practitioners, protective / innoculatory theory of media literacy education was used in only 37 works defended in post–Soviet Russia and in 19 of the rest of the CIS countries, thus reflecting the global trend: for over 50 years the researchers worldwide (Buckingham, 2013: 5–18; Fedorov, 2003; Hobbs, 2010, etc.) have asserted that it is useless to defend against media; on the contrary, media should be analyzed in a broad sociocultural context.
Table 2. Theoretical models and theories used in Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research on media literacy education topics 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social, cultural (based on social and cultural studies media education theory)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practically utilitarian (based on practical theory of media education)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical, protective (based on ethical and protectionist theories)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic (based on aesthetic, art theories of media education)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Theoretical models and theories used in Ph.D. dissertation research on media literacy education topics defended in the CIS countries in 1992–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant media education theories and models</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education defended in CIS countries (1992–2019)</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social, cultural (based on social and cultural studies media education theory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practically utilitarian (based on practical theory of media education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical, protective (based on ethical and protectionist theories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic (based on aesthetic, art theories of media education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Media education objectives

Analysis of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education, defended in the 1990s and the first two decades of the 21st century in the CIS countries, shows that they were aimed at developing the understanding and skills of analyzing the social, cultural, political, ethical, psychological, and economic implications of media and media culture products. This objective, which is extremely important for cultural, sociocultural, aesthetic, educational and ethical models of media education, dominated about half of the scientific works.

The second place (33 %) is occupied by the objective of teaching a person about the practical use of media (including the creation of media products / media texts), which fully
correlates with the practical–utilitarian model of media education.

Such objectives as expanding the knowledge on the theory and history of media culture and media literacy education, that were in low demand in the 20th century, began to gain more substantial weight in the 21st century. This phenomenon can probably be explained by the fact that after a long period of understanding the empirical media educational experience, the time has come for researchers of a systematizing, generalizing, regional geographic, and scientific nature. It is no coincidence that it was in the 21st century that dissertations on the theory of media culture were successfully defended in the CIS countries (Arkhangelsky, 2009; Baranova, 2019; Bozhedarov, 2005; Bytirina, 2009; Chionova, 2012; Demchenko, 2011; Demchenko, 2011; Dzyaloshinsky, 2013; Grigorov, 2014; Grigorov, 2014; Kashkina, 2012; Kirillova, 2005; Korochensky, 2003; Orohovska, 2015; Polyakova, 2015; Rudnichenko, 2009; Tsymbalenko, 2012; Urazova, 2012; Vaganova, 2003; Vozchikov, 2007; Zrazhevska, 2012 and others) and history media literacy education (Chelysheva, 2002; Gorbatkova, 2015; Khudoleeva, 2006; Kolesnichenko, 2007; Mikhailova, 2012; Mosina, 2009; Novikova, 2000; Pechinkina, 2008; Roslyak, 2004; Yurova, 2015, etc.).

**Media material**

The content analysis of dissertations on the subject of media literacy education, defended in the USSR, Russia and the CIS countries from 1960 to 2019, allows us to elaborate tables 4-5, the data of which show that up to the beginning of the 1990s the most popular media material used in dissertations research on media education was the cinema: in the USSR, on average, 62 % of studies from 1960 to 1991 were based on cinematographic material. Television, radio, sound recordings (25 %), the press (7 %), the synthesis of several types of media (7 %) and other media (4 %) reside on more moderate positions (Fedorov, 2009).

Apparently, the Soviet media educators, largely focused on the aesthetic model of media literacy education, sought during this time period to make the most of the artistic media texts. Therefore it was the cinema that was becoming the favourite media material. Moreover, media educators who used to actively employ practical model of media literacy education, in the 1960s – 1980s also preferred to rely on the traditional and familiar film material.

In the period between 1960s – 1980s, amateur (school, student, etc.) press was developing very actively, the number of students involved in the process of creating newspapers and magazines significantly exceeded the audiences involved in film literacy education. It would seem that, against this background, it was the amateur press that was supposed to be the main material for media literacy education research, but this did not happen, because media educators engaged in media literacy education on the press material were much less focused on research activities than their counterparts in film pedagogy. This was reflected in the imbalance of dissertations: from 1960 to 1991, 45 media educational Ph.D. dissertations were defended on the cinematic material in the USSR and only 5 on the material of the press. And although in post–Soviet Russia two dozen dissertations were defended on the material of the press, their number is still inferior to the number of dissertations on the material of cinema and television (about forty dissertations).

