

## **MEDIA USERS COMPETENCIES**

*Slavomír Gálik, Norbert Vrabec, Zora Hudíková, Sabína Gáliková Tolnaiová – Faculty of Mass Media Communication, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*

### **Introduction to the Media Users Competencies Framework**

The conceptual variables related to risks and opportunities (ROs) for deliberative communication in the media users competencies subdomain follow a fundamental holistic and anthropological perspective. This approach results from the interface and interaction between the medium and the user, which are rooted in social practice and at the same time include individual sets of competencies that are adopted in the context of both active and passive media use and strengthened in the lifelong learning process.

The competencies of media users are framed in two basic dimensions. The first of them presents some key characteristics on a personal level, which enable preparation for effective self-realization in today's dynamic change of a changing and mediated society (Kačínová 2018). At the same time, media competences have the potential to develop citizens' personal autonomy and their social and cultural commitment (Ferrés & Piscitelli 2012). The second dimension consists of a wide range of social practices, anchored in one's social environment as well as in the wider social, cultural and political contexts (Baacke 1999, Buckingham 2007).

Competence interactions also take place in a structural, institutional, legislative and regulatory context that influences individual actors (teachers, stakeholders, journalists, etc.) as well as the environment in which these interactions take place. Media competence as a concept can be used both in the sense of a general human capacity as a goal for various structured media education activities (Tulodziecki - Grafe 2019) and describe self-organization abilities with the media which means that media users should aim to apply media in a self-determined and organized, reflective a creative way (Hugger 2008).

Media competence is an important part of the concept of key competencies, which has become a feature of education policy in EU member states at different times and with different emphases since the adoption of the first reference framework in 2006. Key competences are defined by the European Commission (2018b, p.1) as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes appropriate to the context, and where:

- a) knowledge is composed of the facts and figures, concepts, ideas and theories which are already established and support the understanding of a certain area or subject;
- b) skills are defined as the ability and capacity to carry out processes and use the existing knowledge to achieve results;
- c) attitudes describe the disposition and mind-sets to act or react to ideas, persons or situations.

Key competences are those which all individuals need for personal fulfillment and development, employability, social inclusion and active citizenship. They are developed in a lifelong learning perspective, from early childhood throughout adult life, and through formal, non-formal and informal learning.

The European Reference Framework for Key Competences for Lifelong Learning (European Commission 2018) sets the eight key competences:

> Literacy competence

- > Multilingual competence
- > Mathematical competence and competence in science, technology and engineering
- > Digital competence
- > Personal, social and learning to learn competence
- > Citizenship competence
- > Entrepreneurship competence
- > Cultural awareness and expression competence

Although the above-mentioned list of key competencies does not directly mention media competence, individual parameters and attributes of competencies of media users can be identified in practically all of them.

An example is digital competence, which includes "the confident, critical and responsible use of, and engagement with, digital technologies for learning, at work, and for participation in society. It includes information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, media literacy, digital content creation (including programming), safety (including digital well-being and competences related to cybersecurity), intellectual property related questions, problem solving and critical thinking " (European Commission 2018, p.10).

As essential skills and attitudes related to citizenship competence are mentioned "the ability to engage effectively with others in common or public interest, including the sustainable development of society. This involves critical thinking and integrated problem-solving skills, as well as skills to develop arguments and constructive participation in community activities, as well as in decision-making at all levels, from local and national to the European and international level. This also involves the ability to access, have a critical understanding of, and interact with both traditional and new forms of media and understand the role and functions of media in democratic societies." (European Commission 2018, p.12).

The key competences are all considered equally important. They overlap and interlock: aspects essential to one domain will support competence in another. The media are the source of an increasing amount of knowledge about the world. The ability to learn effectively therefore depends to a large extent on the use of individual media technologies, the ability to prefer in the media information that is a new impetus or enrichment for learning. On the other hand, this ability allows a media literate person to "filter" those media stimuli that do not contribute to the process of effective learning at all, or even limit it. In the context of media literacy, the production component also plays an important role - the ability of a person to independently create media content and information and pass it on to others. This aspect is fully manifested in the eighth competence called - cultural awareness and expression competence. Its important part is "developing and expressing one's own ideas and sense of place or role in society in a variety of ways and contexts." (European Commission 2018, p. 14).

Competencies of media users are a highly contextualised activity that takes many forms, involves interpretation and production of shared meanings, ability to access, analyse, evaluate and create messages across a variety of contexts (Hague - Williamson 2009), as well as habitual forms of media use and media socialisation (Park 2017).

The conceptual variables related to risks and opportunities (ROs) for deliberative communication in the media users competencies subdomain take into account the phenomenon of "prosumers" in which citizens have many opportunities for producing and disseminating their own messages as for consuming the messages of others. In other words, media competence is developing by interacting in a critical way

with the messages produced by others, and on a personal level must also be capable of producing and disseminating his or her own messages (Ferrés & Piscitelli, 2012).

Media competencies are also a very important condition for the deliberative communication that takes place in the media space (Dahlgren 2005, Mansell 2010). The higher levels support and the lower level weaken deliberative communication.

What is deliberative communication? Deliberative communication implies communication in which different ideas are articulated and listened to. Decisions are made after reasonable discussion. News media can support the deliberative potential of society by providing truthful facts, and inducing dialogue and rational discussion between different groups in society (<https://www.mediadelcom.eu/deliberative-communication-concept/>).

What are the normative standards of deliberative communication? The normative standards of deliberative communication are open participation, respect for the common good and reasoning. These standards are then divided according to conditions and criteria: mutual respect, responsibility, consensus, authenticity, inclusiveness, equality, rationality, public character of discourse, minimization of external interventions, minimization of self-censorship. Deliberative communication involves various processes, which are defined by the following aspects: consideration of context, consideration of information and media content, openness to relevant and correct content (Cohen 1989, Habermas 1995, 1996, Benhabib 1996, Dryzek 2002, 2010, Englund 2006).

The authors P. Moy and J. Gastil (2006) claim that deliberative communication in the context of democratic discussion includes conflict, resp. conflicting conceptions of the public good, with its participants seeking consensus. At the same time, this discussion has an egalitarian and respectful atmosphere, in which each participant has an equal and reasonable opportunity to speak and at the same time resists the urge to impose his or her own view on others. This process is characterized by openness to conflict, non-dominance, the use of clear information and logical arguments, and mutual understanding. It is an inclusive problem-solving process that gives citizens the opportunity to make meaningful judgments about public affairs. In this context, there is a need to study interpersonal communication, respectively, dialogue. This is a perspective that can support current aspirations for deliberative democracy. As it turns out, the communication dynamics of dialogue have significant potential for deliberative democracy (Escobar 2009). The creation of communication spaces for dialogically generic dynamics represents Escobar's model of the "D + D" process. This requires dialogue formats aimed at exploration and co-production for public reasons and deliberative formats that allow their use and crystallization. It is about rhetorical and interpretive procedures, as well as a discursive construction of competing (saving) perspectives. Escobar points out that pre-negotiation dialogue can help create a secure space for group building in order to reach a consensus without covering up conflicts and differences.

