ANALYTICAL REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

MEDIA EDUCATION 4.0: COMPETENCES – AGENCY – RISKS – INSTITUTIONS

18–19 November 2026 | Online conference

Organiser: University of the National Education Commission in Krakow, Institute of Polish Philology Media Research Centre and Methodological Forum for Young Media Researchers.

Chair of the Organising Committee: Professor Agnieszka Ogonowska
Secretary of the Organising Committee: Dr Bożena Jaskowska
Member of the Organising Committee: Martyna Jankowska, MA

1. Background, scope and objectives of the conference

The international scientific conference *Media Education 4.0: Competences – Agency – Risks – Institutions* was devoted to contemporary transformations in media education in the context of the rapid development of digital technologies, the widespread adoption of generative artificial intelligence (AI), and the increasing algorithmisation of social communication.

Its main objective was to provide an interdisciplinary platform for exchanging research findings and professional experiences concerning new approaches to developing media, digital and AI-related competences, as well as their implications for individual and collective agency, information security, digital well-being and civic participation.

The conference was based on the assumption that contemporary media education can no longer be limited to developing technical skills or the ability to access and use information. It requires a broader approach encompassing critical content analysis, an understanding of how digital platforms and algorithmic systems operate, conscious management of one's media practices, responsible use of generative AI, and the ability to make independent and informed decisions in digital environments.

Another important premise was the need to connect the individual perspective with the broader social and institutional context. Media and digital competences were therefore approached not merely as individual resources, but as elements of a wider system of relationships, educational practices, organisational arrangements and regulatory frameworks. From this perspective, digital agency, resilience to manipulation and information security depend both on users' competences and on the quality of their educational environments, social support systems and institutional accountability.

The conference brought together researchers and practitioners from different academic disciplines and countries, including Poland, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Finland, France, Slovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Germany and Serbia. The programme represented communication and media studies, education, psychology, sociology, law, computer science, information science and related fields.

This international and interdisciplinary approach enabled the examination of media education from theoretical, empirical, methodological, legal and practical perspectives. Particular importance was attached to comparing experiences from different educational systems and

institutional contexts and to understanding media education as a shared challenge facing contemporary democratic societies.

The conference also forms an important part of the activities of the **Methodological Forum for Young Media Researchers**. It provides a platform for presenting and discussing research conducted by the Forum's representatives, including early-career researchers. Their participation highlights the importance of exchanging research experience across generations, developing methodological skills and supporting emerging scholars within the international academic community

2. Conference structure and thematic framework

The conference programme comprised two days of proceedings, ten thematic sessions and parallel presentation blocks. The research contributions were documented in a bilingual Polish-English Book of Abstracts.

The structure of the event reflected four interconnected dimensions identified in its title:

- **Competences** – understood as an integrated set of technical, informational, critical, communicative, creative, ethical and civic skills.
- **Agency** – referring to cognitive autonomy, decision-making capacity, creative media use and active participation in social life.
- **Risks** – including disinformation, manipulation, cyber threats, AI-related risks, privacy violations, problems with self-regulation and the negative consequences of digital media use.
- **Institutions** – understood as actors responsible for creating conditions for competence development, protecting users, shaping educational policies and ensuring the responsible implementation of technologies.

A major strength of this structure was that these four dimensions were not treated as separate or independent areas. Instead, the programme encouraged an examination of their interrelationships. It highlighted the fact that the development of competences does not automatically lead to increased agency, just as awareness of digital risks does not necessarily translate into the ability to prevent or mitigate their consequences.

3. Main thematic areas and scientific contributions of the sessions

3.1. The evolution of media education and critical AI literacy

The first session, *Media Literacy, AI and Education*, focused on the transformation of media education over the past two decades and on emerging challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence in education and research.

In his presentation, *Media Education Core Topics in the Last 20 Years*, Vítor Tomé examined the evolution of key issues in media education, from initial approaches to digital education and school-based media practices to social media, digital citizenship, disinformation and AI competences. An important aspect of this perspective was the changing nature of educational conditions: from information scarcity to information overload, from traditional teaching models to hybrid learning environments, and from assessing individual learning outcomes to considering the long-term impact of education on civic attitudes and participation.

Richard Rogers, in his presentation *Chatbots for Internet Research: A Critical Reflection*, addressed the use of chatbots in social science and humanities research. Particular attention was paid to the reliability of results generated by language models, differences between researchers' findings and AI-generated outputs, the influence of platforms on research data, and the need to audit mechanisms that constrain or shape chatbot responses.