In addition, since the 1990s (at first rather timidly), computers and the Internet have also become the material for dissertations on the topic of media education. Personal computers and the Internet came to mass consumers in the CIS countries with a significant delay compared with the West, but in the 21st century the share of this material in media education dissertation research reached 17 %.

In the 1990s, another new trend emerged for the first time – the first place in terms of the number of dissertations was material based on the synthesis of various media. The
21st century convincingly consolidated this tendency: among the materials of dissertations on media education, media synthesis came out in the first place by a large margin, while the Internet and computers were firmly established in second place. In the 21st century, the share of the press, cinema, television, radio combined as material for the dissertation research of media education in the CIS countries accounted for only 14 %, while the dissertations based on the synthesis of various types of media accounted for about 62 % protected from 2000 to 2019. There is undeniable logic in this: the 21st century has become the century of intensive development of multimedia technologies.

**Table 4.** Media material used in Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research on media on media literacy education topics 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media material used in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education (1960–2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print press</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television, radio, audio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer applications, Internet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of various media</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.** Media material used in CIS countries Ph.D. dissertation research on media on media literacy education topics 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media material used in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education (1992–2019) in CIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print press</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television, radio, audio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer applications, Internet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of various media</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autonomy and / or integration**

An analysis of media literacy education theses from 1960–2019 (see data in Tables 6-7) shows that the number of studies on integrated media literacy education in research in the 21st century has significantly exceeded research papers based on autonomous media education. The trend of research in the 21st century has also shown a rapid increase in the number of dissertation research based on the synthesis of autonomous and integrated media literacy education types: from 1960 to 1999, only 22 of this type of dissertations were written, in the 21st century (in all CIS countries as a whole) – 197.

In the post–Soviet period, 19.9 % of researchers in the CIS countries preferred an autonomous type of media literacy education (basic courses, special courses, electives, clubs, etc.), and 40.1 % – integrated with core / basic disciplines. 40.0 % of researchers
relied on the synthesis of autonomous and integrated types of media education (with the dominant integration and synthesis characteristic of both Russia and the other CIS countries).

Back in 2003, we conducted a survey of 26 experts (from 10 countries of the world) in the field of media literacy education (Fedorov, 2003), in which the synthetic way of introducing media literacy education was distinguished as the most effective by 61.5% of the surveyed experts. The integrated type of media education was supported by 30.7% of international experts, and autonomous – by only 7.7%. The differences in the approaches are obvious, but the data in Tables 6-7 demonstrate that the interest of media on media literacy education researchers in the CIS countries of the 21st century to the synthesis of autonomous and integrated types is clearly increasing. In any case, it is the years 2000–2019 that witness the peak of media on media literacy education focused on the synthetic path of its implementation.

Based on this, it can be assumed that in future years in the CIS countries all three of the above mentioned types will be preserved, since each of them has its own advantages and specifics. For example, the training of media professionals (or media competent teachers) is impossible without autonomous media on media literacy education training courses, and in a school environment, integrated media on media literacy education is more preferable.

Table 6. Autonomous or integrated type of media on media literacy education used in Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of media literacy teaching used in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated with other subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of autonomous and integrated types</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Autonomous or integrated type of media on media literacy education used in Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research in 1992–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of media literacy teaching used in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education (1992–2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated with other subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis of autonomous and integrated types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutions
The content analysis of theses (Tables 8–9) shows that from 1960 to 2009, the main type of institutions used for experimental work in the field of media literacy education were schools. However, in the period from 2010 to 2019, higher educational institutions
(30.1%) and a complex of several institutions (12.7%) start to dominate as experimental platforms for research in the CIS countries, marginalizing schools to the third place (9.2%). The fourth place at this time were media agencies. A generally insignificant part of research experimental sites for media literacy education in the USSR and the CIS countries throughout the period from 1960 to 2019 were pre-school and secondary specialized educational institutions. In the XXI century, for example, five dissertations on the material of preschool institutions in the CIS countries were defended, and even less on the material of secondary specialized educational institutions – four. It may be here that there is a prospect for research due to the specificity of these institutions.

