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Виртуальный музей как новая модель коммуникативной культуры и перспективы музеиной педагогики

**Введение.** Проблемы функционирования виртуальных музеев в социокультурной сфере являются объектом исследования междисциплинарных областей гуманитарного знания. Разные подходы к такому явлению как «виртуальный музей» обусловлены тем, что он постоянно модифицируется, затрудняя разработку теоретической концепции, что делает данный вопрос особенно актуальным. Цель статьи – рассмотреть виртуальный музей как новую модель коммуникативной культуры в контексте перспектив музеиной педагогики.

**Материалы и методы.** Материалы и методы исследования основаны на анализе процессов виртуализации пространства современного музея как новой модели коммуникативной культуры. Методологической базой являются теория музеиной коммуникации, теория репрезентации культурной памяти ("memory studies"), а также методические аспекты музеиной педагогики как актуальной социально-культурной практики. Исследование строится на основе как классических методов (анализа, синтеза, обобщения), так и на использовании культурно-исторического, компетентностного и деятельностного подходов.

**Результаты.** Рост популярности музея в цифровую эпоху, по мнению авторов, связан с модификацией музеиного пространства и с трансформацией функций музея как новой модели коммуникативной культуры. Благодаря сетевым технологиям выделяется ряд новых музеиных коммуникаций. Музей из хранилища и обозрения артефактов прошлого превратился в открытое интерактивное пространство, вовлекающее посетителя в диалог, взаимодействие, что актуализирует использование виртуальных ресурсов музея в учебно-воспитательном процессе школ и вузов. Процессы трансформации музея как социального института и новой модели коммуникативной культуры в условиях цифровизации – в исследовательском поле представителей разных гуманитарных наук (российских и зарубежных). Это дает возможность провести междисциплинарную дискуссию, отталкиваясь от новых коммуникационных функций музея и определить реальные перспективы музеиной педагогики.

**Заключение.** Проведенное исследование помогает определить дальнейшие пути изучения виртуального музея как новой модели коммуникативной культуры и специфику его воздействия на дальнейшее развитие музеиной педагогики как важной структуры медиаобразования, то есть учебно-воспитательного процесса в школе и вузе в цифровую эпоху.
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Virtual museum as a new model of communicative culture and museum pedagogy prospects

Introduction. The problems of virtual museums functioning in the socio-cultural sphere are an object of study in humanitarian interdisciplinary fields. Different approaches to such phenomenon as “the virtual museum” are due to the fact that it is continually modified, complicating the development of a theoretical concept, which makes this issue especially relevant. The purpose of the article is to consider the virtual museum as a new model of communicative culture in the context of museum pedagogy prospects.

Materials and methods. The materials and methods of the research are based on the analysis of virtualisation processes applied to the modern museum space as a new model of communicative culture. The methodological basis is represented by the theory of museum communication, the theory of representation of cultural memory (“memory studies”) as well as methodological aspects of museum pedagogy as a topical socio-cultural practice. The research is based on the classical methods (analysis, synthesis, generalisation) and the use of cultural-historical, competence- and activity-based approaches.

Results. The growing popularity of the museum in the digital era, according to the authors, is connected with the modification of the museum space and transformation of museum functions as a new model of communicative culture. Owing to network technologies, a number of new museum communications have emerged. The museum has turned from a depository and display of artefacts of the past into an open interactive space engaging visitors in a dialogue and interaction, which actualises the use of virtual museum resources in the educational process of schools and universities. The processes of transformation of the museum as a social institution and a new model of communicative culture in the conditions of digitalisation are in the research field of representatives of various humanities (Russian and foreign). This makes it possible to hold an interdisciplinary discussion based on the new communicative functions of the museum and to determine the real prospects of museum pedagogy.

