Н. Б. Кириллова

Новые концепты медианауки в социокультурной системе информационной цивилизации

Объектом анализа в данной статье является процесс интеграции ряда гуманитарных наук, исследующих медиасферу информационной эпохи. На основе интеграции формируется новая синтетическая наука глобализованного мира – Медиалогия, изучающая разные направления духовного бытия человека в условиях цифровой революции.

Так как исследование носит междисциплинарный характер, то методологическим основанием анализа стал концептуально-системный подход, позволяющий использовать как общенаучные, так и культурно-исторический, социально-аналитический и контекстуально-компетентностные методы исследования. Исследование базировалось на анализе разных подходов зарубежных и отечественных ученых (философов, культурологов, социологов, педагогов) к проблемам медианауки в ее историческом контексте и современном статусе.

Основным результатом стало доказательство того, что в итоге глобальных трансформаций эпохи в гуманитарной науке и соответственно в системе образования появились новые объекты изучения: теория и история медиакультуры, медиафилософия и медиаполитика, медиапедагогика и медиаменеджмент.

Автор приходит к выводу о том, что за последние четверть века в гуманитарной сфере сложилась новая комплексная медианаука, теория которой значительно опережает образовательную практику, у которой все еще много проблемных зон в сфере медиапедагогики как фактора формирования гражданина глобализованного мира.

Ключевые слова: медианаука, глобализация, информационная цивилизация, медиакультура, социокультурное пространство, цифровая революция, медиаобразование

Ссылка для цитирования:

Кириллова Н. Б. Новые концепты медианауки в социокультурной системе информационной цивилизации // Перспективы науки и образования. 2021. № 6 (54). С. 10-22. doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.6.1

N. B. KIRILLOVA

New concepts of media science in the sociocultural system of the information civilization

The object of analysis in this article is the integration process of a number of humanities studying the media sphere of the information age. A new synthetic science of the globalized world is formed through integration – mediology, which studies different directions of human spiritual life in the digital revolution.

Since the study is interdisciplinary in nature, the methodological basis for the analysis is a conceptual-systemic approach, which makes it possible to use both general scientific and cultural-historical, social-analytical, and contextual-competence research methods. The study is based on the analysis of different approaches of foreign and Russian scientists (philosophers, cultural experts, sociologists, teachers) to the problems of media science in its historical context and modern status.

The main research result is the proof that global transformations of the era in the humanities and, accordingly, in the education system have led to new research objects: the theory and history of media culture, media philosophy and media policy, media pedagogy, and media management.

The author comes to the conclusion that over the past quarter-century, a new complex media science has developed in the humanitarian sphere, the theory of which is significantly ahead of educational practice, which still has many problem areas in media pedagogy as a factor of forming a citizen of the globalized world.

Keywords: media science, globalization, information civilization, media culture, socio-cultural space, digital revolution, media education

For Reference:

Kirillova, N. B. (2021). New concepts of media science in the sociocultural system of the information civilization. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 54 (6), 10-22.
doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.6.1

Introduction

The modern period of the information age is characterized by a combination of globalization and diversification processes as the result of the digital revolution, which fundamentally changed the existence of all mankind. The scale of the media civilization that has turned the planet into a “global village” [38, p. 7] affects human intellect and activity, while the media sphere becomes a catalyst for many socio-cultural transformations.

The expansion of boundaries of media science, which has come a long way in the 20th century, is also obvious. Initially, researchers were interested in communication artifacts: rock paintings, chronicles, handwritten books, folklore, etc. These problems are still of interest among anthropologists, historians, philologists, and ethnographers. During the information technology revolution, researchers paid attention to the development of the mass communication system and its functioning in society.

In the first half of the 20th century, there were two directions in the study of this sphere. The scientific method proposed by American sociologists Lazarsfeld and Berelson [14], Simon [18], consisted in determining the degree of mass media influence on a person. The second direction is associated with the Frankfurt School of Sociological Research, represented by the works of Adorno and M. Horkheimer [1], Marcuse [39], and others. Following Ortega y Gasset, who told about the emergence of a phenomenon of “mass consciousness” in his book *The Revolt of the Masses* (1929) [41], they carried out a critical analysis of the mass media and their role in the cultural industry as a “mass society” platform.

In particular, Marcuse in *One Dimensional Man* (1964), reflecting on the degradation of culture in the “consumer society”, proves that mass communication tools “harmoniously and often unnoticeably mix art, politics, philosophy, and religion with commercials”, as a result of which “these cultural spheres lead to a common denominator – a commodity form” [39, p. 74]. Thus, “high culture is transformed into pop culture” and “one-dimensional thinking” begins to prevail in society [39, p. 93].