Detailed content analysis of the theses shows that a dramatic increase in the share of universities, as types of institutions used as an experimental base by scientists and media educators of the CIS countries in 2000–2019, can be explained, in particular, by the fact that in the 21st century researchers that the wide development of media education in schools is impossible without media–competent teachers. Consequently, the interest in research on the basis of universities and departments of education grew.

Table 8. Type of institutions used as an experimental site by Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research of media literacy education topics from 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized secondary education establishments (colleges)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre–school institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary education institutions (community centers, cultural centers, clubs)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, Media centers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Type of institutions used as an experimental site by Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research of media literacy education topics from 1992–2019 in the CIS countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education (1992–2019) in the CIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized secondary education establishments (colleges)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre–school institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age groups

The content analysis of dissertations (Tables 10-11) demonstrate that up till the early XXI century the main age group of media audiences researched in Russian Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education, were school pupils. However, then the situation changed in favour of university students. Meanwhile, the focus of media literacy education research conducted at schools is aimed at pupils of middle school and high school, while elementary school pupils and students of specialized secondary education institutions (colleges) remain the less “researched” audience for media competence development. Adult audiences also belong to somewhat neglected groups.

**Table 10.** Age groups of media audiences, participating in researches by Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education in 1960–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups of media audiences participating in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertation on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-schoolers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school pupils on the whole</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and university students on the whole</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult audience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences of different age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11.** Age groups of media audiences, participating in Ph.D. researches on media literacy education in the CIS countries in 1992–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups of media audiences participating in</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education in the CIS (1992–2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-schoolers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High school pupils            2  7  15  0  2  0  0  1  0  27
Secondary school pupils on the whole  4  13  24  0  1  1  1  0  3  47
College students                 0  1  1  0  1  0  0  0  0  3
University students              4  24  125  4  29  28  0  1  5  220
School and university students on the whole  7  12  14  0  4  2  0  0  0  39
Adult audience                   4  8  20  0  2  5  0  0  1  40
Audiences of different age       2  14  27  6  15  21  0  1  8  94
Total                            27  91  246 10  57  61  1  3  17  513

**Geography of research**

Analysis of the data in Tables 12-13 shows that in the 1960–1980s most of the research on media literacy education was carried out in Moscow (61.9 %). The share of research by scientists working in regions in this period was 22.5 %. However, as early as in the 1990s, the ratio changed significantly: in Russia, the number of regional studies (40.0 %) on the topic of media literacy education was almost equal to their quantity in the capital (46.6 %) (Fedorov, 2009).

The first two decades of the XXI century show that the emerging trend is quite natural. From 2000 to 2019 in Russia, the proportion of Ph.D. dissertations defended by Moscow authors on a topic related to media literacy education decreased to 28.8 %, while the share of regional studies rose sharply to 62.8 %.

In our opinion, such a significant decrease in the number of dissertation research on media literacy education by specialists working in Moscow is due to the following reasons:

– in 2000, two recognized leaders of the Moscow scientific schools of media literacy education (Y.N. Usov and L.S. Zaznobina), who were research advisors for a great number of Ph.D. students, passed away;

– in the post–Soviet time in Moscow (to a much greater extent than the provinces) young people began to quit their work at universities and research institutions, since employment opportunities in the capital city made it possible to leave a low–paying career to a more well–paid one;

– by the beginning of the 21st century, several weighty scientific schools and centers of media literacy education emerged in the Russian regions; on their basis new researches started.

In Ukraine, the situation during the post–Soviet period is somewhat different – there is an approximate parity between research defended in Kiev and in the provinces. In the rest of the CIS countries, dissertations are still defended mostly in capital cities.

**Table 12.** The ratio of Soviet and Russian Ph.D. dissertation research media literacy education topics, carried out in the years 1960–2019 in Moscow, Leningrad / St. Petersburg vs. the regions *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of the media education research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad/St.Petersburg</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* with the consideration of the fact that a number of dissertations that were defended in capital cities had been written and supervised in regional universities.

**Table 13.** The ratio of Ph.D. dissertation research media literacy education topics, carried out in the 1992–2019 годах in Moscow, St. Petersburg vs. the regions CIS capital cities and regional cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of the media education research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education in the CIS (1992–2019)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CIS capital cities</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/provincial cities in CIS countries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The economic crisis of the 1990s, inherent in the post–Soviet period, has undoubtedly affected research in the field of media literacy education: the number of Ph.D. dissertations in the CIS countries on this subject remained approximately at the level of the USSR in the 1980s, while in the Western countries this scientific direction was developing much more intensively. The entrance of new information technologies into the educational process led to the fact that the dissertations that were defended in the CIS countries in the 1990s, used the Internet and computer applications as media education material (Gura, 1994; Kulikova, 1999, Lepskaya, 1999; Moiseeva, 1997; Petrova N. P., 1995; Stolyarevska, 1999, etc.).