Conclusion. The study helps to identify the further ways of exploring the virtual museum as a new model of communicative culture and the specifics of its impact on further development of museum pedagogy as an important structure of media education, i.e. the teaching and educational process at schools and universities in the digital age.
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Introduction

The problems of museum space virtualisation and museum pedagogy are an object of research in different humanities (museology, culturology, pedagogy, psychology). The relevance of this issue is conditioned by the interactive function of the virtual museum as a basis of intercultural dialogue. The goals of this dialogue were defined as priorities in UNESCO’s educational programmes, being approved at the UNESCO General Conference in November 2021. It can be stated that there exist many approaches to identifying the significance of the virtual museum in socio-cultural practices of Russia and other countries worldwide. Scholars interpret this term in a different way; this is accounted for by the fact that virtual museums as a new cultural form are characterised by great diversity and are continually modified, thus complicating the development of a new definition [29, p. 80]. This has resulted in a situation showing that the range of concepts within the sphere of virtual museum exploration is quite extensive. For instance, a British museologist E. Hooper-Greenhill, introducing the term “imaginary museum”, believes that its prehistory goes back to Shakespeare’s Globe Theatre [5, p. 81]. And the term “postmuseum” that appeared in the late 20th century denoted a new institution of the Post-Modernism epoch which replaced the notion of public educational institution and became an indicator of “cultural pluralism” [21, p. 188].

A German researcher A. Huyssen considers the postmuseum as a “simulative” phenomenon that has lost “its role in the broad sense of the word and has become one of the key paradigms of contemporary culture” [24 p. 38]. Moreover, the museum, turning into a kind of “forum of citizens” through representation of different subcultures, loses its “aura” like any “work of art in the epoch of its technical reproducibility” [20]. The terms “postmuseum” or “virtual museum” refer to “a digital information resource that is freely accessible on the Internet, allowing one to study the cultural and historical material independently and providing different inherent ways of communication, feedback with the visitors” [27, p. 59].

A museologist Z. Bonami, comparing the traditional (public) museum with the modernised one, emphasises that communication in the former “was a kind of technological process”, for which it was sufficient to “place all exhibits as proper and label them” [21, p. 188]. Meanwhile the latter type, emerging in the 1980s-1990s as a museum of a new type, is “a special information and communication system that produces and transmits information”, which is quite in line with the theory of information society”. This approach, according to the researcher, “gives an idea of how, with the help of different museum objects acting as “signs” and “symbols”, a museum message is prepared and how it is “read” or “deciphered” by the recipients, i.e. museum visitors” [Ibid].

Thus, the history of virtual museum is connected with the evolution of the forms of classical museum, its transformation from a traditional socio-cultural institution into a modern model of communicative culture with innovative museum strategy – interactivity as a form of feedback and dialogue with the visitors. As noted by T.M. Troshina, the “problem of cultural identity, being basic for the museum as a phenomenon, becomes especially relevant today in the situation of increased importance of the museum... as a place of self-identification of an individual through culture” [35, p. 199].
Proceeding from the above, the purpose of the present research is to prove that the virtual (interactive) museum is not only oriented at preservation of cultural and historical traditions, but is also focused on spiritual development of its visitors, awakening their creative activity and intellectual potential. This means that the new museum model is more, than its classical form, related to the prospects of museum pedagogy, since museums nowadays are increasingly positioning themselves as a place of leisure and communication, as open access to new aspects of knowledge, practical experience and creativity.

Materials and methods

The main materials used in the research process are represented by monographs and scientific collections, proceedings of a number of international conferences (Information Age: New Paradigms of Culture and Education, Yekaterinburg, 2019; Dialogue of Cultures in the Age of Globalisation and Digitalisation, Yekaterinburg, 2020; Museum as Meditative Environment, Barcelona, 2020; Cultural Heritage: From Past to Future, St. Petersburg, 2021 and others); articles in reputable international and Russian journals, such as “International Journal of Cultural Studies”; “World of Science. Series: Sociology, Philology, Cultural Studies; “Perspectives of Science and Education”; “Pedagogy of Art”; “Central European Journal of Communication”; “Changing Societies & Personalities” and others. Of great help for the study were the UNESCO Declaration “Education-2030” and the UNESCO Conventions: “On the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage” (2003) and “On the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions” (2005). The portals “Culture.RF” (“museums” section), the media platforms “VKontakte”, “YouTube” and others served as the empirical basis of the study.

The article represents a complex synthetic research relying both on classical methods (analysis, synthesis, generalisation) and the use of cultural-historical, competence- and activity-based approaches. The authors base their definition of museum pedagogy on the interdisciplinary integrative approach: the museum is viewed not only as a socio-cultural institution, but also as an important factor of educational system. The new functionality of the museum as a model of communicative culture activates the pedagogical aspects of modern museum work.