In the 1960s, the Frankfurt School actualized and presented the ideas of the German philosopher and cultural historian Benjamin to the scientific community, publishing the complete collection of his works written in the 1920–30s. Walter Benjamin became one of the key figures among mass media researchers due to the essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1936). The key point in this unique work is the analysis of a new type of “replicated” culture based on the synthesis of technology and creativity. According to the philosopher, “reproduction” contributes to the disappearance of ontological and social boundaries between the copy and the original, destroying the “aura” of the work and devaluing such concept as creativity [25].

An intensive study of the media sphere took place in the second half of the 20th century due to the Canadian sociologist McLuhan, who introduced the term “media” and the new concept “media culture” into the scientific vocabulary. He devoted his main works to their study: *The Gutenberg Galaxy. The Making of Typographic Man* [37] and *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* [38]. McLuhan deserves credit for teaching to consider media culture without contempt, but with an understanding of this phenomenon of the information age, thereby laying the foundations for its scientific comprehension.

The study of mediatization processes and the formation of the information society became a research object in the works of American sociologists: Bell [24], Toffler [44], Castells [32], and others. Works on semiotics by French researchers – Barthes [22], Baudrillard [26], Deleuze [28], Derrida [29], as well as those Russian scientists, who conducted an analysis of the language and perception of media culture works, primarily. Bakhtin [23], Lotman [36], and others, occupy a special place in the history of media culture research.

It should also be noted that in the middle of the 20th century, when semiotics came into its own, cybernetics which studies the processes of managing artificial intelligence and information systems and information science developed in parallel with it. This is the technological basis of media science. As noted by Razlogov, its development is “due to the social aspects of the information society and the prospects for cultural progress in general”, and this proves that “the media sphere is a socio-cultural phenomenon, not a scientific one” [48, pp. 3–4].

Considering different periods in the history of media sphere research, it becomes clear that media problems are a research object of various humanities: history and journalism, the theory of culture and philosophy, political science, and sociology. In pedagogy, at the turn of the 21st century, even a new direction appeared – media education pioneered by well-known Western European experts: Masterman [16], Bazalgette [3], Duncan [6], and others.

Russian theory and practice have also accumulated experience in media education, the main directions of which were adjusted at the beginning of the new millennium by the Association of Film Education and Media Pedagogy created upon the initiative of Doctor of Pedagogy, Professor Fedorov [46]. Since 2005, under his editorship, a specialized journal *Media Education* has been published, which is indexed in the international database Web of Science.

The interdisciplinary approach to studying the media sphere testifies to the fact that at the turn of the 21st century, a new synthetic science of the globalized world was formed – mediology [“media” – a plural form from the Latin word “medium” + Greek word “logos”]. The term “mediology” was first introduced by the French political scientist and sociologist Régis Debray in 1990 to denote the specificity of the doctrine of technical means used to transmit traditions and knowledge. His research work *Introduction a la mediologie* focused on this topic [5].

The term “mediology” also appeared in the vocabulary of Russian journalists as a system for analyzing information from various sources – paper and electronic ones. The complex concept of mediology as a synthesis of the humanities was presented by the author in one of his monographs [34]. Since the realities of the new science in the global theoretical space are still controversial, this issue has become a research subject in this article. The object of mediology is the study of various spiritual production spheres that appeared in the process of global transformations as a result of the digital revolution: media culture development and the need for a new media policy, virtualization and mythologization of the socio-cultural space, the formation of media management, problems of media education and individual socialization.

The research purpose is to study those concepts of mediology that determine its scientific existence and real prospects in the socio-cultural system of a modern information civilization, thereby contributing to the expansion of the scientific-methodological field of various humanitarian disciplines.

Materials and methods

Since the study is interdisciplinary in nature, it combines the general scientific, culturological, sociological, and pedagogical methods. An integral (synergetic) approach is used by the author as a methodological basis for the analysis of mediology as a synthetic humanitarian science, allowing one to consider the whole complex of interrelationships between the media sphere, society and an individual, cultural dialogization processes in the global media space and the plurality of trajectories of human spiritual existence as an object and subject of media policy, media management, and media education.

The cultural-historical approach allows the author to consider the media sphere as a special cultural space and as a source of social development, in the process of which an individual assimilates the socio-cultural experience. The social-analytical method helps to trace the process of mediatization of social and individual consciousness in the post-industrial era. The method of cultural-semiotic analysis allows understanding the specifics and evolution of the media language as a way of socio-psychological impact on an individual.