The access gained by the post–Soviet scientists to Western studies in the 1990s encouraged the application of socio– and cultural models in media literacy education, along with traditional practical, utilitarian and aesthetic ones (see Tables 2-3). The post–Soviet media literacy education research of the 1990s and the 21st century began to rely to a greater extent on an integrated approach and the synthesis of autonomous and integrated approaches (see Tables 6-7).

In post–Soviet Russia, new regional media literacy education research centers began to emerge (Taganrog, Chelyabinsk, and Yekaterinburg). Grant programs of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, key funds of scientific support (Russian Science Foundation, Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation, etc.) supported media education projects. The Russian experience has greatly influenced the development of media education in the CIS countries (Akhmetova, 2016; Gendina, 2013; Shturkhetskyy, 2018, etc.).

In general, the number of Ph.D. dissertation research in the CIS countries on media literacy education from 2000 to 2019 increased 12 times compared to the period of the 1990s (although this growth is associated with Russia and Ukraine, as for the other CIS countries, the topic of media literacy education was rarely examined in Ph.D. research; media educators of these states focused on conducting seminars and practical training sessions aimed to increase the level of media literacy of citizens).

The research boom in the field of media education that occurs in the 21st century in
Russia and Ukraine, in our opinion, is due to the following reasons:

- rapid expansion of media (primarily computer, audiovisual) throughout the world, including, of course, the CIS countries;
- common understanding that that media culture has a serious impact on the development of a person’s personality and, therefore, must become an integral part of the educational process;
- researchers’ aspiration to find new areas for scientific research, and such an area (among others) in the new millennium of media literacy education;
- drastic expansion of scientific contacts in the post-Soviet era (including via the Internet), which served in particular as the impetus for the exchange of media literacy education ideas between scientists from the CIS and Western countries.

While developing media literacy education models and technologies, researchers from the CIS countries, of course, note a number of significant challenges that the development of media literacy education in the 21st century is facing.

So E.I. Khudoleeva has developed a rather detailed classification of typical problems (socio-political, managerial, organizational, didactic, corporate, professional, social, personal) that the development of media literacy education is facing (Khudoleeva, 2006):

- personal (internal psychological problems, fear of new equipment and technologies; unwillingness to make efforts and spend additional energy to study the possibilities of using new technology in their professional activities);
- social (unsatisfactory level of information development of society; lack of access to electronic information tools for many social groups; technical impossibility of everyone to receive education remotely);
- professional (teachers’ poor media competence; unwillingness and impossibility of experienced teachers to take professional training course in the field of media literacy education);
- corporate (poor development of electronic educational space of educational institutions; insufficient use of distance forms of education; lack of exchange of experience in the development of new technologies through a system of advanced training).

Further, the didactic-organizational problems are highlighted, among which there is an acute shortage of qualified media literacy educators and a lack of motivation of teachers and students.

And finally, the problems of state and social level:

- socio-political: the concept of “media literacy education” for the general public remains obscure; public opinion about the need for media literacy education as a component of general education has not yet been formed;
- managerial: there is no official government demand for the development of mass media literacy education, for the preparation of media educators, therefore, they are trained at universities (with rare exceptions); media literacy education is still not officially integrated into the schooling process (Khudoleeva, 2006: 19).

It seems that these problems are identified reasonably (to some extent they are reflected in the theses defended in the CIS countries from 1992 to 2019), and they are inherent not only to Russia and the CIS countries, but also in many other states of the world where media literacy education has still not (unlike, for example, Canada or Hungary) become an integral component of education in schools and universities.

What are the most promising trends (including theoretical models, concepts) in research in the field of media literacy education can be identified for the CIS countries?

The content analysis of the theses we conducted shows that globalization trends in media culture and media education have led to the fact that the traditional for the USSR priority of aesthetically-oriented media education in the CIS countries of the 21st century have been replaced by sociocultural and cultural studies.
Our analysis suggests that in the foreseeable future, the development of media literacy education in the CIS countries will continue to be dominated by socio- and cultural studies and practice-oriented models guided by corresponding theories and objectives (based on the synthesis of media material).