Results

In defining the features and processes of virtual museum functioning, the authors proceeded from its classical definition: “Museum (museion – temple of muses, Greek) is an institution engaged in selection, scientific research and custody of cultural and art monuments. The museums’ activity is aimed at satisfying the individual’s educational and creative interests related to exploring and assimilating the cultural heritage” [32].

At the turn of the 20th-21st centuries, many foreign researchers, including those mentioned above, addressed this issue. In Russia, the problems of functioning and importance of virtual museums have also become an object of analysis by a number of scholars and practitioners. In particular, M.A. Belyaeva and T.A. Ladygina consider the modern museum in the context of new communication technologies [19]; Z.A. Bonami treats it in terms of evolution of its status and the language of communicating with the visitors [21]; D.S. Vasilina considers the virtual museum to be a unique “phenomenon of modern culture”
E.N. Shapinskaya, analysing museum functioning under market conditions, perceives the modern museum as a component of “economy of impressions” [36].

The emergence of the virtual museum is a result of digitalisation of modern culture, which can be viewed “as a consequence of introduction of flexible communication technologies in all areas of social production and as an evidence of emergence of a new socio-cultural media space” [25, p. 38]. The network forms of electronic interaction promoted the creation of real prospects for the renewal and development of diverse cultural practices and social relations. According to M. Castels, “We are living in the conditions of virtual reality culture. This is what distinguishes the information age culture: it is through virtuality that we mainly produce and create the meaning” [26, p. 237]. T. Roppola argues that the museum as an institutional phenomenon serves as one of the key factors of the “system of social reproduction, helping to construct, synthesise various aspects and concepts of artistic reality” [14, p. 43].

In the conditions of virtualisation of museum space, when images dominate over reality “simulating” history and reality, the preservation of in-depth continuity of time through expansion of museum practice is one of the sense-making elements of human consciousness and an axiological measure of activity.

The development of a new anthropotechnical reality and networked (digital) society has led to the transformation in the very organisation of museum space. The museum has gradually turned from the place of storage, exploration and viewing of artefacts of the past, including works of art, into an open, interactive space involving the visitor in a dialogue, interaction and even discussion. Today’s mediatised museum contains not only the reality of physical objects (extensional communication is increasingly receding into the background), but also a specific virtual space containing both information/visual and software/service components. Interactive excursions containing dialogues with the public, master-classes, quizzes and other manifestations of interactivity become significant. Museum websites are also becoming more interactive. That is, the museum has created “a space enabling a more open way of communication” [21 p. 190].

That is why the new type of museum has come to be perceived as a “phenomenon of modern culture” in the full sense of the word. According to D.S. Vasilina, “the virtual museum is a space that uses interactive features on electronic media allowing the user to ‘navigate’ round three-dimensional halls and get acquainted with necessary images and information” [22, p. 97].

The museum is a basic structural model of culture that provides a person with a meaningful existence. The society mediatisation process and the formation of a network paradigm has led to a situation when modern communicative culture based on intensified exchange of images and ideas started bearing signs of “one common time” and “timelessness”. According to L.V. Nurgaleeva, the fate of the museum as a social institution reveals two principled approaches to ethical treatment of the past. The first approach is regarding the past as “an absolute self-sufficient value” regardless of how this past functions at the present moment. The second approach can be defined as “utilitarianism”: the past is valued in terms of its relevance, its “contemporary significance”. Then the past has only a “relative value”. Both types of value orientation determine the future strategies and forms of preserving the cultural heritage in the networked society, “constructing a new communication paradigm” which is represented by programmes of collective and individual search for different interaction forms in the operational practice of virtual museums [30].

T.M. Troshina [35, p. 206] notes: “Full-fledged representation of time in the museum is impossible without a virtual reality created on the basis of information resources”. 
A.N. Balash reflects on the same by considering the peculiarities of representation in a performative museum [18, p. 6]. A special issue is intensified modernisation of museum activities in the market conditions. It is not by chance that the beginning of the 21st century was marked by a number of successive conferences devoted to the realities and future of the museum: “Museum Communication” (2002) and “The Museum between Mission and Market” (2003) organised by the Central Museum of Contemporary History of Russia; “The Museum and the Market” (2006) and “Image and Concept in the Art Museum” (2007) organised by the Hermitage. These conferences actualised the problems of realising the new model of museum communication in modern practice. The communicative approach to museology in the process of cultural self-identification of territories was a prerequisite to activate an interactive action “Museum Night” dated to the International Museum Day. This action was first held in Berlin in 1997; in Russia it was first organised by Krasnoyarsk Museum Centre (2002); in St. Petersburg the “Museum Night” was held in 2006, in Moscow and Yekaterinburg – in 2007.