The contextual and competence-based approaches presented in the works of both foreign and Russian media educators serve as the basis for studying the system of modern media education, including various methods of influencing the formation of media literacy and media competence of an individual. These approaches are also related to the specific goals of education (secondary and higher education), in the process of which educational activities are analyzed in terms of focusing on the result – “the formation of creative abilities of an individual, his/her readiness for creative activity, professional self-determination and self-actualization” [11, p. 193].

The conceptual-systematic approach allowed the author to approach the analysis of mediology as a synthetic science of the globalized world and theoretically substantiate those new concepts and paradigms that were formed in the process of its development and make it possible to determine its prospects in the socio-cultural system of the information civilization. The methodological approaches developed in the study can be used both in theoretical studies of various areas of media science and in the study of practical foundations of modern media education and media management.

Results

The phenomenon of mediology as a synthetic science of the digital age lies in the fact that its problematic field is wide enough: these are issues of the media sphere development and virtual human environment creation; the formation of media culture, its sign system and language, functioning specifics; this includes the main provisions of media philosophy and media policy, as well as the processes of information society modernization, including the problems of media sphere and media pedagogy management.

As a science, mediology is based on the scientific vocabulary that is formed in parallel with the information society development.

Thus, McLuhan introduced the term “media” [Latin word “medium” – means, mediator], which eventually came to be used in science and practice as a synonym for mass media. McLuhan intensified his scientific activities in the 1950-60s, when popular culture – the world of film and television, comics, advertising, and pop music – flourished in the USA and

Europe. McLuhan began to write about this illusory “consumer society” world, focusing on the cultural clichés of various media. Many of McLuhan’s thoughts are perceived as aphorisms: “Media is a message”, “Media language is a technology”, “All media are effective metaphors”, “Only an artist is meant to be an “antenna of the nation”, “To be an artist means to control metaphors” [38].

In accordance with McLuhan’s cultural typology, the following periods can be distinguished in media history: 1) the era of preliterate barbarism; 2) the era of the alphabet and phonetic writing; 3) written-print culture (“Gutenberg Galaxy”); 4) electronic culture (“Marconi Galaxy”). In the new millennium, the Internet Galaxy (Castells) [32] has taken a significant place in the life of humankind. Although McLuhan’s point of view has been repeatedly questioned by historians and cultural experts, it has its own logic. In this regard, the authors agree with those modern researchers who consider the cultural history as “the genesis of social information and its carriers”, arguing that “the informational existence of a person, as well as its reproduction, are the dominant factors in the formation of the person’s culture and sociality” [45, p. 82].

According to McLuhan, the media in their development process (especially “communication hybrids”, as he called audiovisual communications) sought to take possession of consumers’ consciousness, immersing them in a virtual world acting as a drug (hence McLuhan’s famous comparison of the effects of media technologies with the myth about Narcissus, who fell in love with his own reflection) [38, pp. 52–53].

The exaggerated nature of audiovisual media was also noted by Baudrillard, who called them “simulacra” and defined the essence of mediatization as “a total mythological system” [26, p. 247]. Barthes also reflected on this topic and interpreted the media world as mythological, since it is “infinitely suggestive” [22, p. 29]. A Slovenian media theoretician Žižek agrees with these authors; he considers media reality as “the process of turning a real object into an artificial one” [31].

The main paradigm of mediology is media culture, the essence of which the author defines as “a set of information and communication tools developed by mankind in the process of cultural and historical development, contributing to the formation of social consciousness and socialization of an individual. It includes the culture of production, information transfer and the culture of its perception; it is also an indicator of the level of development of an individual, who is capable of perceiving, analyzing, evaluating a particular media text, engaging in media creativity, assimilating new knowledge through the media” [33, p. 18].

Media culture as a multifunctional system develops in parallel with civil society institutions, while performing a number of social functions: information, communication, normative (ideological), relaxation, creative, integration, and mediating ones.

One of the modern American media theorists Jenkins, whose theory is rather controversial, calls media culture a “convergent” phenomenon, in which old and new media collide. He criticizes mass culture denunciation laid down by Adorno and Horkheimer in *Dialectics of Enlightenment* [1], in particular, their point of view on mass culture, focused on a passive consumer. In his opinion, “convergent culture is mainly a rethinking of the methods of cultural production, which implies the free content distribution in different media”. Moreover, Jenkins does not recognize the digital revolution, but assumes that old media peacefully coexist with new ones and “convergent culture is primarily content, not forms (formats)” [30, p. 11].