### **What are the opportunities and risks for competencies of media users?**

Opportunities can be understood as the realization of conceptual variables. Conceptual variables to their maximum extent can be understood as an ideal to which media communication should approach. On the other hand, we can also see risks for media users competencies. For example, under the conceptual variable "cognitive abilities", the following risks are: unable to think critically, unable to verify information, unable to detect hoaxes, lies, half-truths, fake news, conspiracy theories, the weak ability of logical argumentation and collective stupidity, weak knowledge of civics, weak knowledge of the media (Lévy 1999, Bauerlein 2009, Carr 2011, Spitzer 2012, Greenfield 2015, Gálik & Gáliková Tolnaiová 2015, Gálik 2017).

The risks for the conceptual variable "communication competencies" are mainly in two areas. First - if media users cannot articulate their ideas clearly and concisely, problems of comprehension, lengthiness, and diversion of the discussion from the substance of the topic may arise in communication. The second problem may be an inability to listen actively, which again brings misunderstanding into the communication, but at the same time there may be more relational problems (Carnegie 2011, Hradiská & Hudíková & Čertíková 2013, Vybíral 2009, Goulstone 2015, Leal 2018 etc.).

The biggest shortcomings for the conceptual variable "users skills" may be the inability to adapt to rapid developments in technology, techniques, software and applications, and the underestimation of personal data protection in the internet space (see digital literacy research and internet risk perception surveys).

Within the conceptual variable "ethical capabilities", the following are these risks: lack of freedom, self-censorship, weakening of free and ethical behaviour under the influence of political - economic interests and pressures, totalitarian, anti-social and selfish values; intolerance, hatred, lack of interest in public affairs, civic passivity (Hamelink 1995, Kavathatzopoulos 2002, Cooper & Menzel 2013, De Schrijver & Maesschalck 2013, Drozdek 2015, Ljajić 2021).

Within the conceptual variable "social contexts of media communication related to competencies", the following is risk low ability of teachers to implement media literacy concepts among learners. Risk of conceptual variable "media competencies of socio-demographic groups in society" are in the insufficient level of media literacy of media users and low efficiency of the efforts of the EU and member states to enhance the status of media users competencies (International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study 2021, Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments 2020, A Survey on Media and Information Literacy in UNESCO Associated Schools Network 2016, PISA Teacher Survey 2018, OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey 2019).

### **Operationalisation of the conceptual variables**

In the first step, we determined 4 conceptual variables on personal level:

- ✓ Cognitive Abilities
- ✓ Communication Competencies
- ✓ Users Skills
- ✓ Ethical Capabilities

and 1 conceptual variable on structural and system level:

- ✓ Social contexts of media communication related to competencies

### **As the following, few selected examples of the studies related to assessment of media related competencies:**

- Study on Assessment Criteria for Media Literacy Levels (2010)
- Testing a Refining Criteria to Asses Media Literacy Levels (2011)
- Media Competence: An Articulated Proposal of Dimensions and Indicators (2012)
- Global Media and Information Literacy Assessment Framework: Country Readiness and Competencies (2013)
- Mapping of media literacy practices and actions in EU-28 (2016)
- Public Policies in Media and Information Literacy in Europe. Cross-Country Comparisons (2017)
- Media Literacy Index (2017,2018,2019)

- Global Critical Thinking Survey
- The State of Critical Thinking Survey

**Other developments in the areas of key competencies that are also useful to consider include:**

- PISA (2009-2020)
- International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)
- Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)
- OECD Skills Outlook
- E-Participation Index
- Eurobarometer
- Eurostat

**In the following table the conceptual variables are presented and their operationalizing opportunities for empirical work:**

<b>LEVELS OF VARIABLES</b>	<b>CONCEPTUAL VARIABLES</b>	<b>OPERATIONAL VARIABLES</b>	<b>POSSIBLE DATA SOURCES</b>
<b>Personal Level Variables</b>	<b>Cognitive Abilities</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rational argumentation in public communication</li> <li>2. Critical consideration of information in communication/media content</li> <li>3. Authenticity of communication</li> <li>4. Knowledge and understanding of contexts of public communication</li> <li>5. Knowledge and understanding of the media, information and digital literacy in the context of deliberative communication</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)</i></li> <li>-<i>OECD Skills Outlook</i></li> <li>- <i>PISA</i></li> <li>-<i>UNESCO</i></li> <li>-<i>EUROSTAT</i></li> <li>-<i>EUROBAROMETER</i></li> <li>-<i>E-Participation Index (UN)</i></li> <li>-<i>Media Literacy Index</i></li> <li>-<i>Global critical thinking survey</i></li> <li>-<i>The State of Critical Thinking Survey</i></li> </ul>
	<b>Communication Competencies</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ability to formulate clear and concise messages and to clarify their background</li> <li>2. Ability to listen actively</li> <li>3. Ability to communicate in an assertive manner</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>PIRLS</i></li> <li>- <i>OECD Skills Outlook</i></li> <li>- <i>PISA</i></li> <li>- <i>UNESCO</i></li> <li>- <i>EUROSTAT</i></li> <li>- <i>EUROBAROMETER</i></li> </ul>
	<b>Users Skills</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Skill in the use of media and media technology.</li> <li>2. Skills to manage and protect data, information and digital identity, and to ensure safety and eliminate risks when using media devices and applications</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>ICILS</i></li> <li>- <i>OECD Skills Outlook</i></li> <li>- <i>UNESCO</i></li> <li>- <i>EUROSTAT</i></li> <li>- <i>EUROBAROMETER</i></li> <li>- <i>E-Participation Index</i></li> <li>- <i>Media Literacy Index</i></li> </ul>
	<b>Ethical Capabilities</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Free participation in public communication.</li> <li>2. Equal participation in public communication.</li> <li>3. Responsible participation in public communication.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>The European Values Study</i></li> <li>-<i>The World Values Survey</i></li> <li>-<i>UNESCO</i></li> <li>-<i>EUROSTAT</i></li> <li>-<i>EUROBAROMETER</i></li> </ul>

		4. Constructive participation in public communication.	
<b>Structural and System Level Variables</b>	<b>Social contexts of media communication related to competencies</b>	1. Media competencies of teachers. 2. Media Competencies of socio-demographic groups in society. 3. Institutional, strategic and legislative contexts of media users competencies	- <i>International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study (2021)</i> - <i>Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments (2020)</i> - <i>A Survey for Measuring 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teaching and Learning (2014)</i>

## Detailed Description of Variables

### PERSONAL LEVEL VARIABLES

#### CONCEPTUAL VARIABLE: *COGNITIVE ABILITIES*

##### Operational variables:

##### *1. Rational argumentation in public communication*

**Keywords:** *factuality, verifiability of information, credibility of argumentation, rational reasoning, information distortion, documentary persuasiveness.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users to communicate rationally - formulate statements, opinions, raise objection in public debate. The ability of media users to think/reasoning logically correctly in a public debate. The ability of media users to use logical argumentation in communication if they are involved in a public debate. The ability of media users to support their claims, attitudes, opinions and decisions with relevant arguments and sources of information or evidence. The ability of media users to justify their views, attitudes and decisions in public debate. Ability of media users distinguish correct use of arguments from ways of pseudo-argumentation.

