

*Dmitry A. BELYAEV, Ksenia A. AKSENOVA*

## **Explication of Screen Culture: History of Formation and Forms of Cultural Constitution**

**Abstract:** The screen is rapidly becoming the dominant mode of modern culture, acting as a technological tool, a medium and a special, in its own way unique environment for the multidimensional human existence. This actualizes the study of the genesis of screen culture, the content and evolution of the formats of its representation both in the structure of human everyday life and in the historical continuum of culture.

The research methods include the following: the methodology of evolutionism, cultural-semiotic and comparative methods, which allows to trace the genesis of screenness and compare various forms of screen culture; and the typological method and systematic approach, which allowed to systematize the forms of screen culture and reveal the principles of their distinction.

The paper identifies four main screen formats: cinematographic, television, computer and smartphone-mobile. The acceleration of the screening dynamics of many cultural spheres and the formation of a special cultural continuum will be revealed, where all traditional social and personal activities are screened, creating a space of new authenticity and mythology. The framework of its architectonics is visually dynamic forms, often with interactive and hypertextual properties. At the same time, screen rhetoric is based more on visual images and clip-editing techniques for presenting information, which leads to an emphasis on emotional-affective rather than rational-logical perception.

The authors concluded that many sociocultural practices are transferred to the screen format, contributing to the formation of a new dominant modality of human existence as a screen Homo Digital. The explication of the genesis of electronic screenness allows us to understand the structure of the screen reality of modern culture and build effective strategies for predicting its dynamics in the future.

**Keywords:** screen culture, cinema, television, computer, smartphone, interactivity, screen medium, digital man.

**Dmitry A. BELYAEV**

Lipetsk State Pedagogical  
P. Semenov-Tyan-Shansky University  
strit.vol@mail.ru

**Ksenia A. AKSENOVA**

Lipetsk State Pedagogical  
P. Semenov-Tyan-Shansky University  
aksenova89@mail.ru

**EKPHRISIS, 2/2024**

**ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE  
AND THE POLITICS OF IMAGINATION  
pp. 86–96**

DOI: 10.24193/ekphrasis.32.5

Published First Online: December 19, 2024

## Introduction

Today, considering the main paradigm of the genesis of memorial-representational forms, several stages of cultural development can be distinguished: verbal-narrative, written and screen (this periodization is based on an exclusively dominant-stable way of consolidating and generational transmission of the main matrix of meanings and values.). At the same time, the screen format for representing and broadcasting various information arrays emerged only at the end of the 19th century, and already at the beginning of the 21st century it formed a special form of culture that today claims totality (McLuhan 150–153). The modern American researcher of cultural studies L. Manovich quite definitely states: “computerized culture is gradually” filming “all representations and events” (Manovich 2001, 88). He is echoed by the Russian researcher K. E. Razlogov, defining screen culture as a “new communication paradigm” of modern culture (Razgolv 15). The screen is rapidly becoming the dominant mode of modern culture, acting as a technological tool, medium and a special, in its own way, unique environment of multidimensional human existence. At the same time, the screen managed to absorb, integrate and to incorporate all the previous translational types of culture (Tarasov 55).

All this today makes the study of the of screen culture genesis, the content and evolution of the formats of its representation acute both in the structure of human everyday life and in the historical continuum of culture. Our consideration of the screen culture phenomenon is devoted to these semantic plots.

## Materials and Methods

Despite the comparative novelty of the screen culture phenomenon, its various aspects at different times have already become objects of consideration by researchers who have become classics of social and humanitarian thought of the 20th century. In particular, certain philosophical and theoretical topics of analytics of screen culture as a kind of “new text” in the cultural system are raised from a structuralist perspective in the works of K. Levi-Strauss (Lévi-Strauss 1958) and Yu. Lotman (Lotman, Tsivyan 1994). In particular, certain philosophical and theoretical topics of analytics of screen culture as a kind of “new text” in the cultural system are raised from a structuralist perspective in the works of K. Levi-Strauss (Luhmann 2004; Marcuse 1962). J. Deleuze and J. Baudrillard already emphatically consider the phenomenology of screen culture in its various manifestations, noting that it forms a new ontology of modern culture (Baudrillard 1976; 1981; Deleuze 1986). In addition, the topic of screening is developed in the discourse of social futurology by A. Toffler (Toffler 1970) and M. McLuhan (McLuhan 1964), as well as cultural problems