Analyzing media culture, the author pays special attention to the evolution of its language as a sign system. From an information-semiotic point of view, media culture

appears in three main aspects: as a system of artifacts (from Latin words “arte” – artificial and “factus” – created), symbols and signs. According to Lotman, “any system serving communication purposes can be defined as a language” [36, p. 19]. Studying the language of works of art, Lotman proved that any cultural phenomena “should be considered as texts containing information and meaning” [36, p. 284]. The author agrees with the researcher that “text” is a polysemantic concept, and this is not only about a literary work or article, but also about any storage media, including modern electronic sources.

Thus, the author concludes that the language of media culture is represented by signs and sets of signs (“texts”), in which social information is “encrypted”, i.e. the embedded content, meaning, idea. In this regard, one of the cross-cutting issues is the issue of “text ideology”, in which the author draws from the theory by Bakhtin, according to which the text is ideological if its idea is “a live event, played out at the point of dialogic meeting between two or several consciousnesses” [23, p. 130]. Considering the ideas of Dostoevsky’s texts, this writer introduced the concepts of “dialogue” (“dialogism”) and “polyphony” (“polyphonism”) into the scientific vocabulary.

This theory made it possible for Kristeva, Bakhtin’s follower, to look “beyond the language”, to reveal the “pre-verbal” level of the subject’s existence, where the “unconscious” dominates, and to move on to the destruction of sign priority, thereby moving from semiotics to “semanalysis”. Kristeva thus differentiated the traditional text structure, marking the boundaries between “hypertext” and “intertext”, “genotext” and “phenotext”, which relate to each other as a formula and symbolism, as a surface and depth. Thus, she has proven that any text is polyphonic and represents “a special device – a platform where different ideologies encounter to bleed each other in confrontation” [35, p. 21]

The author argues that there is a significant difference between the language of auditory and visual media. In the first systems, the sign factors are sound, speech, music, vocals, and time, which appears in two dimensions – sequence and simultaneity. The structuring of the second (visual) systems is associated with space. Moreover, iconic sign systems dominate in traditional visual arts (painting, graphics, poster).

Technical media culture, which reproduces reality, is associated with “photogeny” (Delluc), i.e. frame aesthetics. Today, this property is not only a feature of cinema and television but also of other audiovisual communication media such as video, animation, computer graphics, instant messengers, social networks, and other screen technologies. In the written culture, the basis of the sign system is a letter, a word, while in the audiovisual culture, a frame is a “first brick”.

A frame in photography conveys a direct impression of a real event, although it is static. According to Eisenstein, cinema uses a frame as an “editing cell”, which allows conveying not only the movement but also the impression of an event, as well as revealing its meaning [47, p. 290]. A television frame enables the viewer to be included in the “stream of events” and see it “from the inside”. One can agree with the opinion of Deleuze that a screen frame gives “virtual visibility, which is inhabited by “images-movements” opposite to fixed sections” [28, p. 20]. In the globalized world, the language of new media is transforming. According to Manovich, the language of a modern digital screen, which is based on digital coding, “is becoming one of the forms of dialogue in the “man – machine” dilemma [15].

Mediasemiotics is closely related to media philosophy, which was actively studied by a post-Soviet Russian researcher Savchuk. The difference between media philosophy and the theory of communication or semiotics is that “media philosophy does not raise the question of specific communication mechanisms, processes or means; its subject implies constituting

the individual and social body, the ways of perception, motivation and human activity in the context of new media” [40, p. 10].

The object of media philosophy is the ontological aspects of media as a system of communication means. Since ontology (in Greek – existence) is a doctrine of existence, the principles of its structure, laws, and forms, in this regard, any direction in media philosophy becomes ontological, including the study of media reality.

The author proves that in the 20th century, many philosophical questions began to be comprehended through various media (printing, cinema, TV, radio): What is existence? What is essence? What is time? What is reason? Today, these questions are somehow raised in global social networks, the blogosphere. Obviously, there is a huge difference between the scientific worldview understanding and its “template” – media reality – due to objective and subjective reasons. That is why the mediology object is the study of media reality as a new socio-cultural human environment – a parallel virtual world, often perceived as an objective reality.

Discussion

Thus, according to the author, the new science of the globalized world – mediology – has a wide field of study of those processes that are associated with the transformation of many socio-cultural and political phenomena that affect the development of civil society and the world as a whole.

One cannot but agree with the opinion of the famous American sociologist Castells, who proved at the beginning of the new millennium that people live in a special culture, which “is virtual, since it is mainly built on virtual communication processes controlled by electronics... This virtuality is today’s reality. This is what distinguishes the culture of the information age: people create the meaning basically through virtuality” [32, p. 237]. It took two decades to see that the researcher was right.