**Risks:** Cognitive incompetence, weak intellectual abilities, cognitive distortion, use of pseudo-arguments caused by intellectual incompetence, comprehensive doctrines, manipulative elements in communication.

##### **Research questions:**

RQ1: Can media users communicate rationally formulate statements, opinions, raise objection in public debate?

RQ2: Do media users have the ability to think logically correctly in public debate?

RQ3: Can media users use logical argumentation if they are involved in public debate?

RQ4: Can media users to support their claims, attitudes, opinions and decisions with relevant arguments and sources of information or evidence?

RQ5: Can media users to justify their views, attitudes and decisions in public debate?

RQ6: Can media users distinguish correct use of arguments from ways of pseudo-argumentation?

**Sources:** *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), OECD Skills Outlook, PISA, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index, Global critical thinking survey, The State of Critical Thinking Survey.*

##### *2. Critical consideration of information in communication/media content*

**Keywords:** *Critical thinking, assessment of Information, ability to assess media objectivity.*

**Description and opportunities:** Ability of media users to think critically, analyze and evaluate information in communication in the media space/media content. The ability of media users ability to verify information. The ability media users to detect hoaxes, lies, half-truths, fake news, conspiracy theories in media products or discussions.

**Risks:** Media users are unable to think critically, analyze and assess the quality and informational value of media content. Media users are unable to verify information. media users are unable to detect hoaxes, lies, half-truths, fake news, conspiracy theories.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Can media users analyze critically communication/media content?

RQ2: Can media users verify information?

RQ3: Can media users to detect hoaxes, lies, half-truths, fake news, conspiracy theories in media products or discussions?

**Sources:** *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), OECD Skills Outlook, PISA, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index, Global critical thinking survey, The State of Critical Thinking Survey.*

### **3. Authenticity of communication**

**Keywords:** *Open communication, congruence between thinking and communication, manipulation strategies, bias, prejudice.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users of congruence between thinking and communication. The ability of media users to detect manipulation strategies in the communication/public debate. The ability of media users to think and communicate in the public debate without bias and prejudice. Ability of media users to identify the cognitive bias of one of the communicators (moderator, politician, social network discussant, etc.).

**Risks:** intentional concealment, tactics, coercion, manipulation, unable to identify the manipulative elements, strategies and cognitive bias and distortions.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Can media users use authentic/congruent communication?

RQ2: Can media users identify/detect manipulation in the communication/public debate?

RQ3: Can media users, as participants of public debate, discuss without bias and prejudice?

RQ4: Can media users identify the cognitive biases of any of the communication participants?

**Sources:** *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), OECD Skills Outlook, PISA, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index, Global critical thinking survey, The State of Critical Thinking Survey.*

### **4. Knowledge and understanding of contexts of public communication**

**Keywords:** *Engagement, democracy, deliberation, participation, barriers of participating external (power, material) or internal (subjective, hierarchical), ideology, propaganda, gap/digital divide, public opinion, media ownership, participatory media, citizen-professional journalism.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users to understand and identify the contexts in which communication/public debate takes place. The ability of media users to understand and identify the structural (organizational, institutional) contexts in which communication/public debate takes place. The ability of media users to understand and identify the social, cultural, political contexts in which communication takes place. The ability of media users to understand and identify the ideological contexts in which communication/public debate takes place. The ability of media users to use this knowledge and understanding in the processes of thinking and evaluating media production in the context of deliberative communication. The ability of media users to understand the competences of democratic culture (values, attitudes, skills, knowledge/ understanding) in communication. The ability of media users to understand and identify external and internal barriers/ interventions in communication.

**Risks:** Media users do not have sufficient knowledge of the various contexts that are part of public communication. Media users are not intellectually able to use this knowledge in the communication process. Weak, insufficient education.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users understand and identify the different contexts of communication in public debate?  
RQ2: Do media users know and understand the structural (organizational, institutional) contexts of communication in public debate?

RQ3: Do media users know and understand the social, cultural, political contexts of communication in public debate?

RQ4: Do media users know and understand the ideological contexts of communication in public debate?

RQ5: Are media users able to use this knowledge and understanding in the processes of thinking and evaluating media production in the context of deliberative communication?

RQ6: Do media users have understanding of the competences of democratic culture (values, attitudes, skills, knowledge / understanding) for deliberative communication?

RQ7: Do media users have ability of media users to understand and identify external and internal barriers/interventions in communication?

**Sources:** International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), OECD Skills Outlook, PISA, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index, Global critical thinking survey, The State of Critical Thinking Survey.

### ***5. Knowledge and understanding of the media, information and digital literacy in the context of deliberative communication***

**Keywords:** *Public debate; deliberative communication, freedom, openness (inclusiveness, equality, mutual respect), education, media and digital literacy.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users to understand the principles, rules and values of deliberative communication in the public debate The ability of media users to understand of the information, media, ICT and processes in their interrelationship in the context of deliberation communication.

**Risks:** Media users do not have knowledge of the principles and rules of intentional communication and the values on which they are based. Media, information and digital literacy is lacking.

#### **Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users know and understand the principles, values and rules of deliberative communication?

RQ2: Are media users able to understand information, media, ICT and processes in their interrelationship in the context of deliberation communication?

**Sources:** *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), OECD Skills Outlook, PISA, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index, Global critical thinking survey, The State of Critical Thinking Survey.*

### **CONCEPTUAL VARIABLE: COMMUNICATION COMPETENCIES<sup>1</sup>**

#### **Operational variables:**

##### ***1. Ability to formulate clear and concise messages and to clarify their background***

**Keywords:** *comprehensible communication, concrete expression, explaining one's views, conciseness and density of expression, factual communication, expressing oneself on the substance of the topic*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users to formulate their ideas concisely. Ability of users to express their ideas in a way that is understandable to the target audience with whom they are communicating and in the context of the situation. The ability of media users to express clearly the substance of the issue. The ability of media users to stick to the topic under discussion. The ability of media users to clarify the background to their ideas and opinions. The ability of media users to express ideas in a logical sequence. The ability of media users to take adequate time for clarification.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: in our understanding, we will use the term ABILITY = abilities if we are talking about conceptual and communicative processes, i.e. if it is a process associated with mental activity, and the term SKILLS - if it is a process associated with the use of technology or software (formerly manual skills)



**Risks:** In the case of very long, inappropriately technical, complex sentences, or vague and unclear phrasing of sentences, there is a risk of misunderstanding of the messages presented in the communication. Disproportionate presentation of one at the expense of the others. Increasing negative emotions due to misunderstanding. The emergence of disinterest in communication. Diminishing the value of what is being said.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users express themselves clearly in their speeches (reasonably long formulations, in language that is clear to the target audience/co-discussants, specific to the topic, possibly with explanatory examples)?

