

CHAPTER 4: TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Julian McDougall, Nurcay Turkoglu, Igor Kanižaj

INTRODUCTION

The assessment across EU member states of the provision of teacher training, professional development and resources for ML educators is informed by the confused relationship between literacy as an established educational field (media/digital literacies, computing, e-safety and ME as a formal curriculum subject) and ML as an informal domain. The teaching of MIL across the EU is framed and to a significant extent constrained by these configurations of policy, discourse and curriculum. For example, a complex situation has developed in the UK whereby the status of Media Studies as a formal, schooled subject with recognized qualifications and related, albeit 'patchy' funding, provision of teacher training and professional development, networking associations and resource providers, progression routes to higher education and even a policy discourse supporting ME was advanced compared to other countries in Europe. But at the same time in the UK the comparative status of ME in public discourse, combined with the scarcity of teacher training and funding for equipment in schools, as well as the lack of Media graduates teaching the subject, has led to an apparent failure of the subject to consistently 'deliver' the skills and attributes for media-literate citizens to match the theoretical and pedagogical ambitions of the EC and more recently UNESCO. This example serves as a striking finding, that there is no clear correlation between the status of ML in the curriculum and the training and development of teachers.

The relationships between and across literacy, new literacies, ML, digital literacy, transliteracies and broader 'safeguarding' objectives have long been a site of dissensus and so the reports assessed here are snapshots of constrained and marginalized practices. Frau-Meigs argues for transliteracy as a conduit for 'new collective dynamics' (2012: 22), whilst Comber observes

'the impact of literacy wars and bandwagons has for too long distracted educators from the main game that people understand how to use texts appropriately to get things done, how to make meaning and how to question the views of the world represented in texts in the interests of particular groups' (2014, p.116).

Although in this text we are not researching new literacy models one has to be aware of both European and American ‘interventions’ in the field have often lacked the capacity for exploring the more complex nature of literacy. The relationship between situated literacy practices to funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al, 2005); repertoires (Marsh, 2009); permeability / porosity (McDougall & Potter, 2015); teacher / student boundary work (Shwartz, 2014); semiotic modes (Parry, 2014); cultural agency (Daniels, 2014) and ‘artifactual’ literacy ethnographies (Jones, 2014, Pahl and Roswell, 2010) have often been marginalized in an overly functionalist approach to media literacy ‘competences’.

According to EU’s *Report on Formal Media Education in Europe* (Hartai, 2014) the concept of ML is commonly expressed in policy, pedagogic, research and public discourse as the ability to ‘access the media, understand and to critically approach different aspects of media contents and institutions, and to create communication in a variety of contexts’ (Hartai, 2014, p.16). As argued elsewhere (McDougall et al, 2015), this ‘composite model’ of MIL adopted across Europe, is impossible to apply to teacher training due to its muddled over-ambition and regulatory / pedagogical contradictions. In the over-arching rationale for their international collection on ML education, De Abreu & Mihailidis (2013) call for ML education to foster criticality, participation, engagement, vibrancy, inclusion, tolerance *and even mindfulness*. This very broad and far-reaching remit for ML as a panacea is untenable for educators to deliver. The situation is further complicated by the ‘digital undertow’ (Frau-Meigs, Velez and Flores, 2014). Due to digital convergence and the proliferation of social media, the already porous definition of literacy is stretched to a far-reaching continuum encompassing at the one end highly protectionist rhetoric about ‘internet addiction’ and at the other an emancipatory ‘Media 2.0’ discourse of ‘participatory culture’.

There is a discernible gap between empirical research in the field of ML and teacher training and development. Conceptually, ML research most usually starts out from theories of powerful literacies and new literacy studies and often seeks to contribute new evidence to debates around participatory culture. These fields are generally mapped with prominence given to the work of Buckingham, Burn, Frau-Meigs, Gonnet, Hasebrink, Hobbs, Jenkins, Kaplun, Kutilainen, Livingstone, Marsh, Potter, Prensky, Suarez, Von Feilitzen, along with more ‘local flavour’ depending on the geographical and cultural contexts for the fieldwork. The kinds of research questions posed in this category often relate to the integration of school /out of school what Potter (2011) refers to as the ‘semi permeable membrane’_sometimes

conceived as ‘third space’ learning, or as Zezulkova describes, ML learning for a young European citizen as a “situated within his or her holistic system in which every experience (is) interconnected and dialogic, (students’) past, present and future whole being and becoming, individual and collective media experience, classroom and media learning, as well as the diverse media platforms, texts, and practices – and thus hermeneutic” (Zezulkova, 2015, p.3). Other areas of enquiry have typically concerned ways of measuring, or accounting for new literacy development; degrees of *critical* ML and the relationship between ML, digital tools and *voice*. Gathering data to speak to new literacy practices, such as *curation*, from young peoples’ perspectives, has been a recurrent objective. A repository of ME research from the last ten years can be found in the *Media Education Research Journal*, in abstracts presented at the annual *Media Education Summit*, but also within EMEDUS through European MIL Observatory, MEDEAnet – Charting Media and Learning in Europe 2012, and ANR Translit as the most extensive project on MIL policies in the European context.

At the same time where ML policy is visible and manifested in practice, if not necessarily in training and development, there is often evidence of hybridity in cultural policy (Hesmondalgh, 2005) – a tense attempt to conflate social-democratic and neoliberal projects, discursively framed most powerfully in the idea of the ‘citizen-consumer’ (Lunt and Livingstone, 2012, cited in Wallis and Buckingham, 2013).

Pragmatically, in this assessment we ‘bracket off’ the complexity of MIL and put aside the profound disconnect between research, policy and practice in order to give prominence to teacher training and development which has a clear rationale for building teachers’ capacity to deliver a specific MIL objective. Thus we attribute a lower weighting to broad initiatives with less alignment to any of three threads of ML which are consistently foregrounded in international policy and / or practice: critical reading, creative production and civic action (see Frau-Meigs and Torrent, 2009).

Comment [dm1]: Again, this isn't born in UK ... Gonnet wrote about "citizen workshops" in the 1990s... I wasn't suggesting it was born in the UK - not sure what the issue is, so leaving it as it is.

Comment [I2]: If Julian has time to reply ok, if not I suggest we erase this line.

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

The reports indicate that in the vast majority of EU member states, there is no provision of formal teacher training in ML and teachers' pedagogic expertise in these areas are dependent on their own interest in seeking out professional development and the availability of such training in their regional or national context. Most ML or education training is provided as part of informal networks or a feature of non-governmentally funded projects. ICT and online safety are covered within teacher training provision and / or governmental educational policy in most EU member states but this is a very different subject area from ML and the confusion between these aspects of curriculum is a major obstacle to ML education.

Within the theoretical framework described, training and capacity building in ME is examined here by looking at the availability of formal, accredited teacher training for ME across the EU. A comparative analysis of media and information education policies in Europe based on the 28 national reports give the precondition for a cross-country understanding of the frameworks for teacher training and capacity building¹.