The author also supports French researchers’ opinion that the world of virtual reality is nothing more than a “simulacrum” (in English to *simulate* means to imitate, pretend), the essence of which was first presented in the works by Baudrillard and then – by Deleuze, Derrida. A simulacrum is a “copy of copies”, fake, fiction. A simulacrum is based on the discrepancy, on the difference between “truth” and “lie”, “real” and “unreal” [42, p. 404]. It is no coincidence that this term has become rather common in the analysis of society mediatization.

Supporting the above-mentioned ideas, the author proves that media reality is characterized by its mythological nature. The reason is as follows: between humans and reality, there is always a mediator that helps an individual to perceive this reality, to develop an attitude towards it. As already noted, one of these forms is the media, the other one is myth (fiction, illusion), into which reality can be “packed”. As noted by the author, this function of the media was especially emphasized by Barthes [22]. Thus, it should be recognized that the mass media create not only a new media reality but also myths that allow a person to perceive reality. However, myths create the person, influencing his/her worldview, ideals, contributing to the process of his/her socialization.

One of the most relevant and complex concepts of mediology is “media policy” associated with the media management system, which largely depends on the socio-economic development of society, its legal and political culture, relations between the state and business, etc.

In the UNESCO Declaration on Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Information Society, for the first time in world practice, information and communication technologies (ICTs) were recognized as a “driving force for building the information society”, contributing to the “convergence of various communication means”. It was also stated that “the implementation of rights and freedoms must be ensured for all without exception, regardless of the technical means used” [27, p. 3]. In the author’s opinion, these UNESCO ideas became cornerstones for the entire state media policy system.

In post-Soviet Russia, legislation on mass media development was actively developed in the 1990s, when a number of legal documents were adopted, which actually formed the basis of media policy in the country. Its core was the Law of the Russian Federation “On the Mass Media” (1991), the main idea of which was freedom of the press and the inadmissibility of censorship. The philosophy of freedom of the press, taken out of the authorities’ control and placed at the service of civil society, has contributed to the formation of many democratic institutions. The main theses of the Law were included in Article 29 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation (1993), including its updated version of 2020.

According to the author, the Law of the Russian Federation on the Mass Media gave impetus to the subsequent development of the media sphere in the context of an information (civil) society. Thus, one after another in Russia, they adopted important legislative acts that activated the media culture development in the country: the Law of the Russian Federation on the Legal Protection of Computer Programs and Databases (1992), the Law on Copyright and Related Rights (1993) (today it is Section 4 of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation); in 1995, another important document was adopted – Law on Information, Informatization and Protection of Information, which created legal guarantees for the media space development in Russia. In 1997, the President of the Russian Federation signed the Decree on Russia’s Transition to the Information Society, which laid the foundation for other specialized documents, including the Concept of State Information Policy and the Doctrine of Information Security of the Russian Federation (2000), etc.

The author states that in the listed documents, media culture and media policy of the state are perceived as a determining condition for fulfilling a creative potential of an individual and society, as a humanistic guideline and criterion for human development in a new information civilization.

The concept of “media management” is closely related to media policy as a combination of different forms and methods of management activities in the media market. The media management system includes the following parameters: 1) a social and economic institution affecting a lifestyle, the sphere of culture and politics, entrepreneurial activity; 2) a totality of persons engaged in managerial work in the sphere of not material, but spiritual production and distribution of media products; 3) a scientific discipline that studies the technical-organizational and socio-economic aspects of managing the media sphere, information production and consumption processes, the impact of ICTs on society, etc. [34, p. 255].

According to the author, media management is an integrating system, which is understood as the whole process of interactions of different media structures and organizations with the state and society, the external environment, sales markets, the marketing system and PR technologies, science and education, etc. Internet and e-management, network communications, and the blogosphere contribute a lot to this.

In the author’s opinion, in the era of globalization and digitalization, *media education* is one of the most relevant areas in science, culture, and education. This is due to the fact that the new parameters of human existence demanded a transition to a special civil

society strategy, based both on a set of knowledge and skills and the mastery of effective ICTs. Media education, which allows bringing together all the competencies, contributes to the formation of new thinking and the development of a creative, professionally trained personality.

The works of many foreign researchers and practitioners reflect different opinions on the goals and objectives of media education. Thus, an English media educator Masterman, one of the pioneers of this direction, focuses on the fact that the main “concept of media education is representation” and the goal is “the formation of critical thinking of the audience” [17]. Masterman’s ideas united many foreign media educators in the 1980-90s: Bazalgette [3], Worsnop [21], Duncan [6], Kubey [13], Feilitzen [8], Hart [9], and others and aroused the interest of Russian teachers.