RQ2: Do media users also explain the background to their thoughts and opinions in their communications (what is the basis for their reasoning, how did they arrive at that opinion, what leads them to that opinion, why is it important)?

RQ3: Are media users' discussion posts directly linked to the topic being communicated?

RQ4: Are media users' contributions in a substantive form, without attacks on fellow discussants or the presenter of the underlying idea?

RQ5: Do media users' statements have a logical coherence?

**Sources:** PIRLS (*Progress in International Reading Literacy Study*); Project: TO DÁ ROZUM; ECo-C© - *European Communication Certificate*; *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)*, *OECD Skills Outlook*, *PISA*, *UNESCO*, *EUROSTAT*, *EUROBAROMETER*, *E-Participation Index (UN)*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Global Critical Thinking Survey*, *The State of Critical Thinking Survey*, *Methodological and Pedagogical Centre in Bratislava* <https://mpc-edu.sk/sk>; SAV [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute\\_no=199](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute_no=199); *Open Society Foundation* <https://osf.sk/>; *ESET Foundation* <https://www.nadaciaeset.sk/>; *Transparency International Slovakia* <https://transparency.sk/en/>; *Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences* <http://www.cspv.sav.sk/index.php?id=44>; *Research Institute of Child Psychology and Pathopsychology* <https://vudpap.sk/>; *State Pedagogical Institute* <https://www.statpedu.sk/sk/>; *Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic* <https://archiv.vlada.gov.sk>; *European Research Centre* [https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre\\_sk#responsibilities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre_sk#responsibilities); <https://www.iiss.org/> <https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/think-tanks/>; <https://www.who.int/>; <https://www.science.edu/>; *domestic laws and regulations*; *related literature*; *research and advocacy reports*; *reports by public bodies, etc.*

## 2. Ability to listen actively

**Keywords:** *attentive listening, openness in communication, dialogic communication, responding to others' statements*

**Description and opportunities:** Ability to maintain attention throughout a discussion. Ability to be open to different perspectives on the same topic and diversity (inclusion). Ability to ask open-ended questions and probing questions. Ability to reflect emotions and elements of non-verbal communication and work with them in communication. The ability to paraphrase and summarize what is said.

**Risks:** self-assertion, repeatedly presenting only one's perspective on a topic. Keeping the discussion to one point. Increasing tension from feeling misunderstood. Not reflecting feelings, not responding to escalating emotions -- leads to feelings of dissatisfaction and threat of conflict. Not responding to significant and beneficial ideas leading to win-win communication.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users react to speakers (expressing their own opinion reacting also to what has been said so far, asking questions, paraphrasing, summarizing) or do they just express their opinions?

RQ2: Do media users ask open questions or do they only ask closed and suggestive questions to confirm their opinions?

RQ3: Do media users ask probing questions to find out more about the views and ideas of fellow participants?

RQ4: Do media users know how to express their emotions appropriately in communication and respond (not) appropriately to the emotions of others?

**Sources:** PIRLS (*Progress in International Reading Literacy Study*); Project: TO DÁ ROZUM; ECo-C© - *European Communication Certificate*; *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)*, *OECD Skills Outlook*, *PISA*, *UNESCO*, *EUROSTAT*, *EUROBAROMETER*, *E-Participation Index (UN)*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Global Critical Thinking Survey*, *The State of Critical Thinking Survey*, *Methodological and Pedagogical Centre in Bratislava* <https://mpc-edu.sk/sk>; *SAV* [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute\\_no=199](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute_no=199); *Open Society Foundation* <https://osf.sk/>; *ESET Foundation* <https://www.nadaciaeset.sk/>; *Transparency International Slovakia* <https://transparency.sk/en/>; *Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences* <http://www.cspv.sav.sk/index.php?id=44>; *Research Institute of Child Psychology and Pathopsychology* <https://vudpap.sk/>; *State Pedagogical Institute* <https://www.statpedu.sk/sk/>; *Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic* <https://archiv.vlada.gov.sk>; *European Research Centre* [https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre\\_sk#responsibilities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre_sk#responsibilities); <https://www.iiss.org/> <https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/think-tanks/>; <https://www.who.int/>; <https://www.science.edu/>; *domestic laws and regulations*; *related literature*; *research and advocacy reports*; *reports by public bodies, etc.*

### **3. Ability to communicate in an assertive manner**

**Keywords:** assertive communication, partner communication, superiority, submission, manipulation, personal verbal attacks, aggressive communication, passive communication, confrontational communication, participative communication, assertive techniques, win win strategy

**Description and opportunities:** Ability to express oneself in a factual, emotionally neutral manner. Ability to express one's opinion, thought, feelings without throwing/attacking another's opinion. Ability to deal with criticism. Ability to communicate in a way that leads to a win win strategy.

**Risks:** Aggressive communication leading to conflict. Communication that disparages other views. Communicating passively, causing internal dissatisfaction which can have negative consequences. Confrontational communication leading to a struggle of arguments. Disparagement of the original intent and deviation from the original topic.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users express their opinions, thoughts, feelings openly and factually (without disparaging the views of other participants in the public debate or the persons themselves, or are they submissive, unemotional and obfuscating in their formulations?

RQ2: Do media users know how not to react emotionally to attacks and criticisms of their person or opinions?

**Sources:** PIRLS (*Progress in International Reading Literacy Study*); Project: TO DÁ ROZUM; ECo-C© - *European Communication Certificate*; *International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC)*, *OECD Skills Outlook*, *PISA*, *UNESCO*, *EUROSTAT*, *EUROBAROMETER*, *E-Participation Index (UN)*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Media Literacy Index*, *Global Critical Thinking Survey*, *The State of Critical Thinking Survey*, *Methodological and Pedagogical Centre in Bratislava* <https://mpc-edu.sk/sk>; *SAV* [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute\\_no=199](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute_no=199); *Open Society Foundation* <https://osf.sk/>; *ESET Foundation* <https://www.nadaciaeset.sk/>; *Transparency International Slovakia* <https://transparency.sk/en/>; *Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences* <http://www.cspv.sav.sk/index.php?id=44>; *Research Institute of Child Psychology and Pathopsychology* <https://vudpap.sk/>; *State Pedagogical Institute* <https://www.statpedu.sk/sk/>; *Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic* <https://archiv.vlada.gov.sk>; *European Research Centre* [https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre\\_sk#responsibilities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre_sk#responsibilities); <https://www.iiss.org/> <https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/think-tanks/>; <https://www.who.int/>; <https://www.science.edu/>; *domestic laws and regulations*; *related literature*; *research and advocacy reports*; *reports by public bodies, etc.*

## **CONCEPTUAL VARIABLE: USERS SKILLS**

### **Operational variables:**

## 1. Skill in the use of media and media technology<sup>2</sup>

**Keywords:** *use of classical media, digital literacy, audio and video recording, graphic software, editing software, audio editing software, graphic software, photo editing software, applications*

**Description and opportunities.** Skill to use traditional media via traditional devices (TV, radio, tape recorder, VCR, CD/DVD player, record player), also via new digital devices (satellites, set-up boxes), etc. Skill in the use of devices for recording sound, images (moving and static). Proficiency in the use of software for creating or editing media content. Proficiency in computer software and applications for communication via the internet and social networks.