of the Frankfurt School (Adorno, Horkheimer 1969). Finally, it is necessary to note the modern studies of M. Castells (Castells 2004) and L. Monovich (Manovich 2012), analyzing the network essence of screen culture in its anthropological dimension, and the works of E. Meskin (Meskin A., Robson 2016), J. Dunn (Dunn 2012), M. George (Goerger 2017) and G. Young (Young 2016), in which the problems of interactivity and “new ethics” of modern types of screen culture are raised.

The methodological research toolkit is due to the synthetic (technocultural) nature of the object and subject of consideration, which determined a single set of methodological approaches and principles-cultural-civilizational, dialectical, active and axiological, on the basis of which the scientific research was performed. Conceptually, we based our consideration on the principles of the unity of the historical and logical, socio-cultural and historical conditionality of human practices.

The study was performed based, firstly, on the methodology of evolutionism, cultural-semiotic and comparative methods, which allow to trace the genesis of screening and compare various forms of screen culture; secondly, on the typological method and systematic approach, which allowed to systematize the forms of screen culture and reveal the principles of their distinction. In addition, the problems of screen culture as such were investigated within the framework of functionalism, which focuses on the interests and needs of a person and the means of their satisfaction, and structuralism, which gives an idea of culture as a set of sign systems and texts and cultural creativity as symbolism.

In general, depending on the considered aspect of the screen culture phenomenon, as well as local scientific tasks, the research methods are adjusted, while maintaining the integrity and unity of the research narrative. The synthesis of cultural and historical principles allowed to perform an integral study of the dynamics of genesis and forms of screen culture representation.

## Results

Today, we can conditionally distinguish four main screen media formats: cinema screen, TV screen, computer screen and mobile-smartphone screen (Gere 2012; Huhtamo 2012). At the same time, it should be emphasized that “the media is not just a means for transmitting information, it is a whole environment in which cultural codes are produced, aestheticized and broadcast.” (Kirillova 11). These media formats have consistently appeared since the end of the 19th century, creating new screen dimensions and contributing to the dynamics of their cultural expansion. Currently, each of them retains its relevance, but the volume and nature of their influence is different. Next, we will dwell in more detail on the history of their formation and the specifics of their cultural presence.

So, the first incarnation of the screen format was cinema, which emerged in the last decade of the 19th century and was broadcast in specialized public spaces. It appears as a result of the technological development of photography, which has been given dynamics and mobility. At the same time, M. Yampolsky notes interesting synthetic properties of cinema: "Cinematography is compared with fine art and photography. But cinema, as a rule, acts as a new stage in the development of these two phenomena, traditionally opposed to each other. From painting, cinema takes a certain transformative moment, an aesthetic beginning, from photography-it takes documentary. A naturalistic document passed through a movie projector unexpectedly reveals the essence. The document in the cinema becomes the sphere of the spirit, spirituality acquires the truth of reality itself" (Yampolsky 33). In this case, cinema is already beginning to appear as a tool and space for constructing a new dimension of cultural ontology.

At the same time, initially, cinema is perceived by the public and has the status of a farcical entertainment designed to show the broad masses an outlandish technological novelty-the demonstration of "live pictures". Of course, after 15–20 years, cinema begins to claim artistic content and raise acute social topics. In the following decades, cinema has developed very dynamically: it masters new technologies and artistic solutions. However, conceptually, as a kind of screen form, it is still based on the same principles today as it was 100 years ago (Kirillova 129).