1. FROM MEDIA EDUCATION TO TEACHER TRAINING

Formal teacher training in ME for capacity building mainly depends on the presence or absence of ME policies in a country but there is no correlation between formal curriculum inclusion and capacity building. Country reports indicate that if there is a ME policy it generally includes the issue of teacher training in ME as well. In some countries (Sweden, France, Italy, Slovakia, Spain, Germany, and the United Kingdom) ME policies are conducted in the frame of general education policies and there are specific degrees (credits/certification) of ME for teachers. The analysis shows that some of the decisive factors for the improvement of teacher training in ME in Europe are:

- a. development of media faculties at the university level,
- b. decentralization of the schools,
- c. budget of the education ministries,
- d. scale of the private and public schools,
- e. willingness of the teacher.

¹ The widespread availability of materials and resources for teachers and also by teachers can be found in online national reports and through the text we will be referring to these reports.

All these factors are dependent on socio-economical changes in societies. But two of them (development of media schools at the universities and the willingness of the teacher), both in institutional and individual level, deserve more attention regarding improvement of MIL because in most of the countries we couldn't find strategic document emphasizing the importance or strategies on how to impact the willingness of the teacher especially in those countries where there are no media schools.

The origins of ME can be traced to Journalism Schools as early as the 19th century in Europe. Transmission of information and popularization of mass media raised new initiatives in journalism education after World War II all over the world. UNESCO played an encouraging role for many of these attempts. However, only since the late 1960s, in strong contrast with US campuses, Western European countries started to develop university-based instruction in journalism: Bordeaux (France) in 1967, Cologne (Germany) in 1968, and Cardiff (United Kingdom) in 1970 (Barrera, 2011). The European tendency to develop journalism courses and departments was not focusing on the training of journalists but aiming at the enhancement of academic knowledge. This tendency probably helped promote ML as it fosters the collaboration of academia and the media for the public good.

The role of media faculties in teacher training in ME has been effective in several circles such as obtaining materials and starting and/or supporting networks for MIL and launching post graduate programs for media educators. Networking and producing materials have been available via new communication technologies.

The role of the universities can be shown in two examples of media schools supporting teacher training in specifically designed post graduate programs in Europe. *Ankara University* in Turkey launched Secondary Teacher Education MA Programs in 2005 on Teaching Journalism, Radio-Television and Public Relations for encouraging Communication graduates for becoming Teachers of Media Literacy in secondary education. In September 2013, the *IHECS Brussels School of Journalism and Communication* launched a new two-year Master's program in Applied Communication, specializing in ME to train professional media educators. Greece has a great history in ML, from the early 80s with ME as a part of communication and mass media studies in 90s. "Faculties from pedagogical and media and communication studies as well as university research institutions are doing a great deal of work on media and digital education" (Andripoulou, Papadimitriou, Kourti, 2014).

There are also several joint initiatives among journalists and teachers to support ML, whose practical actions to raise awareness of the need for a critical and creative media learning system can be understood as one of the most productive and positive responses of the civic society on ME as the ones in Spain.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

“These initiatives include in Catalonia, *Mitjans* (an initiative focusing its actions, including ML issues, on the publication of newsletters and organizing workshops on Communication and Education), or *Comunicar* (a group that conducts training activities, including a very appreciated journal, curriculum guidelines or conferences and seminars). There are also other well-known initiatives such as *Spectus*, *Teleduca*, *HEKO Kolektiboa* or *Entrelínies*. However, it should be pointed out that the above joint initiatives among journalists and teachers have hardly reached any citizens over the past years because they target teachers and students of primary and secondary schools but not other sectors of the society.” (Del Mar Grandio, Vicente, Garcia Matilla, Lazo 2014, p.8).

2. MEDIA EDUCATION POLICIES and TEACHER TRAINING in FORMAL EDUCATION

Is it possible to have quality ME programs without any formal policy? Media researchers in the universities throughout Europe, have been conducting research on the availability of disseminating ML awareness in societies and producing teaching resources that might influence national policies.

Our analysis has found authentic examples providing evidence that even when the official public institutions didn't proclaim any ME policy there is evidence-based praxis with measurable outcomes in most of the EU countries. In France for instance, although the report recognized “the relative absence of public policies”, we found many best practice examples.

There is a general absence of formal public policies in ML although ME (in the departments and/or programmes of media studies, film studies and communication studies, for example) at university level is taught or integrated at university level courses in all EU countries.

There are many research institutions in European countries (such as in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Denmark, France, Portugal, United Kingdom, etc.), which have been doing research to influence policies, to measure the results of such policies and/or to create experiments of ME programmes. These countries also run online platforms nationwide for learning resources, incorporating commercial as well as non-profit materials. Members of

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

research institutions and teacher training institutions are partially involved in the development of suitable materials and offers for ML promotion.

On the other hand, national education policies in teacher training, especially for primary and secondary schools, are mainly focusing on teaching skills in using computer-based education, which covers digital media as well to a degree.

There is a tendency in some European countries to include ML in education policy without emphasising it within teacher training (Sweden, Italy, Slovakia, Spain and Germany). In France in 2016 it was officially integrated in teacher training. There are some references to ML in the “National goals for Teacher Education” as indicated in Sweden; teacher candidates are supposed to be able to “mediate and establish the democratic principles and basic values of Swedish society. The other goal states that the students must be able to show capacity to use information technology in their pedagogic work and be aware of the importance that different media has for this” (Michael Forsman, 2014). However these goals are common for all teachers regardless of their level and there is not a specific degree for teaching ML in Sweden. In France the responsibility for ME lies essentially upon the agenda of the “professeurs documentalistes”/teacher-librarians.

France is a country with one of the best resources for ML training although the authors recognize “the relative absence of public policies regarding the questions of media and information literacy” (Meigs, Loicq, Boutin, 2014, p.14). It has also many stakeholders and national entities such as CLEMI, CANOPE, INA, CNC” (Frau-Meigs, Loicq, Boutin, 2014, p.12). The research on ML in France is not organized on the national level as a research laboratory, but just like in most of the countries through many small projects and different research groups.

In Bulgaria ML is taught mainly in universities. In schools ML problems are tackled more or less by the independent activities of lecturers, whose activity in this respect is linked to their participation in international programs and projects. “The different forms and varieties of media training in Bulgaria are divided into three areas: (1) within University frameworks; (2) within the sphere of non-government organisations and (3) in mobile “ad hoc” formations connected with international or national projects more or less related to ML. These mobile formations have initiatives connected with the realization of project aims and tasks, but have

no policies for implementing and continuing these activities and initiatives afterwards” (Peicheva, Milenkova, Nikolova, 2014, p.11).

In the United Kingdom, ME has been included in the formal, mainstream school curriculum in secondary (11-16) and further (16-19) education in the UK since the 1980s. All children are entitled to ICT and e-safety education, but the ‘mapping’ of this to MIL objectives is minimal.

The Ministry of Culture in Slovakia has developed the concept of ME for rising ML for all; including effective use of media and new communication technologies with a responsible and critical approach to media, developing individual learning skills and eliminating any forms of social discrimination in media. This concept of ML education covers people from preschool children to primary and secondary school students and also the adult population, e.g. parents, seniors and disadvantaged groups.

In countries like Austria and Belgium, there is no formal teacher training in ML. New curricula for future teachers still do not cover ME, which is included only in computer literacy and using media for didactic purposes. In Belgium, “ML is part of the transversal competences framework of the educational system but is not implemented as a key competence” (Audenhove, Marien, Segers, Fastrez and De Smedt, 2014, p.6).