**Risks:** The media user may not have access to relevant technical equipment, technologies, software and applications due to:

A) signal unavailability, e.g. due to the environment (rugged terrain, lack of cable distribution)

B) own unfavourable economic situation,

C) personal incapacity to learn how to work with more complex technical equipment and software and is therefore unable to learn how to work with these devices, software and applications. As a consequence, media users have limited access to and participation in both information and public debate.

### **Research questions:**

RQ1: What access do media users have to media, technology, software and applications?

RQ2: What opportunities do media users have to learn how to work with media, technology and techniques used in the reception of media content, in media production, in communication in media space (e.g. discussions on news portals, engaging in public debates on social networks, etc.) - formal and informal learning?

RQ3: What opportunities are there for media users to learn how to use software and applications to engage in media communication and public debates in the media space - formal and informal learning

RQ4: What is the digital literacy of media users in a given country?

**Sources:** *ICILS (The International Computer and Information Literacy Study)*

*Slovak Informatics Society - guarantor of the ICDL / ECDL system in Slovakia; ICILS (The International Computer and Information Literacy Study); Slovak Informatics Society - guarantor of the ICDL / ECDL system in Slovakia; International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC); OECD Skills Outlook; UNESCO, EUROSTAT; EUROBAROMETER; E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index; Methodological and Pedagogical Centre in Bratislava <https://mpc-edu.en/en>; SAV [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute\\_no=199](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute_no=199); Open Society Foundation <https://osf.sk/>; ESET Foundation <https://www.nadaciaeset.sk/>; Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences <http://www.cspv.sav.sk/index.php?id=44>; Research State Pedagogical Institute <https://www.statpedu.sk/sk/>; Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic <https://archiv.vlada.gov.sk> ; European Research Centre [https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre\\_sk#responsibilities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre_sk#responsibilities); <https://www.iiss.org/>; <https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/think-tanks/>; <https://www.who.int/>; <https://www.science.edu/>; domestic laws and regulations; related literature; research and advocacy reports; reports by public bodies, etc.*

## 2. Skills to manage and protect data, information and digital identity, and to ensure safety and eliminate risks when using media devices and applications

**Keywords:** GDPR, internet safety, security settings, digital identity protection, privacy protection, information and data misuse protection

**Description and opportunities:** Skills to set up security when using the internet and applications. Skill to set protection Skill to protect your privacy on computers and mobile devices. Skill to protect data and information presented in a media environment.

---

<sup>2</sup> Users do not need to be 100% proficient in all classifications, but they should be proficient in the use of devices that allow them to access media information and engage in public discussions in the medial space.

**Risks:** information and data in technical devices are freely available and unprotected by anyone. Users present their personal data and privacy in the media environment without being aware of the consequences. Identity, privacy and sensitive data can be misused.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Is there enough information in the public domain about the risks of not protecting oneself in the online space?

RQ2: Is there enough information in the public domain about how to protect information, digital identity and sensitive data and information in cyberspace?

RQ3: Are citizens being educated in this area?

**Sources:** ICILS (*The International Computer and Information Literacy Study*), Slovak Informatics Society - guarantor of the ICDL / ECDL system in Slovakia ICILS (*The International Computer and Information Literacy Study*); Slovak Informatics Society - guarantor of the ICDL / ECDL system in Slovakia; International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC); OECD Skills Outlook; UNESCO, EUROSTAT; EUROBAROMETER; E-Participation Index (UN), Media Literacy Index; Methodological and Pedagogical Centre in Bratislava <https://mpc-edu.en/en>; SAV [https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute\\_no=199](https://www.sav.sk/?lang=sk&doc=ins-org-ins&institute_no=199); Open Society Foundation <https://osf.sk/>; ESET Foundation <https://www.nadaciaeset.sk/>; Centre of Social and Psychological Sciences of the Slovak Academy of Sciences <http://www.cspv.sav.sk/index.php?id=44>; Research State Pedagogical Institute <https://www.statpedu.sk/sk/>; Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic <https://archiv.vlada.gov.sk>; European Research Centre [https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre\\_sk#responsibilities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/departments/joint-research-centre_sk#responsibilities); <https://www.iiss.org/>; <https://www.global-solutions-initiative.org/think-tanks/>; <https://www.who.int/>; <https://www.science.edu/>; domestic laws and regulations; related literature; research and advocacy reports; reports by public bodies, etc.

## CONCEPTUAL VARIABLE: *ETHICAL CAPABILITIES*

### Operational variables:

#### 1. *Free participation in public communication*

**Keywords:** *communication ethics, freedom, interest and willingness to participate, external barriers, internal barriers, power, conscientious objection, self-censorship.*

**Description and opportunities:** Interest of media users on engagement in public debate. Willingness of media users to participate in public communication. Freedom of media users to participate in public debate – the ability of media users communicate freely without external (power, material) or internal (ethically unjustified subjective, or hierarchical) barriers. The ability of media users to participate in public communication / debate without restricting the freedom of participation of other participants (use of power, coercion ...). The ability of media users to participate in public communication without undue self-restraint (maximizing self-censorship).

**Risks:** Uninterest of media users to participate in a public communication. Different degree of willingness, resp. unwillingness of individual media users to participate in public communication. Lack of freedom to participate and engage in public communication - external (power, material) or internal (subjective, hierarchical) barriers. Interventions in the communication process appear (e.g. by ostracizing opponents of opinions, labelling, ridicule, restrictions on publishing, etc.). Maximizing self-censorship (media users are afraid to take part in public debates, as they are punished by the public authorities or exposed to strong public criticism and derogatory attacks).

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Are media users willing to participate in public debate?

RQ2: Are media users able to participate in the public debate freely without barriers?

RQ3: Are media users able to participate in public communication without restricting the freedom of participation of other participants (use of power, coercion ...)?

RQ4: Are media users able to participate in public communication / debate without undue self-restraint (maximizing self-censorship)?

**Sources:** *The European Values Study, The World Values Survey, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index.*

## **2. Equal participation in public communication**

**Keywords:** *equality, inclusion, mutual respect.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users to accept diverse participating individuals, resp. groups (they may have different positions in the social hierarchy) in a public communication. The ability of media users to accept the same/equal communication opportunities of all different participants in a public communication. The ability of media users to take advantage of the same communication opportunities that other participants have. The ability of media users to respect (verbal and nonverbal) different individuals and groups participating in the public communication. The ability of media users to respect the statements, arguments and opinions of other participants in the public debate even though they are do not identified with them.