The prerequisite for the museum audience to enjoy the process is the ability to understand the “language of things”, and for the exhibition organisers – the ability to construct non-verbal spatial “statements” with the help of exhibits. Virtualisation promotes interactivity, i.e. the visitor’s participation in the process, a dialogue between art and the viewer; it becomes a canonical part of modern museum communication. Many museums are introducing mobile applications, interactive guides; hold multimedia exhibitions. Moreover, virtualisation has radically changed the mode of organisation of the museum space and its internal structure. The result is the museum’s strengthened new functions – educational, research, socio-cultural. Today, being immerged in virtual space, one has a chance not only to get acquainted with the collection contained in a museum in another country, but also to see the items kept in its closed storerooms, those inaccessible to the viewer.

The first mediatised museum spaces were the New York Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art (USA), the Louvre in Paris, the Hermitage, the Tretyakov Gallery, the State Russian Museum, the Uffisi Gallery Museum of Florence and other museums around the world. The Internet as a “space of global free communication” [26, p. 5] has largely promoted the popularity of many museums. For instance, in the early 2000s, the project “The Russian Museum: Virtual Branch” became an information and educational centre accessible in many cultural and educational institutions. The virtualisation of the museum made it possible for anyone, staying anywhere in the world, to visit the Louvre or the Hermitage. It is worth noting that the historical parks “Russia: My History” started opening in many regions of Russia, first in 2015 in Moscow, and from 2017 on – throughout Russia (today this project operates in 23 cities of the country). It should be added that the media project “The Hermitage. Immersion in History” became the most popular phenomenon of a virtual journey of that type in the conditions of the pandemic, winning in the nomination “Brand of the Year 2020”. Today, the Hermitage, as a centuries-old multifaceted museum complex, is engaged in educational activities on various social media platforms: VKontakte, YouTube, on its own website.

As we can see, the modern museum has in fact become an institutional structure keeping to a balance between the “expansion” of modern media technologies and the social potential of the individual, being open to communication and responsible for the future. T.M. Troshina, schematising her reflections on the museum in the contemporary media environment, suggests the following formula: the heritage + interactivity of museums + media environment + national programmes = cultural self-identification of
a new Russia citizen [35, p. 207]. As it can be seen, the museum, on the basis of this synthesis, returning to its origins, turns into a “multifunctional, multimedia institution of public importance” [Ibid]. Thus, museum representation in electronic culture is an opportunity to address the past in a form that combines figurative and intellectual high-level presentation of information about the past.

The virtual museums network represents a new spatial and temporal model of storage and translation of historical and cultural values, formed owing to the introduction of electronic methods of resourcification of information. That is, the virtual museum becomes a significant component of the electronic media environment that represents not historical heritage objects as such, but their structural images. The image, in turn, according to L.V. Nurgaleeva, is “the main product of network consciousness, a programme of intellectual, aesthetic and ethical impact” [30]. The Internet which we access using the computer, according to L. Manovich, “offers a new language for the description of cultural artefacts, human experience and dynamics”. Moreover, as the researcher specifies, “computer vision makes it possible to capture the details of a particular artefact better – as well as visual differences between several artefacts, even if those are minor” [10].

Thus, the museum expands its communication activity in the new media space, turning from a cultural-value custody site into an organiser of the process representing creative interaction of individuals united by the interests involving not only intellectual exploration of historical artefacts, but also construction of an original worldview. This is confirmed by M. Castels’ thesis that “virtualisation of cultural space, within the network society destroying the habitual notions of space and time, acquires its real meaning” [26, p. 151-152].

The modernisation of modern museums’ socio-cultural activities is now a reality; in addition, they function in the market economy, as noted earlier. In this connection, large capital museums as well as museums in the Russian countryside, as noted by a number of practical researchers, nowadays have similar problems: “The main concerns of the ‘temple of priceless relics’ are those connected with accounting: attendance, recoupment, contributions of ‘museum friends’, income from souvenir trade” [19]. This means, as noted by E.N. Shapinskaya, that museums are a part of “impressions economy”, so in order to sell a “museum impression”, the organisers have to be active in “generation” of a high-quality cultural product, utmostly mobile and transformable to meet the consumers’ needs [36, pp. 167-168]. All this evidences the growth of consumerism in museum practices.