Cinema forms a special architectonics of screen perception, influencing the way a person receives information and his position in this new space. From the point of view of our time and modern technical capabilities, the cinema screen is still quite archaic. So, it is focused on broadcasting exclusively arrays of video and audio information in the format of films. A person initially, within the framework of his daily life practices, is outside the cinema screen space, it is even topologically limited by special architectural frames-cinemas. In order to be in this space, a person needs to make a conscious choice, which has an outwardly very specific goal-watching a movie. Being in the cinema excludes the subject from his everyday life and places him in a special sphere of screen influence (Kondakov 192–194).

The cinema screen culture is always public because this format of watching films involves many outsiders-viewers. It also involves the adoption of some externally given normative behavioural regulators, thereby introducing the recipient into a certain social framework. Finally, the cinema screen is total, claims to be full of attention and strives to snatch a person out of everyday life. Here, among other things, the dimension of the screen is noteworthy, which always dominates the person, simultaneously cyclopicly suppressing and delighting, creating "psychological magic" (Ogurchikov 114). At the same time, such a screen format is chronologically limited and arises on an occasion that combines subjective desire and objective-situational opportunity.

This cinema screen culture aroused interest, sometimes delighted and surprised. Moreover, even at the beginning of the XXI century it continues to strive to evoke these

emotions by introducing new technical solutions and improving audio-video effects. However, if screen culture had remained exclusively in such a format, which presupposes a clear external topology of zones of influence and time constraints, it would most definitely not have succeeded in claiming cultural totality. It, most likely, would have occupied a fairly local cultural place, similar, for example, to a theatre. But the development of technology already in the XX century led to the invention of a new screen format-television.

Please note that in this case, under the term “television” we mean a special format of screen broadcasting and playback of information streams performed by means of a special device—a television receiver. This phenomenon has become a fundamentally new stage in the technological evolution of the screen. If practically any white surface (most often a cloth of woven or non-woven type) could act as a cinema screen, here the screen itself was secondary, and the main carrier of innovations was, first of all, the projector. However, now it is the screen in the television form factor that is becoming the main concentration of technologies.

It is also worth paying attention to one remarkable fact. Today, television screen culture is often treated with some humiliation and even disdain, associating it with something archaic and retrograde, which has some reasons, which we will talk about later. At the same time, it built the framework of the modern situation of the screen dominance in culture.

So, the first television receivers appear in the late 1920s, but for many reasons up to the beginning of the 50s they do not receive much distribution. Initially, they were positioned as a kind of application to the radio, expanding its capabilities. Poor image quality, lack of transmitted information content, coupled with a high price, made the TV a rather elite technical entertainment that had no obvious practical sense. As a result, by 1940, about 23–24 thousand copies were released around the world, which, of course, did not allow us to talk about any noticeable cultural influence of television screen culture (Mikhailovich 232).

But already in the 50-60s of the XX century the situation began to change rapidly, as in general, two main factors holding back the mass adoption of television receivers have been overcome: high prices and lack of content. The price was significantly reduced due to the introduction of new technological solutions, which at the same time significantly improved the visual component of the screen visualization quality on TVs. Also, the information content of television became more and more diverse and rich: new TV programs, channels appeared, the forms of television content presentation were improved. In addition, some old films are beginning to be converted into television and many new ones are being created. (Eliseeva, Piskunova 186).

All this by the beginning of the 80s of the XX century led to the massive dissemination of television screen culture and its dominance in the space of the infotainment culture of everyday life (Sergeeva 281).

Essentially, television screen culture has brought a lot of new things into screen culture as a whole. It made a leap both quantitatively, in terms of audience size, and qualitatively, in

terms of forms and degrees of presence in a person's life. First, there is an obvious increase in the number of recipients of television screen culture in comparison with its film format. Thus, in Western countries and Japan, it quickly reached 90% coverage of all households. Secondly, and this moment is even more significant, the intensity of contact with the screen medium has significantly increased. If, in the case of cinema, it was sporadic, exceptional, now it is incorporated into the structure of human everyday life, becoming its everyday practice. Thirdly, the screen culture content goes beyond the purely cinematic forms, offering a variety of video content: news, entertainment shows, educational programs, etc. Finally, fourthly, television screen culture introduces some elements of the subject participation of a person involved in its information space. In the case of cinema, the recipient was deprived of any opportunity to control the information flow of the medium. Now a person, at least, can initiate its switching on and off, and is also able to switch between different TV broadcasting channels. This space of freedom is, of course, very limited in terms of content choice. However, here it is important for a person to acquire subjectivity at the ontological level (in terms of time duration) of interaction with the screen medium.