**Risks:** Exclusion entire groups or individuals (who do not have the time, resources, or intellectual ability to participate effectively in deliberation in the media communication. The existence of reinforcement bubbles into which media users are becoming more and more locked (especially under the influence of social networks). Inability to use the same communication options as other communication participants. An asymmetry between the participants in the communication process in terms of different positions in the social hierarchy and access. Inability to respect the needs and requirements of others. Inability of media users to respect opinions and relevant and correct arguments the others participants in a public debate, biased towards the relevant and correct arguments of the opponent.

### **Research questions:**

RQ1: Have media users the ability to accept the various individuals, resp. groups (may have different positions in the social hierarchy) involved in the public communication?

RQ2: Have media users the ability of to accept the same/equal communication opportunities of all different participants in the public debate?

RQ3: Have media users the ability to take advantage of the same communication opportunities as other participants?

RQ4: Do media users accept equality between the different participants in the public communication?

RQ5: Do media users respect (verbal and nonverbal) different individuals and groups participating in the public communication?

RQ6: Do media users have respect for other statements, opinions and arguments in public communication even though they are do not identified with them?

**Sources:** *The European Values Study, The World Values Survey, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index.*

## **3. Responsible participation in public communication**

**Keywords:** *Responsibility, conscientious objection.*

**Description and opportunities:** The ability of media users take responsibility for their claims communicated in public communication. The ability of media users to be aware and asses of the potential effects and consequences of published information on themselves and other members of society (or the community).

**Risks:** Inability and unwillingness to take responsibility for claims communicated in public communication. Media users are not aware of potential impact/consequences of communication an media content on other participants of communication (members of society) and on themselves.

### **Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users take responsibility for their claims when communicating in the public debate?

RQ2: Are media users aware of the impact/potential consequences of communication and media/communication content on other members of society and on themselves?

**Sources:** *The European Values Study, The World Values Survey, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index.*

#### **4. Constructive participation in public communication**

**Keywords:** *Constructive approach, willingness to cooperate, will to agree, common good, consensus, compromise.*

**Description and opportunities:** The interest, will of media users and ability to use a constructive approach in the communication process focused on consensus or at least a compromise. The interest and will of media users understand and agree in the communication/public debate. The ability of media users to understand and agree in the communication/public debate focus on consensus. The ability of media users to identify interest and willingness use a constructive approach in the communication process focus on consensus. The interest, will and the ability of media users to use a constructive approach in the communication process focused on common good. The interest, will of media users to cooperate focused on common good in the communication/ public debate. The ability to pursue individual (and group) interests with regard to common interests and good in public debate. The ability of media users to identify interest and willingness use a constructive approach in the communication process focus on common good.

**Risks:** Reluctance to consensus, to compromise, to understand and to reach a rational agreement. Inability to cooperate, inability to reach a consensus and to reach a rational agreement, resp. compromise.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: Do media users have the interest, willingness and ability to use a constructive approach in the communication process focus on consensus or at least a compromise?

RQ2: Have media users an interest, and will understand and agree in the communication/public debate?

RQ3: Have media users the ability to understand and agree in the communication/public debate focus on consensus?

RQ4: Have media users interest, will and ability to use a constructive approach in the communication process focused on common good?

RQ5: Can media users harmonize/to pursue their interests with common interest and good in public debate?

RQ6: Can media users in media communication and production recognize whether someone is pursuing their interests to the detriment of others (not respecting the needs and interest of others)?

**Sources:** *The European Values Study, The World Values Survey, UNESCO, EUROSTAT, EUROBAROMETER, E-Participation Index.*

## **STRUCTURAL AND SYSTEM LEVEL VARIABLES**

### **CONCEPTUAL VARIABLE: SOCIAL CONTEXT OF MEDIA COMMUNICATION RELATED TO COMPETENCIES**

#### **Operational variables:**

##### **1. Media Competencies of Teachers**

**Keywords:** *personal media competencies of teachers, pedagogical and didactical competencies of teachers, measurement and evaluation of teachers media competencies.*

**Description and Opportunities:**

The ability of teachers (and student teachers) to be sufficiently media literate themselves (Personal media competencies of teachers). The ability of teachers (and student teachers) to promote and implement media literacy concepts among learners (Pedagogical and Didactical Competencies of Teachers). The teacher's perception of the importance of the media-related competencies (Self-perception approach). Ability of teachers to implement media literacy instructional practice into the curriculum. Ability of teachers to use sufficiently media and digital technologies in his/her professional practice. The levels of media competence of teachers (measurement and evaluation approach). The teachers' attitudes to the importance of the digital media and technology tools as a part of his/her classroom learning and school

policies. The levels of critical thinking skills of teachers. The ability of teachers to use media-related competencies in the context of professional development.

**Risks:** Insufficient level of personal media literacy of teachers (and student teachers). The low ability of teachers to implement media literacy concepts among learners. Insufficient teachers' readiness for the effective use of media and digital technologies in his/her professional practice.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: What is the level of personal media literacy of teachers (and student teachers)?

RQ2: Are teachers (and student teachers) able to promote and implement media literacy concepts among learners?

RQ3: What is the perception of the importance of the media-related competencies among teachers (and student teachers)?

RQ4: Are teachers able to implement media literacy instructional practice into the curriculum?

RQ5: What is the attitude of teachers to media and digital technologies in his/her professional practice?

RQ6: What approaches to measuring and evaluating teachers' media competencies are applied in practice?

RQ7: What is the level of critical thinking skills of teachers (and student teachers)?

RQ8: Are teachers able to use media-related competencies in the context of his/her professional development?

**Sources:**

*-International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study (2021)*

*-Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments (2020)*

*-A Survey on Media and Information Literacy in UNESCO Associated Schools Network (2016)*

*- Survey on Privacy in Media and Information Literacy with Youth Perspectives (2017)*

*-Media Competence of Teachers and Students of Compulsory Education in Spain (2016)*

*-MILID Yearbook (2018-2019),*

*-Promoting Media and Information Literacy in Libraries (2016),*

*-PISA Teacher Survey (2018),*

*-OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (2008-2019)*

*-Survey of Schools: ICT in Education (2013)*

*-World Teacher Survey (2018)*

*-The Common Sense Census: Inside the 21st-Century Classroom (2019)*

*- A Survey for Measuring 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teaching and Learning (2014)*

*-Development Key Competencies at School in Europe (2012)*

*-Media Related Educational Competencies of German and US Preservice Teachers (2020)*

*-Digital Education Survey (2016)*

*-Canadian Teachers Readiness for STEM and Digital Literacy (2020)*

*-CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey (2019)*

*-Measuring Digital Skills (2014)*

*-The International Computer and Information Literacy Study - ICILS (2013, 2018)*

*-Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS (2001 – 2016)*

*-International Assessment of Adult Competencies PIAAC (2011-2019)*

*-European Communication Certificate (2010- 2021)*

*-Fake News and Disinformation Online – Eurobarometer (2018)*

*-EU Code of Practice on Disinformation (2021).*

## **2. Media Competencies of socio-demographic groups in society**

**Keywords:** *Knowledge, skills and attitudes of adult media users, media competencies of children and adolescents, media competencies of employees and professionals, social inequalities related to the state of media competencies of media users, social opportunities and risks related to users competencies in the context of digital media.*

**Description and Opportunities:**

Media related knowledge, skills and attitudes of adult media users. Media Competencies of children and adolescents. Media-related competencies of employees and professionals from various fields (except journalists and teachers). Media competencies of disadvantaged groups, minorities and citizens at risk of social exclusion. Media-related gaps and social inequalities related to adults media competencies (economic, social, health, cultural, citizenship, educational and other risks). Social Consequences of insufficient users competencies related to disinformation and fake news. Social Opportunities and Risks related to users competencies in the context of digital media, technologies, platforms and tools (consequences to jobs, privacy, safety, data protection, media usage patterns etc.).