There are other European countries like Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Romania and Serbia without any special policies for teacher training in MIL but utilizing ICT in education faculties. There is a strong need for new educational strategies in order to raise the awareness and build new educational programs.

There is no specialist teacher training in ML but training in information technology is predominant in Bulgaria (Peicheva, Nikolova and Milenkova, 2014, p.10). The discipline primarily involves computer training of adolescents in all schools.

In Croatia, the national Education and Teacher Training Agency is responsible for the provision of professional and advisory support in the area of general education (Car, Kanižaj and Kralj, 2014). There are no public reports on the amount of resources that has been invested in all ME programmes on national and regional level.

No common policy for ME training exists, but a variety of activities are undertaken within the public educational system to provide training to teachers in Cyprus (Papaioannou, Christophorou and Blondeau, 2014, p.11).

“There is no systematic policy for teacher training in the Czech Republic. In terms of certification, there is no possibility in the CR to obtain the diploma (degree) in ME. The mandatory Recommended Expected Outcomes define the outputs of the educational process in the field of ME, but teachers still lack the appropriate tools for teaching” (Šta’stná, Wolák, Jiráč, 2014, 7)

Similar with the countries above, ME is not included as a specific theme within teacher training in Finland (Kotilainen and Kupianen, 2014). These themes are integrated into many school subjects, mainly visual arts, history, social science and mother tongue. Currently, the Finnish secondary basic education curriculum, together with preschool curriculum is in the process of reform. Cross-curricular themes will not be included in the new basic curricula, nor will themes such as media skills and communication.

There is not a specific national ME policy for teacher training in Romania. National policy for teacher’s continuous training refers to development of digital competences, which is methodologically ICT education. On the other hand, there are several projects and courses organized by higher education institutions and NGO’s. (Stanila, Fotiade, 2014)

Although there is no official ME policy in Serbia, there are seminars and courses for teachers’ improvement in teaching and learning competencies to support communication and cooperation skills among children and students. (Matović, Milin Perković, 2014)

The presence or absence of involvement of the state policies for teacher training in ME is distinctive in the cases of Turkey and Ireland. In Turkey, the Primary School Media Literacy Course Guide and Program, published by Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTUK) and Ministry of Education indicates that pedagogical aspects of ML within a conservative way of protecting children are a state policy (Türkođlu, Ayyildiz, 2014). On the contrary, Ireland has no strategic approach to teacher training for ME: “Resources for learning and teaching are typically developed in response to the demands of the syllabus. Individual schools and teachers are free to select the resources most suited to their teaching requirements” (O’Neill, 2014, p.10).

Media education policies are also affected by the liberal economy. There are examples on the country level though it seems to have more impact in Hungary and Portugal as it appears in country reports. Hungary is a pioneer country in film education, from the early 1960s: “Over the past forty years the course content and the attitude of the subject continuously evolved”

(Schleicher, Retfalfi, 2014, p.17). The example of Hungary is evidence to one of the most important challenges which many countries are facing:

“After the changes in education (...) there has been a clear tendency to centralize not only the education but also the textbook market. The efforts of the current ministry dealing with the standardization of education are clearly shown: they want only one or maximum two textbooks in all subjects used by all high school students in every high school.” (p.19).

We conclude this chapter with the example of Portugal . Due to the fact that there is no budget under the Ministry of Education for ME training, self-training for teachers is related to the competences of the schools in the market of education. (Costa, Jorge, Pereira, 2014). This model is raising important questions on the relationship between private companies and public institutions. We see this question on the top of the agenda for the further research.

3. EDUCATION AND CAPACITY TRAINING FOR TEACHERS – ROLE OF THE STATE, PUBLIC BODIES, AGENCIES AND UNIVERSITIES

3.1. OVERVIEW

In this chapter we will give an overview of different education models and we will introduce different models of capacity training for teachers. Role of the state, public bodies, agencies and universities is of the greatest importance for most of the countries. Education of teachers and librarians, as key promoters of ML is present in every country. But there are huge differences between the 28 countries. One of the general remarks is that formal educational institutions are mostly seen as slow, and unable to respond to the new digital challenges (the ‘undertow’), but in joint actions with public agencies, research institutes and new curricula models introduced by universities there is a large scale of short and long term initiatives, although most of them are primarily focusing on safer and better internet agenda.

3.2. AVAILABILITY OF STUDY PROGRAMS IN ME, ML AND MIL

This part of our research was surprising. Based upon Hallin and Mancini models (2004, 2011) we expected that BA and MA programs within official curricula would be one of the highlights of the North/Central European Countries (although Finland, and Denmark kind of a pioneers in ME university programs), but the Table 1 shows that “hybrid” third wave countries model is actually promoting new educational models. In Bulgaria and Poland, at this moment one can find more study programs than in Sweden, Austria, or in UK.

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

Table 1: Overview of the university BA, MA programs and courses in ME/ML, 2013.

Country	Type of study programme in ME /ML (if any) in 2013		
	BA	MA	Courses
Austria	-	-	+
Belgium	-	+	+
Bosnia-Herzegovina	-	-	-
Bulgaria	+	+	+
Croatia	-	-	+
Cyprus	-	-	-
Czech Republic	-	-	+
Denmark	+	+	+
Estonia	-	-	+
Finland	+	+	+
France	-	-	+
Germany	-	-	+
Greece	-	-	+
Hungary	+	+	+
Ireland	-	-	+
Italy	-	+	+
Latvia	-	-	+
Lithuania	-	-	-
Netherlands	-	-	+
Poland	+	+	+
Portugal	-	+	+
Romania	-	-	+
Serbia	-	-	+
Slovakia	-	+	+
Spain	-	-	+
Sweden	-	-	+
Turkey	-	+	+
United-Kingdom	-	-	+

While Finland, Denmark, Portugal, UK, and Italy are still promoting best practices in university education we are emphasizing new university program models in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary with huge increase in the overall number of educational ME programs.

Poland is giving a new path for media education university programs with 8 BA ME related programs and 5 MA ME programs. Both private and public universities provide these programs. We've found similar situation in Bulgaria.

“Higher specialized media education in the form of bachelor’s, master’s and PhD programs as well as individual disciplines and specializations in the fields of media, journalism or public relations in Bulgaria are available in major public and private universities, such as Sofia University, University of National and World Economy, New Bulgarian University, Southwest University, American University in Bulgaria, Burgas Free University, and others” (Peicheva, Milenkova, Nikolova, 2014, p.14).

Media education is a part of the university curricula in Hungary as well.

“Since 2013 the university education of teachers in Hungary is not done within the Bologna system of BA and MA structure but is done within a 4+1 year education program. There are 50 full time and 10 part time courses. The number of alternative courses are basically this high because these are double major university courses. 20 Students can only take media education together with another major which can be: Hungarian literature and grammar, History, Art, Music, PE, Foreign language and culture, Geography or Information Science.” (Schleicher, Retfalvi, 2014, p.12)

While “hybrid” is becoming the promotor of new models, in all countries we see opportunities for public bodies to build new programs, strategies and initiatives through better cooperation between Pedagogical Institutes, State Agency, and/or Teacher and Training Agencies and responsible Ministries. Even in those countries where ML/MIL is not a part of curricula one can find initiatives of Education and Teacher Training Agency (ETTA) as in Croatia with active participation in organization of professional conferences and national ML and MIL symposiums. ETTA has increased their efforts in raising awareness and capacity building for such a huge number of educators on national level, but they are facing insufficient Government support for capacity building in ME programmes. This is also one of the indicators that there is no strategic approach.