Maria Ranieri, in *Beyond Technical Skills: Critical and Ethical AI Literacy for Education and Democratic Citizenship*, presented a comprehensive understanding of AI literacy, encompassing not only operational and cognitive dimensions but also critical and ethical competences. From this perspective, the ability to identify algorithmic bias, understand the lack of transparency in AI systems, recognise privacy-related risks and reflect on accountability for AI-assisted decisions becomes essential.

Taken together, these presentations outlined an important direction for contemporary media education: moving beyond preparing individuals to use technologies towards developing their capacity to understand, evaluate and actively shape technological environments. AI competences were thus linked to social responsibility and democratic citizenship.

3.2. Research methodologies, data management and the institutional dimension of education

The second session, *Research Methods and Knowledge Practices*, focused on changes in the ways knowledge is produced, organised and validated in digital environments.

Paulo Jorge de Almeida Falcão Alves examined the influence of artificial intelligence on learning practices in higher education, highlighting the need to investigate how students use AI tools, how frequently they rely on them and how these tools affect the completion of academic tasks.

Mari Vállez and Lydia Sánchez addressed research data management in communication and media studies. Their contribution emphasised that data management should not be regarded as an additional administrative responsibility, but rather as an integral component of research methodology.

Contemporary research increasingly relies on diverse data sources, including interviews, surveys, social media content, API-based data collection, web scraping, search engine results and AI-generated materials. These developments require appropriate documentation of research procedures, secure data storage, quality control and the possibility of data reuse.

The common denominator of this session was the recognition that Education 4.0 requires not only new educational content but also a reconsideration of research methodologies, knowledge organisation, academic practices and institutional models of education.

3.3. Digital competences, well-being and social agency

The third session, *Media Education, Well-being and Agency*, was particularly important for developing a positive and agency-oriented approach to media education.

In their presentation, *Digital Competences and the Well-being of Young Adults: A Report from Media Research Centre Studies*, Agnieszka Ogonowska and Bożena Jaskowska presented

findings from an international pilot study conducted in May and June 2026 among 267 university students from Poland, Spain and Slovakia.

The study employed an original questionnaire based on the European DigComp framework and the five-dimensional PERMA model of well-being.

The findings indicated similarities in the self-assessed digital competence profiles of the three national groups. Respondents rated their communication and problem-solving skills most highly, while lower scores were reported for digital content creation, critical information evaluation and self-regulation.

One particularly significant finding was the discrepancy between respondents' declared ability to recognise digital risks (83.9%) and their ability to control the amount of time they spent online (38.6%). This suggests a substantial gap between awareness of digital risks and the practical ability to regulate one's own behaviour in digital environments.

The study also identified a statistically significant positive correlation between overall self-assessed digital competences and well-being ($\rho = 0.56$; $p < 0.001$). The strongest associations concerned digital agency and a sense of accomplishment, as well as digital content creation and a sense of meaning. Information-related competences showed weaker associations with well-being.

These findings provide an empirical basis for further developing the Positive Media Education 4.0 (PME 4.0) framework, which integrates media and digital competences with well-being, agency, creativity, critical reflection and self-regulation. It should be emphasised, however, that the study was exploratory and correlational in nature; therefore, the identified relationships cannot be interpreted as causal.

Justyna Staszczyk presented the Student Digital Consultation Centre as an example of university initiatives aimed at counteracting digital exclusion and strengthening citizens' agency. Her contribution highlighted the importance of direct educational support in accessing and using public digital services and the potential of universities to contribute to social responsibility.

Bartłomiej Chrzanowski addressed media agency and resilience through two case studies involving participants in active film therapy. The presentation suggested that media creation alone does not guarantee lasting developmental change. Its effects also depend on individual resources, opportunities for emotional expression and long-term educational support.

Sylwia Galanciak examined the relationship between experiences of electronic aggression and the mental health of young adults. The use of the DASS-21, SES and Internet Addiction Test in a study involving 575 university students enabled the analysis of the co-occurrence of online hate experiences, symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, and problematic Internet use.

Overall, this session demonstrated that media education should address both individual resources and vulnerability to the negative effects of digital environments. An important direction for future research and educational practice is therefore the integration of competences, agency and well-being within psychological, educational and social perspectives.

3.4. Artificial intelligence, disinformation and critical agency

The fourth session, *AI, Misinformation and Critical Agency*, focused on transformations in authorship, credibility and critical information evaluation in the context of generative AI.