In the new millennium, other priority areas have appeared in the media education system. For example, the main issue for American researchers Berger and McDougall was the combination of media theory and practice: “How we teach ought to change, as well as what we teach” [4]. In their opinion, changing the educational process allows an individual to more fully achieve his/her professional and creative capacity in the future.

The acquisition of skills in the field of ICTs is a necessary element of the education of an expert in any field, but especially a representative of the humanitarian sphere. Potter in his article “Digital Media and Learner Identity: The New Curatorship” proposed a model of teaching digital media through “new curatorship”, which was picked up by educators from different countries as the most promising: a revision of the relations “experience, learning and participation” takes place on its basis [17].

Schmidt also substantiated the theoretical significance and practical necessity of creating educational media literacy programs in universities, since “skills related to media communication are becoming more and more in demand in the light of the constant technology development and the emergence of new communication methods and means, as well as new professions” [19, pp. 53–54].

It should be agreed that, as Ashley notes in his research, the problems faced by many media educators from different countries are mostly standard – limited time for teaching, a large number of students, and a different spectrum of audience abilities. In this regard, many of the teachers interviewed by him note that “classes should be aimed at active interaction with the media and civic life of society, and in the classroom, special attention should be paid to current events and the way students consume the media. This is very important in a democracy, as is the very access to information from different sources” [2, p. 170].

The use of social networks in this process remains a controversial issue of modern media education, since they have entered the daily life of the younger generation. According to Talib, research on digital literacy suggests “the need to develop such tools and methods that help students become skillful ‘digital citizens’” [20, p. 55].

As is seen, modern research in Europe and the USA clearly traces the idea that media education is the most humanitarian form of pedagogy, if it is focused on practice related to the creative self-fulfillment of a future specialist and his/her competitiveness in the labor market.

In post-Soviet Russia, when various scientific studies and regional media schools appeared, several priority areas of media education emerged: 1) professional media education; 2) media education of future teachers at universities, pedagogical universities, professional retraining, and advanced training institutes; 3) media education in the structure of general education in secondary, specialized secondary, and higher education institutions; 4) media

education in cultural and recreational centers; 5) online media education; 6) independent (continuous) media education, which takes place throughout the whole life of an individual.

According to the majority of Russian teachers, the main goal of media education is the formation of students' *media literacy*, *media competence*. The author agrees with the opinion of the leader of Russian media pedagogy Fedorov, who assumes that media competence "more precisely determines the essence of an individual's ability to use, critically analyze, evaluate and transmit media texts in various types, forms and genres, analyze complex processes of media functioning in society" [7, p. 82]. That is why it can be considered as "a key element in the concept of a citizen of the globalized world".

Studies conducted in different years by the Association of Film Education and Media Pedagogy, in which the author also took part, prove that the majority of Russian media educators are focused in their activities on solving the following tasks: development of the audience's ability to think critically; preparing students for life in a democratic society; teaching the media language as a factor in decoding media texts and their aesthetic perception; teaching the audience the theory and history of media culture; development of communication skills of an individual; the formation of students' creative thinking as an ability for self-expression through different media [33, p. 314].

Digitalization has become an integral part of Russian and foreign media education – this is "a modern global trend in the social development, based on the transformation of information into digital form... Education digitalization is a priority area of the state educational policy, which is dynamically developing through the understanding of importance of digital resources in ensuring the continuity, accessibility and quality of education. The development of educational platforms (Coursera, Edx, Universarium, Lectorium, etc.) made it necessary to transform the existing forms and methods of educational activities. According to the author and her colleagues, digital devices and technologies are new "cultural and historical tools" [43, p. 424]. The authors of the article "Digitalization of the educational environment as a factor of students' personal and professional self-determination" consider in this way the influence of the digital environment on the goals and content of the work of a modern school with students, arguing that "the digital transformation of the school environment also introduces new models of the formation of key competences in students as a necessary condition for the freedom to choose a self-determination path" [43, p. 422].

Thus, the research results and their discussion prove that at the turn of the 21st century, a new science of the globalized world was formed and is functioning today – mediology, influencing the development of the political and socio-cultural spheres and, most importantly, contributing to the modernization of various areas of modern education in secondary education and high school.