There is also a group of countries (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia) where universities have a leading role in raising awareness of ML through the education of teachers and journalists. Croatian University of Zagreb (Faculty of Political Science – Journalism Department, and Croatian Studies) in the last five years established new courses on Media Pedagogy, Media and Children and Media Culture for graduate students. There is no BA or MA in ME in Croatia. (Kanižaj, Car, Kralj, 2014, p.20). In Serbia, ML was introduced in 2005 as an optional course at the Teacher Training Faculty, University of Belgrade, besides many study programmes that include courses in the fields of ME faculties and colleges in Serbia. (Matović, Milin Perković, 2014, p.14)

In the Swedish school system at large, teacher training with a wide space for local design of the syllabus is within the national curricular, including media awareness. ME for teacher training is not a specific degree in Sweden. (Forsman, 2014)

In the United Kingdom, GCSE and A-Level Media Studies are firmly established in school/college curriculum although neither GCSE or A Level are mandatory, and thus these remain options taken by small percentages of students and are often provided as 'less academic' alternatives (McDougall, Livingstone and Sefton-Green, 2014). The majority of media teachers in the United Kingdom are English graduates. The most common route into teaching media is through a Post Graduate Certificate in Education in English, although more generic 'on the job' training routes are increasingly common due in part of funding reforms. The percentage of Media teachers holding degrees in the subject increases year on year, but the absence of accredited teacher training in the subject continues. There are, at present, only two Media teacher-training courses, run by the Central School of Speech and Drama and Goldsmiths, both in London. ME training is thus dominated by masters level courses that do not carry qualified teacher accreditation, modules within Masters in Education programmes and by continuing professional development courses and events. It should be noted that at the time of writing, the Media Studies curriculum in England is subject to a significant re-development commissioned by the Government, including a reduction in creative production and an emphasis on written examinations demonstrating students' understanding of prescribed theories applied to set media texts from an approved list. Whilst this will, in the opinion of many ME specialists, reduce the distinctive development of contemporary ML in the school curriculum, it will also reduce the distinction between Media Studies and Humanities / Social Science subjects so that teachers of those subjects may feel more equipped to teach the new version of the subject.

In Finland there are two universities with master's degree in ME. In Portugal, in higher education institutions, five Universities and a Polytechnic Institute offer courses in ME at degrees aimed for school-teachers and included in Educational Sciences. (Costa, Jorge, Pereira, 2014). Some Estonian higher education institutions have integrated the theme of ME in their curricula, mainly "due to the passion and initiative of a few enthusiasts" (Siibak, Ugur, Vinter, 2014, p.13)

In Slovakia there is a special degree in ME for secondary school teachers launched by the Faculty of Mass Media Communication, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius (UCM) in 2010. Supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic, a special program of continuous education for teachers is called "*Qualification study of Media Education school subject for secondary school teachers*". It is the only

educational project allowing secondary school teachers to obtain the full qualification for teaching ME in Slovakia. (Vrabec, 2012b in Vrabec, Petranova, 2014, p.8)

In Turkey, “secondary Teacher Education MA Programmes in departments of “Teaching Radio and TV”, “Teaching Journalism” and “Teaching Public Relations” started in 2005 in Ankara University, Institute of Education (Turkoglu and Ayyildiz, 2014). Istanbul University has also launched these MA programmes and under the department of Secondary Teacher Education. Additionally, graduates of Communication Schools of the Universities can teach ML (without having pedagogical formations) to junior high level with the initiative of the schools, but are not allowed to teach in kindergarten level. In the Primary Teacher Training “information literacy” is a compulsory course for the teachers to follow up digital technologies in their teaching tasks” (p.7).

In Denmark, “training of upper-secondary school teachers is university-based, and teachers of media studies must have a BA or an MA degree in media studies. Other media-related subjects are also taught in upper-secondary education with similar degree credentials in the subjects of relevance” (Drotner, 2014, p.14).

In the vast number of other countries ME or MIL programs as an elective course within other study programs (media studies, library science, visual culture, journalism...) But even though in most of the countries universities don't have BA or MA programs in ME, they are providing important research activities for primary and secondary school together with agencies.

3.3. TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

In last chapter we showed that BA and MA study programs in ME/ML are not so easy to find on the overall EU level. Even within the educational system where there isn't any possibility for ME inside formal curricula there are other opportunities to introduce new teaching models and empower teachers in order to provide sustainable and quality learning outcomes. ANR TRANSLIT attempts to show the variety of stakeholders and diversity of practices throughout Europe.

We found several main activities within teacher training (TT) programs in four main categories:

- TT organized and provided by the universities

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

- TT organized and provided by the TT agencies and state bodies
- TT organized and provided by the private companies
- TT organized and provided by the NGOs

Regarding the content and type of the trainings it is primarily focused on:

- ICT activities
- Critical Analysis of media content
- Other topics such as creative media

Training also can be compulsory and elective, but usually are part of the long life education programs. It is funded by the state, agencies or by the schools (like in Portugal) and it can be also voluntary. In some countries we found examples of educational networks and partnerships that are including different stakeholders.

France is strongly supporting this variety of stakeholders. Primary school teachers participate in M@gistère with 18 hours of compulsory training requirement. Training is also primarily focused on library science

“like with a distinct predominance of classical bibliography research: data bases, catalogues, library resources. In contrast, a minor part is dedicated to Internet tools, evaluation and the new problems related to information technology. The aim of such training remains the acquisition of information skills, according to the canonical pattern of library search (researching, evaluating, producing information)”. (p.14).

Ministry of National Education is encouraging teachers in France to become members of different specialized social network groups. The intention of the MNE is to “offer them daily support in their professional activity whether it takes place inside the classroom (education resources, learning tools) or outside the classroom (calls for proposals, collaborative working groups)” (p.15). However the number of teacher members of this social network is still limited.

In Austria

“The virtual university of education offers various online seminars for technical skills regarding ICTs but also critical analysis of media content (e.g. TV series) and creative media use at school (e.g. how to produce podcasts). Participation in such online training is voluntary

and there are is currently no available data regarding the effectiveness of these seminars for the practice of ME in Austrian schools.” (Trültzsch-Wijnen, 2014, p.10)

In Belgium The CANON Cultuurcel organisation provides ML training through a network that deals with cultural education within teacher training programmes, in which all teacher-training institutes in Flanders are represented. All teacher training institutes, supplemented with the schools of arts meet twice a year to discuss ML. (Van Audenhove, Mariën, Bens, Fastrez, De Smedt, 2014, p.6)

In Romania, the MediaSIS training course is aimed at teachers who want to improve their media and digital literacy. “In Portugal by 2011 roughly 45,000 teachers have attended a training course in Pedagogical and ICT skills, under the Technological Plan.”(Costa, Jorge, Pereira, 2014, p.10).

In Spain, there is a “distinction between the training of the future teachers in the higher education and the lifelong education of primary and secondary school teachers” (María del Mar Grandío, Miguel Vicente, Agustín García Matilla, Alfonso Gutiérrez Martín, Carmen Marta Lazo, 2014, p.5). Training programmes of the future teachers include ME both for promoting/using media skills and developing critical analysis of media.