Jagoda Macios examined the automated assessment of written assignments by language models, focusing on discrepancies between evaluations made by human examiners and AI systems. The analysis of 74 English-language examination papers indicated that apparent agreement in overall scores may conceal differences in the assessment of individual criteria. This raises important questions about the reliability and fairness of automated assessment in education.

Edita Štrbová addressed the differences between the actual motivations of individuals who share disinformation and the motivations attributed to them by other users. Her presentation shifted the focus from the ability to identify false information towards the social, emotional and communicative factors underlying its dissemination.

Georgina Kiss-Kozma presented research on manipulation and the credibility of online political communication among young people in Hungary. The findings highlighted that recognising the manipulative nature of fake profiles does not automatically translate into the ability to assess the credibility of political actors and opinion leaders.

The common conclusion of this session was that media education needs to move beyond traditional fact-checking. Contemporary users should be able to assess not only whether information is accurate, but also how it was produced, who distributes it, which mechanisms of influence it employs and what interests may underpin its circulation in the public sphere.

3.5. Disinformation, chatbots, security and critical thinking

Session 5A focused on emerging mechanisms of information manipulation, including risks associated with generative artificial intelligence.

Hubert Nowakowski addressed the critical evaluation of generative chatbot responses, arguing that factual verification alone is insufficient. Users also need to recognise information-selection mechanisms, refusal patterns, response moderation and the variability of outputs produced by AI systems.

Jakub Fila examined a less obvious aspect of cybersecurity: the possibility of deliberately deceiving AI vision systems through image manipulation. His presentation on adversarial attacks demonstrated that algorithms may misinterpret reality even when the manipulated image remains perfectly understandable to a human observer. This expands the concept of digital security to include the limitations of machine perception.

Maria Ślugaj analysed the mechanisms behind the emergence and dissemination of Internet legends, drawing on the concepts of information cascades, social proof and emotional communication. The case of the online narrative surrounding the Blue Whale challenge illustrated how information of uncertain status can acquire the appearance of an established fact through repeated circulation.

Sara Szydło addressed deepfakes and disinformation in the context of aviation safety. Particular attention was paid to the emotional responses of audiences to false reports of aviation disasters and manipulated audiovisual materials.

The parallel Session 5B, *Law, Citizenship and Digital Education*, expanded these issues to include institutional and regulatory perspectives.

Kinga Werens examined the importance of media competences in helping professions, highlighting their relationship with communication quality, professional responsibility and the safety of people receiving support.

Magdalena Popczyk addressed copyright and permitted use as components of journalists' media competences. Her contribution emphasised that responsible content creation and distribution require not only technical proficiency but also legal and ethical awareness.

Gabriela Romaniuk examined the role of state institutions in media education, highlighting the need for better coordination between organisations such as the National Broadcasting Council (KRRiT), the Personal Data Protection Office (UODO) and NASK.

Patryk Szklarz presented the evolution of the European Union's approach to media education: from supporting basic digital competences, through developing critical media reception, to strengthening resilience to manipulation and disinformation.

Taken together, these parallel sessions demonstrated that counteracting disinformation requires the simultaneous development of individual competences, appropriate legal frameworks and effective institutional cooperation.

3.6. Intergenerational media education and AI competences

The second day began with the session *Media Literacy Research and Intergenerational AI*, devoted to the development of media education in different social environments and age groups.

Laura López Romero presented educational initiatives undertaken by journalistic organisations in Andalusia, demonstrating the importance of professional media organisations in developing media literacy among children and young people.

Sirkku Kotilainen focused on AI competences, disinformation and digital citizenship among young people. Her contribution highlighted research into children's and young people's experiences and practical approaches to developing their critical awareness of media environments.

Łukasz Tomczyk presented intergenerational AI education through the PRODIGI project. His contribution explored the potential of younger generations to support older people in developing digital and AI competences, while also addressing the risk of deepening digital exclusion and the need to promote critical and safe use of generative AI.

An important conclusion of this session was that media education should not be addressed exclusively to children and young people. It requires a lifelong learning perspective encompassing older adults, teachers, parents and representatives of different professional groups.

3.7. Generative AI: research, assessment, accountability and competences

The seventh session focused on the practical and methodological implications of implementing generative artificial intelligence.

Justyna Staszczyk examined the responsibilities of universities as providers and users of AI systems in the context of Article 4 of the EU Artificial Intelligence Act. Her presentation highlighted the institutional responsibility to ensure an appropriate level of AI literacy among academic staff, teachers and students.