Another problem is the fact that in the 21st century, under the influence of the Internet and digital technologies, not only the state media are losing their sacred right to create and disseminate information. Presently state museums also have competitors – private individuals and organisations who deal in preservation of cultural memory as part of their activity; digital technologies create favourable conditions for this. Individuals tend to be collectors having a broad range of interests, or enthusiasts with a passion for preserving family or regional history. Some organisations preserve and digitise their chronicles, doing so in the name of corporate identity and strengthening of own brand; the others invest in creation of expensive museum collections for image creation and maintenance purposes [19].

Whereas the role of museums in the Soviet period was fundamentally ideologised and “privatised” by the state, now, in recent decades, Russian museums, as A.V. Smirnov notes, have an opportunity to decide themselves how “the cultural memory content will be translated into the public consciousness and how actively the museum will be involved in the overall process of commemoration” [33, p. 20].
Back in the 1990s, the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation initiated the creation of a State Catalogue of the Museum Fund of Russia, a unified information resource containing basic information about museum objects and museum collections kept in all museums of the Russian Federation. The work to compile the State Catalogue proved to be difficult and was realised only on the third attempt: the first one took place in 1996-2009, the second one – in 2009-2013. At present the compilers are faced with a task to include all registered items in the electronic catalogue by 2025. Today, there are 5,530 items in the “museums” section of the “Culture.RF” portal [28].

As contemporary researchers state, being based on the data provided by Russian and international sources, there is a general trend towards increasing the importance of digital media in the global and Russian recreation industry which aims at attracting consumers, and towards enabling them to get acquainted with a cultural product remotely, with further involvement in a face-to-face dialogue. This goal is also pursued by modern virtual museum projects, which makes it a significant mission of the creative industry.

The analysis of the virtual museums’ problem area also includes museum pedagogy perspectives that are actively discussed in humanitaristics. Museum pedagogy in terms of encyclopaedic approach is “a field of science studying the history of museums, features of their cultural and educational activity, methods of museums’ impact on various categories of visitors, interaction of museums with educational institutions, etc. [32]. The subject of museum pedagogy includes the issues relating to the content and forms of the museum’s pedagogical impact and identification of its functional resources. Although the educational function was inherent in the museum from the very beginning, since the time of the first Mouseion in Alexandria (3rd century BC), the term “museum pedagogy” appeared relatively recently.

This concept was first introduced and formulated by the end of the 19th century in Germany by A. Lichtwark, A. Reichwein, E. Rosmeler who interpreted it as “a direction of museum’s work with students” [23, p. 252]. Russian museum pedagogy was developed in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. The concept of “museum pedagogy” is treated by numerous researchers through the phenomena of convergence of museum culture and pedagogy, their interaction in the process of character education. For instance, T.E. Vasilyeva claims that museum pedagogy “rests” on three scientific disciplines: pedagogy, psychology and history. Speaking of history, she means “the history of material culture” which is closely intertwined with art history and linguistics [Ibid, p. 253]. T.M. Troshina believes that “museum pedagogy, on a par with andragogy, is a critically important activity area in art museums since the time of their origination” [35, p. 202].

The new educational situation in Russia that took shape at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries, as well as the transformation of the museum itself, modify the idea of mission, functions and forms of museum pedagogy which is developing today, as noted earlier, in the mainstream of communicative culture. This theory focuses on visual and audiovisual codes of museum communication, which, according to the researchers of media culture, represent a kind of communication language [9, p. 434].