In Romania The University of Bucharest also has launched an initial training and professional reconversion section in the field of documentation and information sciences aiming at training the ‘teachers documentarist’ which includes not only ICT levels but also aims to promote the “definition and the implementation of a documentary policy by activities (pedagogical, cultural) organized in CDIs (Documentation and Information Centers) at local level“ (Stanila, Fotiaide, 2014, p.8)

Teacher training program is seen as the important “bypass” with strong impact in societies where the study programs are rare and of lower quality, but TT program has to been acknowledged because of many advantages and the ability to provide new training programs in cooperation with public and private institutions in a shorter time frame. This is of great importance especially for ML/MIL where new challenges are appearing on everyday basis.

3.4. TEACHING MATERIALS AND RESOURCES

Teaching resources and materials are abundant due to the development of information technologies in schools, which is a crucial part of the general education policies. Higher education institutions and ME departments of the universities (communication and journalism, for example) provide specific media and information materials to be used in the curriculum. Most of the ML documents are available in local languages, some of them translated from European Council & UNESCO documents upon national agreements. There are also some original texts in local languages. In some countries research institutions and media centres are also supportive in building guided activities.

We also found important role of universities especially in capacity building and providing support in research to school system, NGOs and other stakeholders. Universities are one of the most important partners and many initiatives have for new materials have been organized on the university level.

In some countries we found outstanding examples of joint cooperation of educational institutions and journalistic organisations and companies (Austria, Belgium, Finland, Spain, Portugal). These models could be implemented in other EU countries.

In many countries we found that librarians are providing many educational programs within the schools. We propose a new model for the evaluation of the teaching material and resources based upon 8 categories: Multiple topics, Languages used, Digital Repository, Materials provided by teachers, Best practice examples, Off-line materials and Digital materials. We

Table 2: Overview of teaching material and resources ME/ML, 2013

Country	Score	Type of the teaching material and resource							
		Multiple topics	More than one language	Digital repository	Provided by teachers	Established networks	Best practice examples/awards	Traditional off-line content	Digital content
Austria	6	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
Belgium	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bulgaria	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Croatia	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Cyprus	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Czech Republic	7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Denmark	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Estonia	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Finland	7	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
France	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
Germany	7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Greece	7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

Hungary	6	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Ireland	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Italy	7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Latvia	N/A								
Lithuania	N/A								
Netherlands	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Poland	6	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Portugal	6	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Romania	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
Serbia	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Slovakia	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Spain	6	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Sweden	7	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
Turkey	35	1	01	01	0	0	0	1	1
United-Kingdom	5	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1

This table suggest that we could find three groups of countries:

1. *The leaders in teaching material and resources*: Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Greece and Italy. In these countries teachers are provided with outstanding resources, with strong focus on digital materials, networking, and teachers are awarded for the best practice. If compared to Hallin and Mancini (2004, 2011) we could say that we have new model with combination of Nord/CEU countries and Mediterranean countries.
2. *Countries with solid teaching materials and resources*: Austria, France, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Netherlands, UK, Estonia and Ireland. Most of these countries are not promoting teacher examples of best practice and/or there is not enough resources produced by the teachers in comparison to the first group. In this group we found countries from all three Hallin and Mancini models.
3. *Countries with lower teaching material capacities*: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Serbia, and Slovakia. Especially in these countries there is an urgent need for a long term strategy in order to overcome the existing challenges, although from the reports we could see that in last several years there has been a considerable improvement. Most of these countries are representing “hybrid” model as suggested by Hallin and Mancini (2011).

However, this kind of categorisation has its own constraints. Maybe one of the biggest advantages of ANR TRANLIST is that it gives a broader perspective on the country level.

In chapter 3.2. we emphasized Bulgaria as one of the examples of the countries with high quality study program. In comparison to this table we can say that there is huge gap between the number and quality of study programs and the number and quality of teaching material on a disposal to teachers.

Many examples of materials available online are prepared by high-school teachers themselves based on their creativity as in the case of Hungary, Bulgaria, Serbia, Spain and Sweden.

However there are also important country specifics we have to be aware of. One of the main characteristics of Germany is that “the materials are mainly adjusted to the respective framework on state level” (Kammerl, Hasebrink, 2014, p.13). Due to the fact that each state has its own media authority they also provide offers for schools – its extent depending on the financial funding of the respective media institute. Germany has impressive collections of teacher materials such as: <http://www.verbraucherbildung.de/materialkompass> but is still facing the same problems like the vast number of others – according to curricula there is not much time for ML and it has to be taught within other subjects. That is one of the reasons for authors to call for

“opening up curricula for the tasks of media literacy promotion”. Germany also has a special “seal of quality for educational media (Comenius) and an award for programs promoting media literacy (Klicksafe Award), but there is nothing especially for promoting media literacy in school” (Kammerl, Hasebrink, 2014, p.14).

Probably one of the best repositories can be found in Greece. *Photodentro* was launched in 2013, within the Digital School, to serve as the ultimate best practice model for other countries. (Andriopoulou, Papadimitriou, Kourti, 2014, p.15) This is actually a Greek Digital Learning Object Repository for primary and secondary education. According to the national report, “*Photodentro* is in the same time accumulating metadata from collections of digital resources that are stored in digital libraries and repositories of other organisations (museums, libraries, audio-visual archives) and which can be exploited in the learning process.” (p.15)

In Italy teachers have many opportunities and possibilities for training and education. Key stakeholders as INDIRE, National Institute for Research and Innovation on Education and Ansas – National Agency for development of School Autonomy. INDIRE is producing PuntoEdu, “a web portal where multimedia educational content has been developed for training activities as well as for pedagogical training for teachers” (Aroldi, Murru, 2014,

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

p.15). Teachers in Italy can use one of the four databases that collect resources provided by ANSAS: Dia, Pon, Gold and Musiknet. Authors identify two fundamental approaches to ME training: theoretical (how to plan and design ME projects) and practical (guidelines and practical instruments ready to be implemented in the program).

In comparison to its neighbouring countries, although listed in the second group of countries Hungary has great tradition and resources for teachers both from primary and secondary school. First books and manuals on film literacy were published between 1966 and 1969. (Schleicher, Retfalvi, 2014, p.17). Many books are available online, still following strong tradition of film literacy. Materials, not just the textbooks but different audio-visual materials are also promoting key actors from the Hungary film history but there is also a specialized agency Educatio through which educational materials are published for the general public on the web in order to “expand the national education program in line with the academic portal Sulinet” (p.19). The same goes for Czech Republic with impressive list of manuals and textbooks. The portal of the *Research Institute of Education* (www.rvp.cz) is a good example for having a fundamental role for providing teaching materials in Czech Republic, which offers many texts and methodologies for ME teachers and it is created by media studies theorists and independent teachers. Some teaching resources were produced by experts, teachers and students as part of national campaigns such as “Safer internet for children and Youth” (<http://ucitelji.hr>) in 2010-2013 in Croatia.

Although Netherlands has outstanding training resources through its project mediawijzer.net, with a rather small number of other institutional actors supporting teacher training: “Mediawijzer.net proposes competence models for teachers and for teacher training students. The models comprise ten different competences, categorized in four areas, namely: understanding, use, communication and strategy” (McGonagle, Schumacher, 2014, p.24).