In general, we can say that already at this stage of the development and spread of screen culture, one can speak of its dominant cultural influence. It was television screen culture that became the basis for the formation of mass culture. The transfer of screen technologies to the home format allowed them to penetrate the most personal, intimate living space of a person. At the same time, despite the emerging elements of the recipient's possible subjectivity in the system of his contact with the television screen culture, the object attitude towards a person as a passive consumer of transmitted information still dominates here. At the same time, a person develops an attitude towards television screen culture as a "new sacredness", that is everything visualized through television and a priori perceived in a special, authoritative and privileged status. Moreover, in the 60-90s it turns into a kind of masquerade "criterion of truth". Any television demonstration is endowed with special characteristics of authenticity. All this will have a significant impact on the transmission of political meanings through television screens, which we will discuss in more detail later.

The next in chronology was the emergence of the computer format of screen culture, which technically appeared in the 70s of XX century, however, it began to receive a noticeable cultural distribution only in the last decade of the last century. By computer screen culture, we mean a multimedia information array generated by a personal computer (PC) (Shaw 406). That is, here, in parallel with the television receiver, a new screen form factor appears, which has a number of very remarkable innovations.

At first glance, it may seem that there is no great reason to single out computer screen culture as a separate stage of its development, since it outwardly differs little from television. However a personal computer, despite its external similarity to a TV, has significantly expanded and, to some extent, fundamentally changed the modality of a person's contact with a screen.

First, the personal computer allowed to use screen technology to display not only audio-video information, as it was before, but also various textual arrays. Accordingly, now screen visualization could absorb almost all manifestations of written culture and at the same time supplement it with modern search and navigation tools, which provided new opportunities when working with texts (Guins 42–49). This was an important step towards the absorption of text by the screen, translating it into a digital format of existence.

Secondly, the philosophy of a personal computer, in contrast to a television receiver, is much more subject-oriented. The PC was originally specialized not for playing external streaming content, but for launching specific applications, which is performed personally by the user. Moreover, the computer content itself, as a rule, involves many interactive elements that “include” the user in the screen action, endowing him with the functions of an actor (Aarseth 54–62). As a result, a person gains a much larger space of freedom when interacting with a screen medium.

At the same time, it should be noted that by the end of the XX century the PC was significantly inferior to television receivers in mass distribution and practice of everyday use. The computer retained an aura of elitism (including price) and a relatively high demand for the threshold value of special competencies for the user. This situation began to change only at the beginning of the 21st century, when the cost of the PC dropped significantly, and its user interface became more user-friendly (Patridge 182).

The rapid development of digital technologies in the form of the World Wide Web and the Internet has greatly increased the popularity of computer screens. It has multiplied the volume and variety of content, as well as enhanced the interactivity and hypertextuality of all information arrays (Burdea G. Goiffet 2003). The PC in the first decade of the XXI century begins to turn into a universal communication and information device.

However, there was one important factor holding back the spread dynamics of computer screen culture at all levels of human everyday life-stationarity. Here, a PC is fundamentally similar in form factor to television receivers—they are both relatively bulky and involve predominantly stationary use. Of course, there are laptops—a mobile version of a PC, but they do not completely remove the specifics (restrictions) of using a computer, considering its form factor. Accordingly, the use of a computer is limited by the place of its deployment, and a person turns out to be tied to its topos (Mitchell 541–542). This situation was noticeably discordant with the ever-growing intention to mobility in human culture and practices. Overcoming this limitation occurred at the fourth, in theory mobile-smartphone stage in the development of screen culture. (Holt 129).