The visitors’ comprehension of the audiovisual (digital) communication language through the concept of virtual museum’s space makes contemporary museum pedagogy, one way or another, an integral part of media education having similar social functions, as evidenced by the works of many Russian and foreign researchers. But still, as evidenced by the research, the leading function of the modern museum pedagogy is the dialogical function.
The intercultural dialogue objectives were adopted as priorities by the UNESCO General Conference in November 2021: in the Medium-Term Strategy 2022-2029 and the Programme 2022-2025. The intercultural dialogue subject area is presented in the first document as an integral part of the toolkit reflecting the strategic goal aimed at strengthening the “inclusive, peaceful and equitable societies” that fully promote cultural diversity and sustainable development. The consistent analysis of the text of the said strategic documents makes it possible, according to D.L. Spivak, to identify two key objectives of the intercultural dialogue at the present stage, namely, “bridging the gaps” in collective consciousness and “promoting common values and memory constructs” [16, p. 243; 34, p. 111]. As to the Programme, it outlines the features of a three-level construct: “intercultural understanding” – “intercultural competences” – “intercultural dialogue” [Ibid]. It should be noted that D.L. Spivak in his work “Intercultural Dialogue in the New Medium-Term Strategy of UNESCO” presented an essential in-depth review of the current development trends in the subject area of cross-cultural, intercultural and transcultural dialogue. The importance of intercultural dialogue is also defined by UNESCO in other documents, such as “The Cultural Strategy” and “Education 2030” strategy [17].

All of these documents are relevant for the modern museum pedagogy, thus proving its other function becoming more prominent in the 21st century – interdisciplinarity. As already noted, the modern museum, including a virtual one, is a special model of communicative culture encompassing an aggregate of specialists representing various humanities: museologists, culturologists, art historians, psychologists, pedagogues, who try to resolve the problems of complex nature, though not always successfully, in the process of implementing the goal and objectives of museum pedagogy.

For instance, E.N. Polyudova, in her speech at Barcelona Conference on Education in 2020, offers the term “meditative space” as a new environment of modern museums, that makes it possible to provide a new style of interaction between museum visitors and works of art. From her point of view, it is necessary to create meditative space clusters in the modern museum, which will meet the visitor’s need for independent perception of artefacts [12]. This work also requires specialists who are erudite and trained in the theory and practice of modern museums, on the one part, and in the domain of pedagogy, psychology and media culture, on the other part.

Discussion

The present research has illustrated a number of problems connected with modernisation of the museum space and the functioning of the virtual museum as a new socio-cultural institution in the epoch of globalisation and digitalisation. One should recognise the assertion made by a number of scholars and practitioners stating that the museum has turned from the place of storage and viewing of artefacts into a new model of communicative culture, an open interactive space engaging the visitors in a dialogue and interaction, which has expanded its functional resources. In this regard it is possible to agree with the opinion of M.A. Belyaeva and T.G. Ladygina who have identified a number of new museum communications: 1) digitalisation of the museum space and its collections; 2) interaction with the visitors through social networks; 3) digital communication with different information bases and access to consumers far beyond the museum; 4) creation
of virtual museums as separate socio-cultural institutions; 5) the use of virtual museum resources in the educational process of schools and universities [19].

The museum space mediatisation result can be seen through the strengthening of educational, research and socio-cultural functions of the museum, which has been clearly demonstrated by virtual practices of the leading museums of the country and the world over. T.M. Troshina was correct in proving that the modern museum has turned into a “multifunctional, multimedia institution of public importance” [35, 207]; however, this does not contradict to the traditional museum practice [Ibid]. Still a number of researchers, namely A.N. Balash [18], E.N. Polyudova [12], D.S. Vasilina [22], believe that the virtual museum is a qualitatively new phenomenon, something completely different in comparison with the traditional museum. Of interest is the point of view of A. Gálosi who proposed “to consider real and virtual museums as different entities within the same continuum of culture, though not in the opposite corners of constructed realities”, thereby arguing that these two museum forms are part of the same museum paradigm” [3].

One should also acknowledge the fact that virtual museums, being a new space of media culture, need a more profound study of communicative ideology as a scientific paradigm. The perception of the museum as a depository of historically significant relics – forms of cultural memory – for the purpose of their presentation and research acquires a more comprehensive content within the new paradigm, ensuring due impact of museum communications on the real cultural process. However, one should also agree with E.N. Shapinskaya who states that the modern museum functions in the conditions of the market economy; therefore one cannot ignore the fact that museum activities, which are part of “impressions economy”, show a growing consumerism [36, p. 167].