A research team consisting of Władysław M. Kolasa, Michał Rogoż, Milena Gajewska, Weronika Gorajczyk and Piotr Bukański presented a visual audit of generative models as an example of a research methodology that can also be applied in media education. The analysis of 895 images generated within the project *AI Dreams of Russian Propaganda* demonstrated the importance of systematic model testing, documenting generation conditions and critically evaluating AI-generated outputs.

Małgorzata Kowalska-Chrzanowska, Krzysztof Wieniecki and Władysław M. Kolasa examined visual distortions of historical figures generated by AI. Their analysis of images of Jadwiga of Poland and Emilia Plater demonstrated that synthetic materials can take the form of seemingly documentary representations of the past, despite having no authentic historical equivalent. This issue is particularly important for media and historical education, as it requires the development of critical visual interpretation skills.

Karolina Jeleń and Aldona Guzik addressed participants' agency in the process of using AI-generated images through the UnLock project. Their contribution explored the relationship between memory of place, local community experiences and AI-generated visual representations of the future.

The session demonstrated that AI literacy should also include the ability to conduct technological audits, assess the credibility of visual representations and understand the social implications of automating creative processes.

3.8. Information ethics, digital sovereignty and civic communication

The eighth session, *Media Literacy, Information Ethics and Civic Communication*, broadened the perspective on media education to include democracy, digital sovereignty and information integrity.

Ana Vojinovic addressed the issue of digital colonialism, highlighting the concentration of technological power, the influence of algorithms and the accumulation of personal data as factors that may restrict individual autonomy and national digital sovereignty.

Aysen Sapundzhi presented the concept of developing a Bulgarian OMSAI cluster integrating competences in OSINT, media monitoring, semantic search and artificial intelligence. Her contribution highlighted the importance of cooperation between technology companies, academic institutions, non-governmental organisations and public authorities in strengthening information resilience.

Kai Löser examined the use of AI as a tool supporting interdisciplinary teaching. Particular attention was paid to the Frankfurt Triangle model, which incorporates the technical functioning of language systems, their social implications and their educational applications.

The presentation of Divina Frau-Meigs looked at the impact of the Agentic turn on information systems as users are challenged with disinformation and non-human produced ("artificial" or "synthetic") content and functionalities. The paper presented a matrix to AI/Not to AI to help as a compass for human involvement with AI, by choice, with agency and integrity of information as a main focus for fostering meaning and trust.

The common denominator of this session was the understanding of media education as a prerequisite for informed participation in democratic life, rather than merely a set of skills required by individual technology users.

3.9. AI in educational and technological practice: digital culture, security and trust

Sessions 9A and 9B covered a broad range of issues related to the practical use of technology, critical thinking and user responsibility.

The presentation of Agnieszka Ogonowska outlines a humanistic model of AI competence developed on the basis of original research involving adolescents. Moving beyond a purely technical understanding of competence, the model emphasises young users' agency, critical reflection, responsibility and cognitive autonomy, while also recognising the role of family, peer groups and educational institutions.

Kinga Paszek addressed the role of digital competences in road safety, analysing the significance of navigation systems, transport applications and driver assistance technologies. An important issue was the risk of excessive trust in technology and the potential reduction of independent situational assessment.

Zuzanna Koral focused on the impact of social media on critical thinking, drawing attention to the role of recommendation algorithms, emotionally charged headlines and popularity indicators in the evaluation of information.

In Session 9B, Julia Mościbrodzka analysed unreflective use of digital platforms, the attention economy and self-regulation. Maria Ligęza examined disinformation as a threat to democracy, social trust and European cohesion, while Sandra Kubiak addressed the romanticisation of criminals in popular culture and its educational implications.

Both sessions highlighted the need to develop cognitive autonomy and responsibility for one's own media practices. A particularly important observation was that the mere availability of verification tools does not guarantee their use. Education should therefore also cultivate habits, motivations and attitudes that encourage critical thinking.

3.10. Media, representation and participation

The final session, *Media, Representation and Participation*, focused on the relationship between communication, creativity, imagination and agency.

Martyna Jankowska presented an analysis of the relationship between content type and the quality of audience engagement on LinkedIn. Her study of 801 posts published in 2025 by mBank, Allegro and PZU indicated that image-building and relationship-oriented content generated more positive reactions, whereas expert-oriented content was more likely to

encourage substantive discussion. The presentation highlighted the limitations of measuring communication effectiveness solely through quantitative indicators.