Poland has many institutions and initiatives active in production of teaching resources. Most of the discussions on production of material were on open educational resources. “Educational materials are state controlled only with respect to their quality and compliance with the curriculum requirements” (Iwanicka, Walter, Kielkiewicz-Janowiak, 2014, p.19).

In Portugal the “School Libraries Network Program” (Rede de Bibliotecas Escolares-RBE)”, “a joint initiative of the Ministries of Education and Culture that was launched in 1996, has a relevant contribution for literacies, be it reading, writing, information and digital literacy”

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

(Pinto et al., 2011: 78 in Costa, Jorge, Pereira, 2014, p.15). According to the authors the resources are not designed as traditional textbooks and there is a gap between the academic works and teachers' training although there are some private efforts for funding. "In the case of the project 'Media Smart', an initiative of the private sector for advertising literacy and supported by the Ministry of Education, the resources are freely distributed from the website and are not localised but only translated by the Ministry of Education (from the UK version)". (p.16)

In Slovakia generally, there is not a sufficient amount of educational materials necessary for teaching ME in Slovakia. Teachers mostly use materials and publications produced by foreign professionals (in English or Czech language). The reason is the lack of finance for publishing such materials and textbooks. Protection of intellectual property in Slovakia is considered important but there is a scarcity of educational resources and materials. "The reason for that is mainly the lack of financial sources for design, production and distribution of such information and educational materials to schools (...) The content of texts financed by the Ministry of Education is assessed by a committee of teachers who have experience with ME teaching. (Vrabec, Petranova, 2014, p.12.)

In Spain, most of the projects by regional governments and media to produce ME materials for teachers and students of primary and secondary schools, have been taking traditional and new media as information resources. The Spanish Ministry of Education has launched websites with a specific section and sources for ME in 2007.

There are also school teachers who wish to work *with* and teach *about* the media in the classroom and have therefore developed educational material by themselves, such as the *Television Literacy Network* in Serres (Northern Greece) that offers, among other things, a detailed booklet for teaching television literacy in the classroom. Another online platform (www.mediamanual.at) for ME was developed in Austria on various aspects of ME and ML as well as teaching materials for all kinds of media is provided. *Koolielu* (School-life) portal of Estonia is publicly available for all and contains a special section with ME materials (<http://koolielu.ee/waramu/search/sort/created/curriculumSubject/153529205>).

3.5. TRAINING PROGRAMS AND ICT

There is a strong emphasis on the role of ICT learning in teacher training in MIL (according to the country reports). There are optional ME courses in the curricular for students where ME policies are taken into consideration but the general overview shows that ICT learning and information literacy are more likely to take place in the general curriculum as compulsory courses. Different components of ML such as computer literacy, digital literacy, visual literacy and film literacy are hardly distinguished in one common model.

Throughout Europe, there are countries facing different IT and ICT challenges: problems of infrastructure, Internet availability and penetration as in the case of Latvia, where the fundamental preconditions for online capacity building are not provided (Brikše, Freibergs, Spurava, 2014, p.17). There are also different standards when considering the formal capacities of school libraries for ICT learning. At the same time, in some countries, the challenges are overcome by effective cross-cultural cooperation where NGOs and private companies become partners in ICT learning programs.

Along with traditional models of education in the last years there is an increasing number of countries promoting ICT, e-skills and e-learning on different levels (Austria, Cyprus, Turkey, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Italy, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Finland). However, each country has its own characteristics and obstacles.

In Cyprus, a “coordinating role is assumed by the Pedagogical Institute that cooperates with the directorates of the Ministry of Education and school inspectors. Computer literacy and Internet safety have been two privileged training targets, with the former being a course in the curriculum and various contests among students and schools on safety are organised annually, contribute to broader efficiency. Schools participate also in programmes to receive a certificate for safe networks and internet environment.” (Papaioannou, Christophorou, Blondeau, 2014, p.11)

In the Czech Republic, “the institutionalization of ICT as a part of education institutionalized also a gap between “ME” and ICT (including “new media”). Due to the developments in the media in recent years, this division appears very problematic”. (Vrabec, Petranova, 2014, p.9)

While reporting on the role of ICT in training programs we recognize four different approaches:

1. *Fundamental ICT preconditions* – some countries are through official policy more oriented toward the infrastructure, and general penetration. In the reports we couldn't measure the differences in this first level and the capacities of the schools and universities. As long as we don't have approximately the same level of ICT preconditions we should emphasize that one of the basic preconditions in order to implement a specific training activity is to have the same “starting point” within the classrooms.

In Portugal Technological Plan for Education (PTE) (launched in 2009) was mainly focused on technology and Internet access (Conceição Costa, Ana Jorge and Luís Pereira, 2014).

“The most visible programs of PTE were the ‘e.escolinha’ (e-little School), created to deliver the laptop ‘Magalhães’ (Magellan) for children, the ‘e.professor’ (e-teacher) directed to school teachers and that allow them to buy laptops with broadband access and the ‘e-oportunidades’ (e-opportunities), directed to adults that were in training programs, and mainly related to computer skills acquisition” (p.10).

2. *Implementation of ICT in learning programs* – Second level is the use of ICT in learning, primarily by librarians but state agencies are investing resources in many countries in order to empower different stake holders and provide them with new ICT knowledge and skills.

Croatia has initiated digital competencies capacity building through CARNet (Croatian Academic and Research Network). They are running a project ICT Edu from 2009. “The goal is to educate all teachers and provide them with digital competencies. Together with project partners Ministry of Science, Education and Sports and ETTA they have organized and implemented 2190 workshops in the primary and secondary schools for 45284 teachers”. (Kanižaj, Car, Kralj, 2014, p.8)

In France The Ministry of Education, via DGESCO, has implemented programs of in-house training with e-learning. They produce resources and encourage teachers to create resources on their own. Resources are available through DVDs, websites, through catalogues of films whose rights have been acquired, listings of relevant educational tools, even downloadable periodicals. Teachers are also using the material produced by UNESCO. As far as the resources are concerned the authors of the French report emphasize that “there is a limit to the development of resources that is due to a

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

very restrictive implementation of educational exception to copyright in France.” (Frau-Meigs, Loicq, Boutin, 2014, p.15).

In Spain, since the 1980’s, training for ICT use and education with innovative technologies are available for all schoolteachers instructed by Center of Teachers and Resources (CTR). The Open University in Spain (UNED) with the Centre of Teachers (CEP) has been organizing courses and workshops for teachers’ education in digital competences and media (Del Mar Grandío, Vicente, García Matilla, Gutiérrez Martín, Lazo, 2014)

In Sweden *ITIS* (1999–2002) or *Information Technology in Schools* (ITIS) was an important development in Swedish schooling. It was launched by the *National Agency for Education* in collaboration with the union for employees of the municipals, and connected to *The Delegation for IT in Schools*. The aim with IT IS was to train teachers in the use of computers. (Forsman, 2014, p.9)

3. *Effective ICT use in the class* – This is directly connected with Digital Repositories mentioned in the chapter 3.4. Nordic countries but also Italy and Greece are leading the way. Since 2007 in Denmark, a Ministry of Education specifies ‘ICT and media competences’ to encompass ‘subject-specific’ as well as ‘general study’ competences whose training should be based on progression from personal tool, to practical didactic tool, on to reflexive didactic tool. (Drotner, 2014) ICT and media are defined as tools for information search (‘critical, explorative, reflective’), communication (examples given are: CMS, intranet, chat, SNS, presentation), production and editing (examples given are: web, blogs, wikis, video, sound, digital photo). This approach is based on a definition of ICT and media as means of teaching, not ends of learning.