**Risks:** Insufficient level of media literacy of adult media users. Insufficient level of media literacy of children and adolescents. Risk of social exclusion of some social groups due to low level of media competencies. Negative social consequences of disinformation and fake news as a consequence of low level of users media competencies.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: What is the level of media-related knowledge, skills and attitudes of adult media users?

RQ2: What is the level of media competencies of children and adolescents?

RQ3: What is the level of media competencies of employees and professionals from various fields (except journalists and teachers)?

RQ4: What is the level of media competencies of disadvantaged groups, minorities and citizens at risk of social exclusion?

RQ5: Are some groups in society at risk from media-related gaps and social inequalities in the context of a low level of media competencies?

RQ6: What can be the social consequences of insufficient users competencies related to disinformation and fake news?

RQ7: What are the social opportunities and risks related to users competencies in the context of digital media, technologies, platforms and tools (consequences to jobs, privacy, safety, data protection, media usage patterns etc.)?

**Sources:**

-*International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study (2021)*

-*Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments (2020)*

-*A Survey on Media and Information Literacy in UNESCO Associated Schools Network (2016)*

- *Survey on Privacy in Media and Information Literacy with Youth Perspectives (2017)*

-*Media Competence of Teachers and Students of Compulsory Education in Spain (2016)*

-*MILID Yearbook (2018-2019),*

-*Promoting Media and Information Literacy in Libraries (2016),*

-*PISA Teacher Survey (2018),*

-*OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (2008-2019)*

-*Survey of Schools: ICT in Education (2013)*

-*World Teacher Survey (2018)*

-*The Common Sense Census: Inside the 21st-Century Classroom (2019)*

- *A Survey for Measuring 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teaching and Learning (2014)*

-*Development Key Competencies at School in Europe (2012)*

-*Media Related Educational Competencies of German and US Preservice Teachers (2020)*

-*Digital Education Survey (2016)*

-*Canadian Teachers Readiness for STEM and Digital Literacy (2020)*

-*CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey (2019)*

-*Measuring Digital Skills (2014)*

-*The International Computer and Information Literacy Study - ICILS (2013, 2018)*

-*Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS (2001 – 2016)*

-*International Assessment of Adult Competencies PIAAC (2011-2019)*

-*European Communication Certificate (2010 - 2021)*



- Fake News and Disinformation Online – Eurobarometer (2018)*
- EU Code of Practice on Disinformation (2021).*

### **3. Institutional, strategic and legislative contexts of media users competencies**

**Keywords:** *Institutional and legislative contexts of media users competencies, implementation of the media users competencies, developing media users competencies through legislation, strategies and other initiatives.*

**Description and Opportunities:**

The efforts of EU and member states to enhance the status of media users competencies. Challenges European countries face in the process of implementation of the media users competencies. Challenges European countries face in the process of the implementation of transversal competencies (digital information, civic and other types of competencies). The efforts and challenges that media organisations and digital platforms face in the process of development of media competencies of media users. The efforts and challenges that academic institutions, NGO's and think tanks face in the process of development of media competencies of media users. The efforts and challenges that stakeholders face in developing media users competencies through legislation, strategies and other initiatives.

**Risks:** Low efficiency of the efforts of the EU and member states to enhance the status of media users competencies. The insufficient interest of media users in strategies, initiatives and tools related to the development of media competencies.

**Research questions:**

RQ1: What are the best efforts of EU and member states to enhance the status of media users competencies?

RQ2: What are the most important challenges that EU institutions and members states face in the process of the development of media competencies of media users?

RQ3: What are the most important challenges that academic institutions, NGO's and think tanks face in the process of development of media competencies of media users?

RQ4: How to increase efficiency and acceptance of the efforts of the EU and member states to enhance the status of media users competencies?

**Sources:**

- International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study (2021)*
- Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments (2020)*
- A Survey on Media and Information Literacy in UNESCO Associated Schools Network (2016)*
- *Survey on Privacy in Media and Information Literacy with Youth Perspectives (2017)*
- Media Competence of Teachers and Students of Compulsory Education in Spain (2016)*
- MILID Yearbook (2018-2019)*
- Promoting Media and Information Literacy in Libraries (2016)*
- PISA Teacher Survey (2018)*
- OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (2008-2019)*
- Survey of Schools: ICT in Education (2013)*
- World Teacher Survey (2018)*
- The Common Sense Census: Inside the 21st-Century Classroom (2019)*
- *A Survey for Measuring 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teaching and Learning (2014)*
- Development Key Competencies at School in Europe (2012)*
- Media Related Educational Competencies of German and US Preservice Teachers (2020)*
- Digital Education Survey (2016)*
- Canadian Teachers Readiness for STEM and Digital Literacy (2020)*
- CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey (2019)*
- Measuring Digital Skills (2014)*
- The International Computer and Information Literacy Study - ICILS (2013, 2018)*
- Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS (2001 – 2016)*
- International Assessment of Adult Competencies PIAAC (2011-2019)*

- European Communication Certificate (2010- 2021)
- Fake News and Disinformation Online – Eurobarometer (2018)
- EU Code of Practice on Disinformation (2021)