Aldona Guzik and Beata Gazda presented Internet metaphors as a tool for analysing young adults' relationships with technology. The Internet was perceived as a friend, guide or partner, but also as an environment that may lead to information overload, dependency and loss of control. Particularly important was the discrepancy between recognising manipulation mechanisms and actually being able to resist their influence.

Małgorzata Adamska and Jakub Nodzyński examined the role of psychology and storytelling in media education, highlighting the need to move from knowledge about risks towards lasting behavioural change. The use of cognitive mechanisms and narrative techniques may support memory, decision-making and resilience to digital manipulation.

The final session made it possible to understand media education not only as a process of protecting users against risks, but also as a space for developing imagination, creativity, communication and active social participation.

4. Key findings and overarching conclusions

An analysis of the topics presented in the conference programme and Book of Abstracts makes it possible to identify several major conclusions concerning the future development of Media Education 4.0.

First, media education needs to move from an instrumental model towards a critical and agency-oriented model.

The ability to use devices and applications is not sufficient for informed participation in digital environments. Users need to understand how platforms, algorithms and AI systems operate and to be able to evaluate their limitations, underlying interests and social consequences.

Second, digital and AI competences should be developed in close connection with well-being.

An important direction is to incorporate self-regulation, attention management, a sense of agency, creativity and the ability to use technologies constructively. Media education should promote not only safe media use but also positive experiences associated with digital participation.

Third, recognising disinformation must be distinguished from genuine resilience to manipulation.

Users may declare awareness of digital risks while simultaneously sharing unverified content, responding to emotional manipulation or struggling to control their own media practices. It is therefore essential to investigate the gap between declared competences and competences actually demonstrated in practice.

Fourth, the development of AI requires an expanded understanding of media literacy.

Contemporary education should include not only information verification but also the critical assessment of chatbot responses, audits of generative models, recognition of algorithmic bias, evaluation of synthetic images and an understanding of automated information selection and processing.

Fifth, media education is a systemic and institutional responsibility.

Responsibility for its development cannot rest solely with schools and individual teachers. Cooperation is required between universities, public institutions, non-governmental organisations, media organisations, expert communities and technology providers. Appropriate legal frameworks and organisational arrangements are also essential.

Sixth, media education should adopt a lifelong and intergenerational perspective.

Media and AI competences are necessary for children and young people, university students, working adults, older people and professionals in public and helping professions. This requires differentiated educational approaches that take account of the specific needs of different groups.

Seventh, methods for measuring actual competences need to be further developed.

Self-assessment does not always accurately reflect users' actual abilities. Questionnaires should therefore be combined with practical tasks, behavioural analysis, observation and qualitative research methods. Particular attention should be paid to whether knowledge and awareness translate into concrete decisions and lasting practices.

5. The significance of the conference for the development of Media Education 4.0

One of the important intellectual outcomes of the conference is the opportunity to conceptualise Media Education 4.0 as an integrated framework connecting competences, agency, resilience and institutional responsibility.

From this perspective, media, digital and AI competences should not be treated as closed lists of skills, but rather as dynamic individual resources developed within specific social, educational and technological conditions.

Three dimensions are particularly important:

1. **The critical dimension** – including content analysis, source evaluation, understanding algorithmic mechanisms and identifying manipulation.
2. **The functional and creative dimension** – including the practical use of digital and AI tools, content creation, problem-solving and informed participation in communication.
3. **The relational and social dimension** – including support from families, peers, educational environments and institutions, as well as opportunities to apply competences in civic and community activities.

This approach provides a basis for further developing the Positive Media Education 4.0 framework, as well as broader explanatory models exploring the relationships between competences, digital agency, resilience and well-being.

The conference also provided a basis for further comparative research involving different generations, educational systems and institutional contexts. Particularly promising is the integration of research into self-reported competences with the analysis of actual user practices and their ability to make responsible decisions in situations of information uncertainty.

6. International and interdisciplinary significance

A major strength of the conference was its integration of research perspectives and experiences from different countries. The participation of researchers representing, among others, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Finland, Slovakia, Hungary, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, France, Niederlands, Germany and Serbia enabled the consideration of diverse approaches to media education and digital policies.

The international character of the event was significant not only in terms of academic representation but also in terms of knowledge exchange. It facilitated comparisons between educational models, institutional arrangements and practices for developing media competences, while highlighting shared challenges associated with disinformation, generative AI, information security and the protection of democratic participation.