Conclusion

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that the theoretical aspects of media science, which developed at the turn of the 21st century, are of importance, thereby proving the prospects for developing mediology as a synthetic humanitarian science, which can combine many disciplines in the educational process, including theory and history of media culture, intercultural communication, media policy, media management, and media education as well. These areas became the basis for a comprehensive media program, which is being tested at the Ural Federal University named after the First President of Russia

B.N. Yeltsin at the Department of Art History, Cultural Studies and Design [11; 12]. Its goal is to help graduates become full-fledged specialists both in the field of culture and socio-cultural activities and in the mass media, which corresponds to the goals and objectives of the information age.

Media pedagogy is becoming increasingly in demand and necessary in the system of the main areas of Russian cultural policy. Due to the fact that audiovisual technologies (interactive electronic environment, virtual communications, Internet resources, online education, etc.) have become the basic factors of the modern media space, they determine the main focuses of media education programs for schools and humanitarian universities. The main task in this case is the digitalization of the educational environment as a factor of students' personal and professional self-determination.

The author considers the leading goal of media education to be the formation of a person's media culture and the development of his/her creative capacity in the socio-cultural system in the modern information civilization, i.e. the education of a creative citizen of the globalized world.

REFERENCES

1. Adorno, T., & Horkheimer, M. (1944). *The Cultural Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. Dialectic of Enlightenment* (pp. 120–168). New York.
2. Ashley, S. (2015). Media Literacy in Action? What Are We Teaching in Introductory College Media Studies Courses? *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 70(2), 161–173.
3. Bazalgette, C. (Ed.) Media Education Worldwide. UNESCO.
4. Berger, R., & McDougall, J. (2013). Editorial Media Pedagogy Research: Are We There Yet? *Media Education Research Journal*, 3(2), 5–11. Retrieved September 13, 2021, from http://merj.info/wpcontent/uploads/2013/01/MERJ_3-2-Editorial.pdf
5. Debray, R. (2000). *Introduction a la mediologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
6. Duncan, B. (1989). *Media Literacy Resource Guide*. Toronto: Ministry of Education of Ontario, Publications Branch, of Queen's Printer.
7. Fedorov, A.V. (2007). Media Competence of a Person: From Terminology to Indicators. *Innovations in Education*, 10, 75–108.
8. Feilitzen, C. (1999). Media Education. In C. Feilitzen, & U. Carlsson (Eds.), *Children and Media: Image, Education, Participation. Children and Media Violence* (pp. 24–26). Göteborg: UNESCO International Clearinghouse on Children and Violence on the Screen.
9. Hart, A. (1997). *Media Education in the Global Village*. Southampton: Media Education Center.
10. Jenkins, H. (2014). Rethinking "Rethinking Convergence/Culture". *Cultural Studies*, 28(2), 267–297.
11. Kirillova, N.B. (2020). Creative Potential of Media Education as a New Paradigm of the Information Age. In *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference on Philosophy of Education, Law and Science in the Era of Globalization (PELSEG 2020)* (pp. 191–195).
12. Kirillova, N.B. Media Culture of a Globalized World: Evolution of Language Technologies. *Changing Societies & Personalities*, 4(4), 427–440.
13. Kubey, R. (1997). Media Education: Portraits of an Evolving Field. In R. Kubey (Ed.), *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick & London: Transaction Publishers.
14. Lazarsfeld, P., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. (1944). *The People's Choice. How the Voter Makes up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
15. Manovich, L. (2016). *The Science of Culture? Social Computing, Digital Humanities, and Cultural Analytics*. Retrieved August 12, 2021, from <http://manovich.net/index.php/projects/cultural-analytics-social-computing>
16. Masterman, L. (1997). A Rational for Media Education. In *Media Literacy in the Information Age*. New Brunswick (U.S.A.), London (UK): Transaction Publishers.
17. Potter, J. (2012). *Digital Media and Learner Identity: The New Curatorship*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
18. Simon, H.A. (1966). *The Sciences of the Artificial* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: M. I. T. Press. Retrieved August 12, 2021, from https://monoskop.org/images/9/9c/Simon_Herbert_A_The_Sciences_of_the_Artificial_3rd_ed.pdf
19. Schmidt, H.C. (2015). Helping Students Understand Media: Examining the Efficacy of Interdisciplinary Media Training at the University Level. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 7(2), 50–68.
20. Talib, S. (2018). Social Media Pedagogy: Applying an Interdisciplinary Approach to Teach Multimodal Critical Digital