At this stage, the screen culture takes on a new, *mobile* form-factor that can be implemented in smartphones, tablets and many other devices. The mobile-smartphone screen culture began to become a noticeable cultural phenomenon from about 2007–2008, when the first iPhone model appeared, which made a technological revolution in the smartphone

market, and the Android mobile operating system. Further, the mobile-smartphone screen culture is rapidly gaining mass distribution, becoming by 2015 the main information and communication format.

Technologically, the smartphone has incorporated the basic functions of a personal computer, to which mobility has been added. The latter allowed the smartphone to take a total place in the structure of the practices of human everyday life. It acts as a means of entertainment, education, communication and the satisfaction of many everyday needs. It is no exaggeration to say that the smartphone has become immanent in the existence of a modern person (Babinovich 65). And together with that phenomenon, screen culture finally acquired its status.

It is noteworthy that, on the one hand, all of the above forms of screen culture still retain their relevance today, occupying certain consumer niches. So, cinema, television and PC exist separately and develop in their own way. On the other hand, it was the smartphone screen culture that, through modern network technologies, was able to integrate all previous formats of screen culture on its platform.

On-Screen Media Formats	Chronology of Cultural Constitution
cinema screen culture	from the end of the 19th century
television screen culture	from the middle of XX century
computer screen culture	from the 80s of XX century
mobile-smartphone screen culture	since the beginning of the XXI century

## Discussion

It can be argued that by the beginning of the second decade of the XXI century screening has taken a dominant place in modern culture. K.E. Razlogov rightly notes: “the entire modern culture is marked by the primacy of audiovisual, sound-visual communication” (Razgolv 29). From a technological tool of pictorial representation, it has turned into a prevailing mode of existence, transmission and reproduction of culture. Moreover, N. B. Kirillova emphasizes that “*the screen played a decisive role in the democratization of culture and in the emergence of its new forms*” (Kirillova 131). At the same time, the screen culture significantly changes the person himself, his identity and ways of thinking. So, if we speak in the modality of various transhumanistic and futurological perspectives of human evolution, today the formation of the screen Homo Digital (“digital man”) is becoming more and more obvious. The latter transfers most of its life practices to the format of virtual digital screen reality. All this leads to the formation of a special cultural continuum, where all traditional social and personal activities are filmed, creating a space of new authenticity and mythology (Bartel 290).

## Conclusions

The authors revealed that over the past 100 years, under the influence of the intensive development of electronic digital technologies, a new media and communication format of screen explication of information arrays has developed. As a result, today it is the dominant form of reflection and transmission of the main cultural texts and meanings. All this legitimizes modern culture as, first of all, screen culture, immanent to the human life world at the everyday and special professional levels. The framework of its architectonics is visually dynamic forms, which today often have interactive and hypertextual properties. At the same time, screen rhetoric is more based on visual images and clip-editing techniques for presenting information, which leads to an emphasis on emotional-affective rather than rational-logical perception.

## Works Cited

- Aarseth, Espen. *Cybertext: Perspectives on Ergodic Literature*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Adorno, Theodor, Horkheimer Max, *Dialektik der Aufklaerung: Philosophische Fragmente*. Frankfurt, 1969.
- Babinovich, Vasily. Identity of a gamer in the virtual space of video games. *Bulletin of the Tomsk State University*, no. 446, pp. 64–67, 2019.
- Bartel, Christopher. Free will and moral responsibility in video games. *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 17, iss. 4, pp. 285–293, 2016.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *L'échange symbolique et la mort. Collection Bibliothèque des Sciences humaines*, Gallimard, 1976.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacres et Simulation*. Galilée, 1981.
- Burdea, Grigore, Goiffet, Philippe. *Virtual Reality Technology*. NY, 2003.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Internet Galaxy*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema*. University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Dunn, Jeff. Virtual worlds and moral evaluation. *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 14, iss. 4, pp. 255–265, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-012-9298-6>
- Ferreira, Carolin Overhoff. *The End of History Through the Disclosure of Fiction: Indisciplinarity in Miguel Gomes' Tabu in Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image*, (5), 18–47, 2012.
- Foucault, Michel. *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*, Gallimard, 1975.
- Gere, Charlie. Genealogy of the computer screen. Screen culture. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 38–54, 2012.
- Goerger, Michael. Value, violence, and the ethics of gaming. *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 19, iss. 2, pp. 95–105, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-017-9417-5>.