The interdisciplinary nature of the programme made it possible to examine the same phenomena from different perspectives. AI was discussed as a technological and methodological issue, but also as a pedagogical, psychological, legal, ethical and social challenge. Similarly, disinformation was approached not only as a problem of information quality but also as a phenomenon related to emotions, motivations, social relationships, politics and institutional functioning.

This integration of perspectives represents an important contribution to the further development of research on media education.

7. Significance of the conference for the activities of the Media Research Centre at the University of the National Education Commission in Krakow

The conference was closely aligned with the research and educational profile of the Media Research Centre at the University of the National Education Commission in Krakow. In particular, it addressed the Centre's research interests in media and digital competences, AI literacy, counteracting disinformation and investigating the relationship between media activity and well-being.

Its thematic scope was directly connected with the Centre's research areas, including Positive Media Education 4.0, digital and AI competences, the experiences of Generation Alpha and young adults, and the social and psychological consequences of functioning in algorithmically mediated environments.

An important element was the presentation of the Centre's own research findings within an international comparative context. This provided an opportunity to connect theoretical reflection with empirical evidence and to identify possibilities for further developing educational models and assessment instruments.

The conference also created an important platform for building relationships with international and Polish research institutions and identifying potential areas for joint projects, publications and educational initiatives.

From the perspective of the Centre's activities, particular importance should be attached to developing international cooperation, exchanging good practices and connecting scientific research with initiatives addressed to teachers, students, parents, public institutions and civil society organisations.

8. Recommendations and directions for future activities

Based on the analysis of the topics included in the conference programme and Book of Abstracts, the following recommendations can be formulated for the further development of research and educational practice:

1. **Develop integrated Media Education 4.0 frameworks** combining DigComp, AI competences, critical media literacy, positive psychology and well-being.
2. **Design assessment tools for performance-based competences** enabling the evaluation of actual skills in information verification, critical assessment of AI-generated responses, self-regulation and responsible technology use.
3. **Conduct comparative and longitudinal research** involving different age groups, family, peer and educational environments, and diverse cultural contexts.
4. **Integrate AI education into educational curricula**, taking into account its technical, cognitive, critical, ethical and social dimensions.
5. **Develop education aimed at counteracting disinformation** that goes beyond basic fact-checking techniques and incorporates the analysis of motivations, emotions, social influence mechanisms and platform dynamics.
6. **Strengthen institutional cooperation**, particularly between universities, schools, libraries, media organisations, non-governmental organisations and institutions responsible for information security.
7. **Integrate well-being and self-regulation into media education**, including attention management, control over time spent using digital media and the conscious development of healthy relationships with technology.
8. **Promote intergenerational initiatives** that facilitate mutual learning and help reduce digital exclusion, particularly in relation to emerging AI technologies.
9. **Support interdisciplinary research teams** combining media studies, education, psychology, computer science, law and social sciences.
10. **Continue international academic exchange**, including the development of joint research projects, publications and educational initiatives.

9. Conclusions

The international conference *Media Education 4.0: Competences – Agency – Risks – Institutions* represents an important scientific initiative aimed at identifying and analysing contemporary challenges associated with the functioning of individuals and institutions in digital environments.

Its principal academic contribution lies in its broad and interdisciplinary approach to media education, extending beyond the traditional understanding of competences as the ability to operate media and digital tools. The conference placed particular emphasis on the relationships

between knowledge, critical thinking, cognitive autonomy, agency, resilience to manipulation, well-being and social responsibility.

A particularly important conclusion is that contemporary media education must not only respond to risks arising from technological development but also harness the potential of technology to foster creativity, cooperation, civic participation and quality of life. This requires moving beyond both uncritical technological enthusiasm and approaches focused exclusively on risk prevention.

In this context, Media Education 4.0 can be understood as an integrated educational framework in which technical and informational competences are connected with critical reflection, ethics, creativity, self-regulation, well-being and the capacity for informed action in digital society.

The research contributions presented in the conference materials point to the need for further investigation into the mechanisms through which digital competences and agency are developed, as well as the role of family, educational and institutional environments in building the resilience of individuals and communities.

The event contributes to the ongoing international debate on the future of media education and provides a valuable platform for exchanging research findings and developing cooperation between academic communities, educational institutions and social practitioners.

The conference highlights the need to recognise media education not as an additional area of learning, but as one of the fundamental dimensions of preparing individuals and societies for responsible, critical and agentic participation in contemporary digital environments.