In Romania The University of Bucharest also has launched an initial training and professional reconversion section in the field of documentation and information sciences aiming at training the ‘teachers documentarist’ which includes not only ICT levels but also aims to promote the definition and the implementation of a “documentary policy by activities (pedagogical, cultural) organized in CDIs (Documentation and Information Centers) at local level”. (Stanila, Fotiaide, 2014, p.8)

In Austria “As part of the eFIT strategy, the ‘eBuddy’ concept facilitates technically skilled teachers helping less skilled colleagues in using media and e-learning tools in the class”. (Trültzsch-Wijnen, 2014, p.10)

“The closeness with media literacy and the teaching of digital technology has rekindled the possibility of a global view around information cultures with the library as “learning-center” or “third place” for the implementation of such new learnings and training”. (p.14) The role of school libraries is also very important. They are becoming modernized and authors emphasize that, although still not in the whole country, they are becoming digitalized “teaching libraries”, for MIL.

Through many new programs ICT training is becoming one of the basic preconditions in support of ME schedules, although in many countries the ‘safer internet’ approach still dominates, mostly due to the fact the is strongly supported by official public institutions. We see that in many countries ICT training has been initiated within safer Internet campaigns. One could say that at this moment most of the countries are now in the position to have countries with first two levels accomplished but without sufficient participative programs and promotion of critical/reflexive approach.

4. MEDIA EDUCATION PROVIDED BY THE NGO, PRIVATE COMPANIES, INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

ME is bringing together different stakeholders. Even in the countries where official bodies and governments are not aware of the need for ME to become a part of educational policy, there are programmes, projects and initiatives coming from below, primarily from NGOs, private organisations and different voluntary networks. In almost every country we found at least one ML education initiative. Most of the activities in the first phase of activities were developed from the perspective of film literacy and in the last five years there has been a profound shift towards Internet safety, engaging some IT companies as stakeholders. The danger is that general critical and creative ME has fallen between the screen-dominated film literacy in the past and the concern with both cyber-safety and ICT and coding skills.

At the same time, new initiatives and projects in the field of information literacy are being developed through collaborations between teachers and librarians. ICT and MIL are connected with these two professions on an everyday basis. However, these kinds of activities

will only be sustainable if policy makers provide motivating frameworks for voluntary work and financial support.

A significant threat is the motivation of private stakeholders. If all extracurricular activities are offered by private companies we have to take into account their interests, sometimes far beyond SCR – Social Corporate Responsibility. In many coding programs, private companies seek the role of predominant supplier. At the same time, the absence of policy on how to include other stakeholders in ME, is making alliances and partnerships more difficult to build. Despite these challenges the need for ME is bringing public and private in a new context with many new opportunities for joint cooperation.

We found great opportunities in ESF funds in the EU in many examples on how EU funded projects can help build capacity on a horizontal level in primary and secondary education. These kinds of projects often have great visibility. EU networks make it easier to distribute outcomes and initiate the transfer of knowledge.

Different organizations have directly or indirectly stimulated the take up of ML through teacher training colleges in Austria. The Media Coach project focused on increasing the ML expertise of professionals in libraries, schools and the youth sector. It provides extensive training to professionals who work with students and youth in different settings.

In some count Bosnia-Herzegovina, “due to the lack of state financial support to teachers’ education, programs of continuous education and lifelong learning are usually financed from donations. Given the inaction of the State, some non-governmental organizations and the international community are assuming the responsibility for training teachers” (UN Human Rights Council 2008: 15 in Turčilo, Tajić, 2014, p.15).

Research shows that only 51% of surveyed teachers are aware of the existence of teacher training for ME. “In 2010 three Bosnia-Herzegovina universities (Sarajevo, Mostar and Bihać 2014) have joined the Tempus project “Information Literacy for Lifelong Learning and Knowledge Based Economy in the Western Balkans“, run by the Limeric Institute for Technology. This is the first project aimed at gathering professors, librarians and policy makers in order to develop joint curricular for training teachers for information and ME. The objective is to introduce innovative online training of teachers in elementary and high schools, as well as to harmonize information literacy trainings in the Western Balkan countries”. (p.20)

We found example where many EU funded projects brought together NGOs, private organisations and public officials.

In Croatia, NGO's have initiated public opinion research on ML, established cooperation with the Ministry of science, education, and sports, but also with Education and Teacher Training Agency. Through the program Pet za net, teachers have built new curricular and DKMK has educated a large number of teachers, children and their parents in one of many workshops in Croatian primary and secondary schools. Due to their efforts even the national institutions have changed their agenda and included ML in the regular educational supported programs. (Kanižaj, Car, Kralj, 2014)

An important role has been played by non-profit organisations in Czech Republic as well:

“Civic associations and non-profit educational organizations have responded to the situation and began to draft the first methodological materials, educational courses and support for teachers. The absence of the possibility of professional specialization is still a major problem that prevents anchoring ME in the school practice (.). The vast majority of graduates of Faculties of Education in CR had undergone their studies without a deeper contact with media issues (studies have shown that young teachers usually meet with ME after their coming into practice). The situation is slowly changing and some faculties are beginning to offer teachers the basics of media studies but this range is still not adequate or uniform” (Šta'stná, Wolák, Jiráček, 2014, p.8).

As media is seen as a cross-curricular topic, teaching the didactics of ME is dependent upon the willingness and interest of the lecturers responsible.

In Germany, a huge number of resources and teaching material is produced by multiple stakeholders: private companies, NGO, institutes, churches and teachers themselves are building their own resources often with support from other stakeholders. (Kammerl, Hasebrink, 2014)

In Greece, resources are primarily published with the help from private sector, “NGOs (e.g. KARPOS, Let's Go to the Cinema - PAME CINEMA, Olympia Film Festival) and independent media professionals”, but also efforts from teachers are significant in the production of materials. (Andriopoulou, Papadimitriou, Kourti, 2014, p.14) For example, the Television Literacy Network offers, among other things, a detailed booklet for teaching television literacy in the classroom. However, all formal resources have to be approved by the

Formatted: Right: 0.63 cm

Institute of Educational Policy. This body has the authority also on the national curricular. The Hellenic Audiovisual Institute provides training material, primarily through its Media Literacy Department. “They are also producing “material on media education for teachers, parents and students, in paper and online format that was freely distributed in school units all over Greece” (p.14)

Italy is a good example of how EU funded projects can enhance the ME programme, such as “Digital & Media Literacy Education” – a guide for ME courses on five different topics. However, Italy has a conflicting characteristic in the form of a weak role of libraries that is affecting MIL capacity building. (Aroldi, Murru, 2014)

In Lithuania,

“the National program of Teaching about Information Processes and Human Rights (2006) was developed by a group of education and media experts, educators, and NGO activists. This initiative included the development of teaching and learning materials integrated into various teaching subjects, such as: ethics, citizenship education, literature, history, also extra-curricular activities. Most of the resources have been published on the website of the Teacher Professional Development Centre. Stronger collaboration between teachers and researchers is needed to support effective practice of teachers' training” (Juraite, 2014, p.8)

In Poland, the following initiatives have promoted teacher training and capacity building: Scholaris.pl, Interkl@sa, WolneLektury.pl, The Wikimedia Polska Association, Didakta, EdukacjaXXI wieku, Wolne Podręczniki, Digital School. Materials are also prepared by teachers themselves, and Digital School is a governmental programme implementing the goals set by Opening up Education initiative launched by EC. (Iwanicka, Walter, Kielkiewicz-Janowiak, 2014, p.21)

In Romania, “several e-platforms (as provided by the MNE, universities or other private organizations) are available for teachers’ use but it is not clear how useful teachers find them or the extent to which they use them” (Stanila, Fontiade, 2014, p.10). Universities involved in teacher training programmes have produced mainly ICT and e-learning materials and academic research on digital learning is popular among university students but most of the resources are produced by the specific projects. (p.12)

In Serbia, “teaching resources and materials are provided by NGOs and the private sector, mostly as a result from specific project activities” (Matović, Milin Perković, 2014: 19).