Most likely, a small increase in the number of Ph.D. dissertations on the material of pre-school institutions and institutions of secondary special education is also possible. The trend of the synthesis of media literacy education and journalism (including media criticism) is going to grow.

In Ukraine, most likely, the tendency to ideologize media literacy education, started in 2014, attempts to make media literacy education a propaganda and counter-propaganda tool, will grow.

In general, our forecast regarding the development of research on media literacy education in the CIS countries is optimistic: the content analysis of dissertation research in the CIS countries that we have conducted allows us to anticipate a further increase in the volume of studies (mainly due to regional research teams) related to problems of media education, media literacy, and media competence.

**List of dissertations on media education topic in the USSR and the CIS countries**

**USSR**

**1950-1959**


**1960-1969**


1970-1979


1980-1991

Cherkashin, E.A. (1989). Popular science film about art as a means of forming the artistic interests of


Odintsova, S.M. (1981). Film analysis as one of the factors of improvement of professional training of students-philologists of pedagogical universities. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.


**Russia**

1992-1999


Pustosmekhova, L.N. (1999). Features of the role-play organization with the support of the TV programs at different stages of training. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.


Yakushina, E.V. (2002). Methodology of teaching the schoolchildren to work with the information resources on the basis of the current model of the Internet. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.

2010-2019

77


Belous, E.S. (2013). Internet portals as a means of training teachers to create electronic resources within the framework of professional development in computer science. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.


Filimonov, A.S. (2013). Technology of formation and development of information and communication
competence of the future teacher of physics in the educational environment of the university. Ph.D. Dis. Samara.


Kalinkskaya, E.V. (2013). Development of children's speech with multimedia social and cultural
programs in educational institutions of social and pedagogical assistance. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.


Orenburg.

83


Suvorova, T.N. (2016). Development of methodical system of teachers' training for designing and
application of electronic educational resources on the basis of system-activity approach. Ph.D. Dis. Moscow.


Zhiravleva, S.V. (2018). Formation of communication skills of a senior pupil in the information-


**Ukraine**

1992-1999


2000-2009


Kazakov, Y.M. (2007). Pedagogical conditions of the use of media education in the process of training


2010-2019

Dis. Kiev.


Others CIS countries

1992-2019


Conclusions

Comparative analysis and synthesis of goals and objectives, key concepts, the main stages of historical development, structure, content, models of mass media education in the CIS countries allows to develop the following scheme.

Goals and objectives of mass media education in CIS countries

The general goal of mass media education for all CIS countries is to develop and improve the level of media literacy / media competence of the population (that is, culture of communication with media, creative, communicative abilities, analytical thinking, the ability to create, disseminate, interpret, analyze and evaluate the role and functions of media in society, media texts of different types and genres).

Mass media education objectives:
- practical-creative (training in the ability to search, create and distribute media texts of various kinds and genres while respecting the humanistic focus and ethical correctness of these messages);
- analytical (training the skills of qualified analysis and evaluation of the role and functions of media in the society, media texts of various types and genres);

Peculiarity of tasks:
- in some CIS countries (Ukraine, Moldova), these tasks are increasingly associated with the opposition to Russian media influence.

General key theoretical concepts of mass media education in the CIS countries:
- practical (focused on teaching hands-on skills of work with media technology with the subsequent creation and dissemination of media texts);
- development of critical thinking about the role and functions of media culture in society and media texts of different types and genres;
- protectionist (typical for the synthesis of media education and religion);
- aesthetic (oriented to bring up a high aesthetic taste on the material of the most high-quality works of media culture);
- sociocultural and cultural studies (analysis of the role of media in society and media texts in a broad socio-cultural context).

A number of theoretical concepts (semiotic, ecological, ethical, etc.) have little effect on the development of media education in the CIS countries.

Peculiarities: in Ukraine (an associated member of the CIS since 1993), in recent years, the ideological theory of media education has been favoured, in which critical thinking is developed through detecting fake media information, in particular, in the news (Gumenyuk, Potapova, 2015; Media Literacy..., 2016; Training ..., 2015). Starting from 2014, the development of media education in Ukraine increasingly goes hand in hand with anti-Russian propaganda (Gumenyuk, Potapova, 2015; Dorosh, 2014; Emets-Dobronosova, 2014; Koropatnik, 2015; Media Literacy..., 2016; Training ..., 2015; Cherepovska, 2015, etc.).

