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**Abstract**

From 1960 to 2019, about six hundred Ph.D. 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 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 content analysis of the Ph.D. dissertations in the CIS countries shows that globalization trends in media culture and media literacy 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for the USSR priority of aesthetically-oriented media education in the CIS countries of the 21st century have been replaced by sociocultural and cultural studies. The analysis suggests that in the foreseeable future, the development of media 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 dissertations on the material of pre–school institutions and institutions of secondary special education is also possible. The trend of the synthesis of media education and journalism (including media criticism) is going to grow.

In general, the forecast regarding the development of research on media education in the CIS countries is optimistic: the content analysis of dissertation research in the CIS countries allows 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.
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1. **Introduction**

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
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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>

2. Materials and methods

The material for our study was Ph.D. dissertations on the subject of media literacy education, defended in the USSR and the CIS countries from 1960 to 2019. The main research methods are comparative analysis and content analysis of theses.

3. Discussion

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, precariously 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.

4. Results

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 context.

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>Dominant media literacy education theories and models</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social, cultural (based on social and cultural studies media education theory)</td>
<td>2</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>№</th>
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social, cultural (based on social and cultural studies media education theory)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Practically utilitarian (based on practical theory of media education)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ethical, protective (based on ethical and protectionist theories)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aesthetic (based on aesthetic, art theories of media education)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>27</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; Bozhedorov, 2005; Butyrina, 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 the history media literacy education (Chelysheva, 2002; Gorbatkova, 2015; Khudoleeva, 2006; Kolesnichenko, 2007; Mikhaleva, 2012; Mosina, 2009; Novikova, 2000; Pechinkina, 2008; Roslyak, 2004; Yurova, 2015, etc.).

**Media materials**

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>№</th>
<th>Media material used in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Print press</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Television, radio, audio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Computer applications, Internet</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Synthesis of various media</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>№</th>
<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></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Print press</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Television, radio, audio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Computer applications, Internet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Synthesis of various media</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>N</th>
<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>1</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated with other subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Synthesis of autonomous and integrated types</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>N</th>
<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></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated with other subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Synthesis of autonomous and integrated types</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>№</th>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Specialized secondary education establishments (colleges)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pre-school institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supplementary education institutions (community centers, cultural centers, clubs)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Media agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Libraries, Media centers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Several institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></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>№</th>
<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></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Specialized secondary education establishments (colleges)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pre-school institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supplementary education</td>
<td>8</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>№</th>
<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>1</td>
<td>Pre-schoolers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elementary school pupils</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middle school pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High school pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Secondary school pupils on the whole</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School and university students on the whole</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adult audience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Audiences of different age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>№</th>
<th>Age groups of media audiences participating in research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education in the CIS (1992–2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preschoolers</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school pupils</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school pupils on the whole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and university students on the whole</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult audience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences of different age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>№</th>
<th>Location of the media education research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media literacy education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leningrad/St.Petersburg</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional cities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</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>№</th>
<th>Location of the media education research</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D. dissertations on media education in the CIS (1992–2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other CIS capital cities</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regional/provincial cities in CIS countries</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusion

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, 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; Shturkhetsky, 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 preschool 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.
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