- Literacy. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 15(2), 55–66.
21. Worsnop, C. (1999). *Screening Images: Ideas for Media Education*. Mississauga, Ontario: Wright Communications.
 22. Barthes, R. (2008) *Mythology* (S. Zenkina, Trans.). Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 23. Bakhtin, M.M. (2017). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. St. Petersburg: Azbuka, Azbuka-Atticus.
 24. Bell, D. (2000). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. A Venture in Social Forecasting*. Moscow: Academia.
 25. Benjamin, V. (1996). *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Selected Essays. Moscow: Medium.
 26. Baudrillard, J. (2007). *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* (D. Kralichkin, Trans.). Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 27. *Declaration on Human Rights and the Rule of Law in the Information Society*. (2005). Moscow: Russian Committee of the UNESCO Information for All Program.
 28. Deleuze, J. (2004). *Cinema*. Moscow: AdMarginem.
 29. Derrida, J. (2007). *Positions* (V. Bibikhin, Trans.). Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 30. Jenkins, G. (2019). *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide* (A. Gasilin, Trans.). Moscow: RIPOL Classic.
 31. Zizek, S. (1998). *Cyberspace, or Unbearable Closure of Being*. Art of Cinema, 1. Retrieved August 10, 2021, from <https://old.kinoart.ru/archive/1998/01/n1-article25>
 32. Castells, M. (2004). *Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business and Society* (A. Matveev, Trans., V. Kharitonov, Ed.). Yekaterinburg: U-Factoria.
 33. Kirillova, N.B. (2008). *Media Culture: Theory, History, Practice*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 34. Kirillova, N.B. (2012). *Mediology as a Synthesis of Sciences*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 35. Kristeva, Yu. (2004). *Destruction of Poetics. Selected Works*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
 36. Lotman, Yu.M. (2000). *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. In Yu.M. Lotman, *About Art* (pp. 14–285). St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo.
 37. McLuhan, H.M. (2005). *The Gutenberg Galaxy. The Making of Typographic Man* (I.O. Tyurina, Trans.). Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 38. McLuhan, H.M. (2003). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (V. Nikolaev, Trans.). Moscow-Zhukovsky: Canon-Press-Ts.
 39. Marcuse, H. (1994). *One Dimensional Man* (A. Yudin, Trans.). Moscow: REFL-book.
 40. Savchuk, V.V. (2008). Media Philosophy: Discipline Formation. In V.V. Savchuk (Ed.), *Media Philosophy. Main Issues and Concepts* (pp. 7–39). St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the St. Petersburg Philosophical Society.
 41. Ortega y Gasset, H. (2002). *The Revolt of the Masses*. Moscow: AST.
 42. Kemerov, V., & Kerimov, V. (Eds.). (2003). *Social Philosophy. Dictionary*. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt.
 43. Tomyuk, O.N., Dyachkova, M.A., Kirillova, N.B., & Dudchik, A.Yu. (2019). Educational Environment Digitalization as a Factor of Students' Personal and Professional Self-Determination. *Perspectives of Science and Education*, 42(6), 422–434.
 44. Toffler, E. (2003). *Metamorphoses of Power*. Moscow: AST.
 45. Tkhangapsoev, Kh.G., Astafieva, O.N., Dokuchaev, I.I., & Leonov, I.V. (2020). *Information-Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Introduction: Monograph. St. Petersburg: Asterion.
 46. Fedorov, A.V. (2007). *Development of Media Competence and Critical Thinking of Students Studying at a Pedagogical University*. Moscow: Informatsiya dlya vsekh.
 47. Eisenstein, S.M. (1964). Behind the Scenes. In S.M. Eisenstein. *Selected Works in 6 Volumes* (Vol. 2, pp. 283–296). Moscow: Iskusstvo.
 48. Razlogov, K.E. (Ed.). (2006). *Electronic Culture and Screen Creativity*. Moscow: Academic Project; RIK.

Информация об авторе
Кириллова Наталья Борисовна
 (Россия, Екатеринбург)

Профессор, доктор культурологии,
 заведующая кафедрой культурологии и социально-
 культурной деятельности
 Уральский федеральный университет имени первого
 Президента России Б.Н. Ельцина
 E-mail: n.b.kirillova@urfu.ru
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9187-7080
 Scopus Author ID: 55857862200
 ResearcherID: V-1546-2018

Information about the author
Natalia B. Kirillova
 (Russia, Yekaterinburg)

Professor, Doctor of Culturology, Head of the
 Department of Cultural Studies and Socio-Cultural
 Activities
 Ural Federal University named after the First President
 of Russia B. N. Yeltsin
 E-mail: n.b.kirillova@urfu.ru
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9187-7080
 Scopus Author ID: 55857862200
 ResearcherID: V-1546-2018