- Guins, Raiford. *Game After: A Cultural Study of Video Game Afterlife*. *Game After: A Cultural Study of Video Game Afterlife*. The MIT Press, 2014.
- Holt, Robertson. *Examining video game immersion as a flow state*. 108th Annual Psychological Association, 2000.
- Horbury, Alison. A Psychoanalytic Ethics for Screen Aesthetics? The Case of Spring Breakers. *Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image*, (11), 131–151, 2019.
- Huhtamo, von Erkki. Elements of Screenology: Toward an Archaeology of the Screen. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 116–174, 2012.
- Kirillova, Natalia. *Media culture: theory, history, practice*. Academic Project, 2008.
- Kirillova, Natalia. The Transformation of Screen Culture as a Phenomenon of Information Age. *KnE Engineering*, vol. 3, iss. 8, pp. 128–133, 2018.
- Kondakov, I. V. Screen text and “book” text: depth of interpretation. *Science of television*, iss. 11, pp. 191–197, 2014.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Anthropologie structurale*. Plon, 1958.
- Lotman, Yuri, Tsiyvan Yuri. *Dialogue with the screen*. Alexandra, 1994.
- Luhmann, Niklas. *Die Realität der Massenmedien*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2004.
- Manovich, Lev. Archeology of the computer screen. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 55–76, 2012.
- Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media*. The MIT Press, 2001.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man*. Beacon Press, 1964.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw Hill, 1964.
- Meskin, Aaron, Robson, Jon. Video Games as Self-Involving Interactive Fictions. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 74(2), pp. 165–177, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12269>.
- Mikhailovich, Viktor. Television time. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 226–251. 2012.
- Mitchell, William John Thomas. Interdisciplinarity and Visual Culture. *Art Bulletin*, vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 540–544, 1995.
- Nilsson, Jakob. Thought-Images and the New as a Rarity: A Reevaluation of the Philosophical Implications of Deleuze’s Cinema Books. *Cinema: Journal of Philosophy and the Moving Image*, (6), 94–121, 2014.
- Ogurchikov, P.K. Screen culture and modern communicative space. *Humanities and socio-economic sciences*, no. 2, pp. 113–116, 2007.
- Patridge, Stephanie. Video Games and Imaginative Identification. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 75, iss. 2, pp. 181–184, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12355>.
- Piskunova, Svetlana, Eliseeva Olesya. *Screen culture in the space of modern mediaculture*. Context and Reflection: Philosophy of the World and Human Being, vol. 6, pp. 183–191, 2015.
- Razlogov, Kirill. Screen as a meat grinder of screen discourse. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 9–37, 2012.
- Sergeeva, Olya. Computer screen as an element of everyday life at home. *Theoretical problems*, pp. 274–298, 2012.

- Shaw, Adrienne. What Is Video Game Culture? Cultural Studies and Game Studies. *Games and Culture*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 403–424, 2010.
- Tarasov, Alexey. The screen type of the cultural code as a semiotic characteristic of the modern stage of socio-cultural transformation: cultural-philosophical analysis. *Society: philosophy, history, culture*, no. 12. pp. 54–56, 2016.
- Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. Random House, 1970.
- Yampolsky, Mikhail. *The Visible World. Essays on Early Cinema Phenomenology*. Kinovedcheskie Zapiski, 1993.
- Young, Garry Violent video games and morality: a meta-ethical approach. *Ethics and Information Technology*, vol. 17, iss. 4, pp. 311–321, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-016-9386-0>