The main stages of the historical development of mass media education in the CIS countries

in the 1990s:
- deprivation of the state support during the years of "perestroika" (typical for all CIS countries);
- gradual departure from the popular in the Soviet period ideological and aesthetic approaches of media education, exploration of the Western approaches (culturological, development of critical thinking, etc.) (typical for Russia, Ukraine and Belarus);
- presence of only weak foci of media education in a number of CIS countries: typical for Azerbaijan, Georgia (until 18.08.2009 Georgia was part of the CIS), Tajikistan,
Turkmenistan (Turmenistan is associated member of the CIS) and Uzbekistan;
- attempts of private business to support the media education movement (typical only for Russia);
- intensive development of academic research in the field of media education (at this stage it is typical mainly for the Russian Federation);

XXI Century:
- recognition of the importance of media education at the state level (typical for Ukraine, where in 2011-2018 a large-scale experimental introduction of media education in dozens of secondary schools began, and to a lesser extent for Russia, where on November 17, 2008 the Government approved the Concept of Long-Term Social and Economic Development of the Russian Federation for the period until 2020, where in the section on information and communication technologies the need for media education is declared; in 2013 the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation supported the idea of film education as an elective in secondary schools);
- intensive use of new Internet technologies for the development of media education (primarily in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan);
- launching new university majors/minors related to media education (Russia, Ukraine);
- convening a series of international and regional conferences (incl. UNESCO sponsored) on media education (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia);
- organizing a series of international and regional schools, training seminars, courses on media education (primarily in Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan);
- continuation of the intensive development of research in the field of media education, carried out in many cases with the support of Russian science foundations and foreign funds (for the Russian Federation) or only foreign funds (typical for Ukraine, Moldova, Kyrgyzstan);
- gradual integration of media education programs in a number of CIS countries (typical for Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia (until 18.08.2009 Georgia was part of the CIS), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan).

Structure and content of models of mass media education in the CIS countries

Conceptual basis: synthesis of the theory of development of critical thinking, practical, and sociocultural theories of media education.

Aim: development of media literacy / competence of the individual.

Objectives: development of the following skills: practical, creative, analytical.

Methods of media competence’s development: verbal, visual, explanatory-illustrative, problem-based research.

The main units of the contents of the media education program (the availability of a particular unit depends on the age and professional status of the audience): the place and role, functions of media and media education in modern society, types and genres, media languages; basic terms, concepts related to media culture; historical stages of development of media culture in the world; analysis and evaluation of the functioning of media and media texts of different types and genres in the socio-cultural and ideological contexts; technologies of creation and distribution of media texts of various kinds and genres.

Areas of application: schools, secondary special educational institutions, higher education institutions, professional development courses, additional education institutions and leisure centers; distant media education of various categories of the population; independent (continuous) media education, for example, through Internet sources.

Anyway, all modern models of media education in the CIS countries (with all the diversity of age and professional entire population groups) contain diagnostic, content-targeted and effective components (Akhmetova, 2011; 2012; 2014; 2016; Baranov, 2002;
It is necessary to agree that "the question of the possibility of developing cross ethnic media education systems that reflect the needs of integration groups in the global media discourse and which can withstand external information threats is quite debatable. The search for answers will inevitably affect: a) the educational environment in which media literacy courses should be introduced (at various levels of instruction), developed with the account of international information interests; b) the media sphere, which includes the contents of all types of media (both national and allied) and carrying out a spontaneous impact on the audience's citizenship; c) political reality, predetermining the attitude of citizens to the information provided to the media and, on the other hand, experiencing the consequences of the audience's information choice; d) institutions of civil society (local, national and transnational), whose viability largely depends on the sustainability of the information sphere; e) ideological climate in integrable societies" (Venidiktov, 2015: 194).

Herewith, we believe that the CIS countries should not build the development of mass media education of the population based on confrontation and ideological propaganda. All thematical blocks of media education programs should evenly give the audience an idea that there are no ideal democratic states in the world with ideally objective mass media. That is why the basis of media education activity must be sociocultural concepts (including, of course, analytical and practical components) rather than ideological ones that will allow the audience to comprehensively master the ambiguous world of media culture.
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