However, the most debatable issue in this study is the museum pedagogy prospects. The foundations of this pedagogy were formulated as early as at the end of the 19th century. The authors of this essay have concluded that the new educational situation in Russia, as well as the transformation of the museum space developing along the lines of communicative culture in the 21st century, require comprehension of due visual and audiovisual codes as a peculiar language of communication. In this regard, one can agree with L. Manovich who states that it is necessary to know “the computer’s visual language as a new form of description of cultural artefacts, experience and dynamics... The visual dimensions convey colour, texture, contours, composition and other characteristics of museum items better than human languages” [10]. E.L. Sidorenko and P. Arch are right in their own way, asserting in their joint work that “digital (audiovisual) technologies involve the methods of theoretical modelling, idealisation and technical experiments”, which contributes to protection of intellectual rights [15]. A. Kaun is supportive of their position to a certain extent, although she treats the language of digitalisation not as “a culture of communication, but as a digital incoherence”, while proposing to alter this situation “through active investigation of digital culture” [7]. The latter is regarded by her as one of the main present-day goals of media education with the structure including museum pedagogy, as believed by the authors of this research.

Modern media education is multifunctional, as evidenced by the views of various researchers. In this regard, G. Hwang and S. Shi highlight the information-semiotic function of this system as a basis for the influence of artificial intelligence [6]; S. Gálik believes network-style thinking to be an important factor of media education, since it performs a cognitive function [2]; the major factor in these terms, as viewed by V. Muzykant and O. Shlykova, is the formation of media competence [11]. One can also agree with the opinion
of Y. Gorelov and N. Khilko [4] who, like the authors of article [8], consider the formation of creative personality to be one of the main goals of media education. And still, the opinions of C. Rapanta and S. Trovão are treated as leading in museum pedagogy issues – these researchers associate intercultural education with dialogical and aesthetic functions [13]. They also state, like J.A. Brasil and R. Cabecinhas [1], that the top-priority and predominant function in the activity of the 21st-century virtual (interactive) museum is the dialogical one.

The authors of this research have proved that intercultural dialogue issues are of particular priority in the context of the documents approved by UNESCO in November 2021. Their relevance for museum pedagogy is undeniable, defining its interdisciplinary function oriented towards solution of complex-nature problems.

The proposal by E.P. Olesina and E.I. Polyudova – to assign a new status of “educational museology” to the dialogue between the school and the museum – seems to be interesting, though debatable [31, 70-71]; the researchers mean to integrate the latter into a comprehensive system of educational interaction. The relevance of this proposal lies in the assumption that, considering the possible ways of development of this new direction in theoretical and methodological aspects, the necessity for professional training of school teachers-culturologists becomes topical [Ibid].

A non-standard way of training a culturologist-museologist is offered by the Department of Cultural Studies and Socio-Cultural Activities of Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B. N. Yeltsin, which introduced a new profile “Modern Museum and Creative Industries” into the Master degree programme in 2021-2022. Its aim is to train professional managers – museology organisers as well as museum pedagogy specialists addressing the issues of student education and training. In 2022, the Department of Cultural Studies and Socio-Cultural Activities of Ural Federal University initiated an interregional applied research conference of young scientists in Yekaterinburg “Cultural Institutions and Creative Industries as Factors of Socio-Cultural Development of the Information Society” which brought together over a hundred museologists, pedagogues, postgraduates and students who united their efforts towards development of due prospects of regional museums in the conditions of globalisation and digitalisation.

The research discussion materials make it possible to ascertain the topicality of all the problems (scientific, organisational, practical) connected with the activities of the virtual museum as a new model of communicative culture, and with the museum pedagogy prospects.

**Conclusion**

Summarising the research findings, the following can be noted.

1. The interaction of the modern museum with the new media, along with the virtualisation of the museum space, represent the most promising form of the museum’s transformation and existence as a factor of preservation of cultural and historical heritage in the information space of the socio-cultural sphere.

2. The reorganisation of the traditional museum into a new model of communicative culture not only upgrades its status as a relevant social institution, but also extends its functions in the system of cultural industries and in the educational process at schools and universities, contributing to the formation of the 21st-century creative personality with innovative mentality.
3. Studying the multifunctional resources of the virtual museum as based on the specifics of audiovisual technologies, on its democratism and interactivity, is closely connected with the problems and prospects of museum pedagogy which is now becoming one of the important structures in media education, which is confirmed by participating in UNESCO's policy goals aimed at promoting universal values and memory constructs based on further development of intercultural dialogue.
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