Among the projects of these NGOs there are online libraries, the publication of translated handbooks for teachers and basic ME books for students. “*Microsoft Office* in Serbia also provides digital literacy workshops and seminars for teachers and students” (p.19)

In Sweden, Nordicom has the International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media as a part in its network. According to Forsman (2014, p.18) Nordicom has been in charge of this UNESCO-financed operation since 1997 which makes them one of the key stakeholders. The Clearinghouse brings together a network of approximately 900 participants representing a number of different users – members of the research community, media professionals, politics, government authorities, voluntary organizations and other interested individuals.

At the end of this chapter we would like to emphasize the importance of NGOs but also their role in initiating new partnerships between private and public partners. They have helped to raise the awareness, empower the teachers, promote best practice and build capacity even in those countries where governments have failed or are still not aware of the importance that ML/MIL have in our contemporary society.

5. CONCLUSION

In the first chapter we started with listing five decisive factors for the improving of teacher training in Europe: development of media faculties at the university level, decentralization of the schools, budget of the education ministries, scale of the private and public schools, and willingness of the teacher. Throughout the article we provided a large scale of indicators for these factors. It was interesting for us to see how the diversity in Europe is represented also in different teacher training policies and strategies, especially to analyse the study programs and compare them to the number and quality of existing teacher training materials. This analysis has given enough evidences that best practice models within teacher training materials can be found even in those countries where there isn't a large number of study programs. A significant number of this outputs has been done primarily by NGOs.

However, this analysis has showed that media educators achieve better outcomes in developing learners' MIL in countries with a longer tradition of ME and more strongly classified institutional support for ME as a discrete area of the curriculum. The institutional support is one of the key preconditions for quality ME training.

ML policies, where they exist across the EU and are linked to education, are often representative of a discursive cultural hybridity attempting to conflate competing socio-political values (social democracy in the digital public sphere and neoliberal consumerism) and the potential for such a conflicted model to be directly applicable in teacher training and development is minimal.

ME policies, where they exist across the EU, are rarely, if ever, directly linked to the training of media educators. There is an urgent need for new systematic approach to teacher training in ME on the state level. Even some of the most representative countries with outstanding practice in ME have failed in this respect.

There is little evidence that public policies lead to pedagogic innovation or creativity in the field of ML. The ANR TRANSLIT reports indicate that where teachers can be empowered to develop their own pedagogical resources, with autonomy, MIL outcomes are enhanced. The new policies and best practice models should be promoted on supranational level in order to build the teachers capacities.

Co-operation between public and private bodies leads to successful initiatives for MIL education, but clear guidelines for the roles of all stakeholders are needed to protect educational entitlement from corporate interests. Alongside this, there is scarce evidence of a coherent relationship between informal sector training and development and educational policies in the public sector. Where strong curriculum classification exists (eg in the UK), training is provided by awarding bodies but with a focus on preparing students for assessment rather than inclusive pedagogy.

Many successful MIL initiatives, often funded as EU projects, focus on pedagogic shifts to give voice to young people to be critically and powerfully literate on their own terms, as opposed to delivering a narrow, functional conception of digital skills and online safety as understood by the adult public sphere.

Our analysis has given many best practice examples at the state level. Although often without any official policies almost every country has showed great potential at least in one of the observed categories. Teacher training is of the great importance for the overall ML/MIL outcomes. Due to all MIL challenges in the modern classroom we see teacher training as one of the cornerstones of all ME programs.

REFERENCES

- Barrera, C 2011, "The History of Mass Media in Europe: Towards Post-National Perspectives and [Hi-]Stories" Paper presented at ECREA Comm History Workshop (Dublin, September 7-9, 2011)
- Burn, A & Durran, J 2007, *Media Literacy in Schools: Practice, Production and Progression*. Paul Chapman, London.
- Comber, B 2014, "Literacy, poverty and schooling: what matters in young people's education?" *Literacy* 48(3) (2014): 115-123.
- de Abreu, B & Mihailidis, P (eds.) 2014, *Media Literacy Education in Action: Theoretical and Pedagogical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York.
- European Commission, 2011b, "[Testing and Refining Criteria to Assess Media Literacy Levels in Europe Final Report](http://www.eavi.eu/)", accessed November 1, 2014, <http://www.eavi.eu/>
- Frau-Meigs, D 2012, "Transliteracy as the New Research Horizon for Media and Information Literacy," *Medijske Studije* 3(6) (2012): 14-27.
- Gonzalez, N, C. Moll, L & Amanti, C 2005, *Funds of Knowledge: Theorising Practices in Households, Communities and Classrooms*, Mahwah, Erlbaum.
- Hartai, L 2014, *Report on Formal Media Education in Europe (WP3)*. EMEDUS: European Media Literacy Education Study. (Brussels: European Union: Lifelong Learning Programme (internal source).
- Hesmondhalgh, D 2005, 'Media and cultural policy as public policy: The case of the British Labour government'. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11(1) 95-109.
- Hobbs, R 2005, *Digital and Media Literacy: A Plan of Action* White paper, The Aspen Institute, Washington DC.
- Jones, S 2014, "'How people read and write and they don't even notice": everyday lives and literacies on a Midlands council estate," *Literacy* 48(2) (2014): 59-65.

Lunt, P & Livingstone, S 2012, *Media Regulation: Governance and the Interests of Citizens and Consumers*. Sage, London.

Media Education Research Journal: <http://merj.info/>

Media Education Summit: <http://www.cemp.ac.uk/summit/2015>

National ANR TRANSLIT REPORTS, translit.fr

Potter, J 2011, *New literacies, new practices and learner research: Across the semi-permeable membrane between home and school*. *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, 16 (3). pp. 174-181. ISSN 1239-6826

Prensky, M 2012, *Teaching Digital Natives: Partnering for Real Learning*. Corwin Press, New York.

Vos, I. 2012, Charting Media and Learning in Europe, MEDEAnet, www.medeanet.eu/report

Wallis, R & Buckingham, D 2013, 'Arming the citizen-consumer: The invention of 'media literacy' within UK communications policy'. *European Journal of Communication* 28(5), 527-540.

Zezulkova, M 2015, *Whole Person Hermeneutic Media Learning in the Primary Classroom: An Intercultural Grounded Philosophy*. Unpublished PHD thesis, Centre for Excellence in Media Practice, Bournemouth University.