## REFERENCES

- BAACKE, D. (1996). Media competency as a network: Reach and focus on a concept that has economic activity. *Virtually Media in Media Practice*, 20(78), 4-10.
- BAUERLEIN, M. (2009): *The Dumbest Generation: How the Digital Age Stupefies Young Americans and Jeopardizes Our Future (Or, Don 't Trust Anyone Under 30)*: New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.
- BENHABIB, S., ed. (1996): *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- BUCKINGHAM, D. (2007): *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- DAHLGREN, P. (2005): The Internet, Public Spheres, and Political Communication: Dispersion and Deliberation. In *Political Communication*, 22:2, 147-162.
- CARNEGIE, D. COLE, D. (2011): *How to Win Friends and Influence People in the Digital Age*. New York, USA: Simon & Schuster.
- CARR, N. (2011): *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains*. New York – London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- COHEN, J. (1989): *Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy*. In Hamlin, Alan; Pettit, Philip, eds.: *The Good Polity*. London: Blackwell, pp. 17–34.
- COOPER, T. L., MENZEL, D. C. (eds) (2013): *Achieving ethical competence for public service leadership*. M.E. Sharpe, New York.
- DE SCHRIJVER A., MAESSCHALCK J. (2013): *A new definition and conceptualization of ethical competence*. In: Cooper TL, Menzel DC (eds) *Achieving ethical competence for public service leadership*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York, pp. 29–50.
- DROZDEK, A. (2015): *Media Ethics*. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition). 42-47.
- DRYZEK, J. S. (2002): *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DRYZEK, J. S. (2010): *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ENGLUND, T.: Deliberative Communication: A Pragmatist Proposal. In *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 2006, Vol. 38, No. 5, pp. 503-520.
- ESCOBAR, O. (2009): The dialogic turn: dialogue for deliberation. In: *Spire Journal of Law, Politics and Societies*, 4 (2). pp. 42-70.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2018): *The European Reference Framework for Key Competences for Lifelong Learning*. Brussels: European Commission.
- FERRÉS, J. & PISCITELLI, A. (2012): Media Competence: An Articulated Proposal of Dimensions and Indicators. In *Communicar*, Vol. XIX, No. 38, pp. 75-81.
- GÁLIK, S., GÁLIKOVÁ TOLNAIOVÁ, S.: Influence of the Internet on the Cognitive Abilities of Man. Phenomenological and Hermeneutical Approach. In *Communication Today*. 2015, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 5-15.
- GÁLIK, S.: On Ontological Definition of Media Truth and the Role of Media. In *European Journal of Science and Theology*. 2019, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 1-8.
- GÁLIK, S.: Philosophical Reflection of the Influence of Digital Media on Current Education. In *Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie)*. 2020, Vol. 60, No. 1, pp. 100-106.
- GÁLIKOVÁ TOLNAIOVÁ, S.: Media and Truth in the Perspective of the Practice and Life Form of the Modern “Homo Medialis”. In *Communication Today*. 2019, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 4-19.

- GOULSTONE, M. (2015): *Just Listen: Discover the Secret to Getting Through to Absolutely Anyone*. New York, USA: Amacom.
- GREENFIELD, S. (2015): *Mind Change: How Digital Technologies Are Leaving Their Mark on Our Brains*. New York: Random House.
- HAGUE, B. & WILLIAMSON, C. (2009): *Future Lab. Digital Participation, Digital Literacy, and School Subjects: A Literature Review*. London: NFER.
- HABERMAS, J. (1995): Reconciliation through the public use of reason: remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism. In: *Journal of philosophy*. Vol. 92, 1995, pp. 109–131.
- HABERMAS, J. (1996): *Between Facts and Norms. Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- HAMELINK, C. J. (1995) Ethics for Media Users. In *European Journal of Communication*, 10(4):497-512.
- HRADISKÁ, E., HUDÍKOVÁ, Z., ČERTÍKOVÁ, H. (2013): *Praktikum sociálnej komunikácie (Practice of social communication)*. Žilina: Eurokódex.
- HUGGER, K. A. (2006): Medienkompetenz versus Medienbildung? Anmerkungen Zur Zielwertdiskussion in Der Medienpädagogik." In *Dieter Baacke Preis. Methoden Und Konzepte Medienpädagogischer Projekte. Handbuch 1*, edited by J. Lauffer and R. Röllecke, Bielefeld: GMK, pp. 29–36.
- KAČINOVÁ, V. (2018): Media Competence as a Cross-Curricular Competence. In *Communication Today*, Vol. 9, No.1, pp. 38-57.
- KAVATHATZOPOULOS, I. (2002): *Ethical competence training for individuals and organizations*. In: Von Weltzien H (ed) *Moral leadership in action: building and sustaining moral competence in European organizations*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp 293–303.
- LEAL III, B. C. (2019): *4 Essential Keys to Effective Communication in Love, Life, Work-Anywhere!: A How-To Guide for Practicing the Empathic Listening, Speaking, and Dialogue Skills to Achieve Relationship Success*. Audible an Amazon Company.
- LÉVY, P. (1999): *Collective Intelligence: Mankind's Emerging World in Cyberspace*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Perseus Books.
- LJAJIĆ, S. (2021): *Media, Ethical Norms And Media Literacy Education*. In *Facta Universitatis*, 4(2): 185-194.
- MANSELL, R. (2010): *Commentary - Mediating the Public Sphere: Democratic Deliberation, Communication Gaps and the Personalisation of Politics*. In: C. T. Salmon (ed) (2010) *ICA Communication Yearbook 34*. New York: Routledge, pp. 259-274.
- MOY, P. & GASTIL, J. (2006): Predicting Deliberative Conversation: The Impact of Discussion Networks, Media Use, and Political Cognitions. In: *Political Communication*, 23:443–460.
- PARK, J. (2017): *Media Literacy, Media Competence and Media Policy in the Digital Age*. Hawaii University International Conferences Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences & Education, January 3 - 6, 2017 Ala Moana Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii.  
Available at: file:///C:/Users/HP/Desktop/Park-Jooyeun-2017-AHSE-HUIC.pdf
- SPITZER, M. (2012): *Digitale demenz*. München: Droemer.
- TULODZIECKI, G. & GRAFE, S. (2019): Media Competence. In *The International Encyclopedia of Media Literacy*, edited by R. Hobbs and P. Mihailidis. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1 – 14.
- VYBÍRAL, Z. (2009): *Psychologie komunikace (Psychology of communication)*. Praha: Portál.

### **Documents and Strategies:**

- International Media and Information Literacy Institute Feasibility Study (2021)
- Global Survey on Media and Information Literacy Developments (2020)
- A Survey on Media and Information Literacy in UNESCO Associated Schools Network (2016)
- Survey on Privacy in Media and Information Literacy with Youth Perspectives (2017)
- Media Competence of Teachers and Students of Compulsory Education in Spain (2016)
- MILID Yearbook (2018-2019),

- Promoting Media and Information Literacy in Libraries (2016),
- PISA Teacher Survey (2018),
- OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (2008-2019)
- Survey of Schools: ICT in Education (2013)
- World Teacher Survey (2018)
- The Common Sense Census: Inside the 21st-Century Classroom (2019)
- A Survey for Measuring 21<sup>st</sup> Century Teaching and Learning (2014)
- Development Key Competencies at School in Europe (2012)
- Media Related Educational Competencies of German and US Preservice Teachers (2020)
- Digital Education Survey (2016)
- Canadian Teachers Readiness for STEM and Digital Literacy (2020)
- CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey (2019)
- Measuring Digital Skills (2014)
- The International Computer and Information Literacy Study - ICILS (2013, 2018)
- Progress in International Reading Literacy Study – PIRLS (2001 – 2016)
- International Assessment of Adult Competencies PIAAC (2011-2019)
- European Communication Certificate (2010- 2021)
- Fake News and Disinformation Online – Eurobarometer (2018)
- EU Code of Practice on Disinformation (2021).