Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie)

ELECTRONIC JOURNAL

The Sociocultural Context and the Main Developing Stages of Family Education in Russian Feature Films

Irina Chelysheva [a], [*]

[a] Rostov State University of Economics, Russian Federation

Abstract

Family issues have always been an important topic in Russian feature films. Films about family and family education, challenges of parent-child relationships are essential for media education of the younger generation. The educational potential of feature films is that they position family values and foundations, help build models of intra-family interaction, teach respect for the older generation, help strengthen intergenerational ties and preserve the best traditional values.

This article presents the sociocultural context of the image of family and family education based on Russian feature films. The author carried out an interdisciplinary analysis of the main approaches, concepts and family models presented in pedagogical, psychological, cultural, and sociological studies.

The main research methods are theoretical analysis and synthesis; generalization and classification, content analysis, abstraction and specification, and generalization. Using these methods, the study identifies the main transformation processes and changes characteristic of the presentation of family issues in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, associated with the key priorities of state family policy, ideology, pedagogical views and psychological ideas. Based on the analysis, the main stages of transformational processes of reflecting images of family and family education in Russian feature cinema are identified from the point of view of the main conceptual approaches, directions, goals, and objectives of media education.

Keywords: family, family upbringing, media, media text, media culture, media education, feature films.

1. Introduction

Family issues have always been and remain one of the central themes in both Soviet and Russian feature films of various genres. The modern information society dictates new ideas about the world, man's place in it, living conditions, principles of coexistence in society and in the family. Family images in media culture including cinema media texts are also changing. Feature films, like the entire system of media culture as a whole, cannot be considered outside of interaction with "the political and cultural contexts. The reflection of the modern Russian information society is associated primarily with changes in the traditional cultural mentality, and is a kind of reaction to technical progress and technological innovation, the emergence of various models of information and communication channels. Modern media culture has ceased to be an isolated sphere, and today it is one of the most sensitive indicators, actively responding to various kinds of social, political, economic and cultural transformations (Gálik, Gáliková Tolnaiová, 2022; Gáliková Tolnaiová, Gálik, 2020; Gáliková Tolnaiová, Gálik, 2022; Kashkina, 2012). These transformations

---

[*] Corresponding author
E-mail addresses: ivchelysheva@yandex.ru (I. Chelysheva)

invariably influenced the images of the family and ideas about family relationships in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods.

Family images and family interaction patterns presented on the Russian film screen in different years have undergone significant transformations according to ideological, social, and worldview public ideas. In this article we will make an attempt to present the main developing stages of family education in Russian feature films (1920–2020) in the sociocultural context.

2. Materials and methods

The main material for our research is pedagogical, cultural, sociological, and psychological approaches to the study of the sociocultural context of the theme of family and family education in presented in Russian feature films (1920–2022) in terms of goals, objectives, key concepts and models of media education.

The following methods were used during the study: theoretical analysis and synthesis; generalization and classification, content analysis, abstraction and specification, and generalization.

3. Discussion

Family issues and family education are of constant relevance in Russian and foreign research.

As for some foreign scholars, who analysed Soviet and Russian audiovisual media texts about families, they fail to trace the evolution and transformation of the family image and family education in cinema (Albada, 2000; Bitney, 2022; Cheung et al., 2022; Jacoby, 2011). Although, some studies presented by foreign scientists look into the following aspects of family images presented in mass media: the family image in comedies (Douglas, Olson, 1995); youth images in cinema and television (Potter, 2022); fatherhood and masculinity in post-war Hollywood films (Bruzzi, 2005); parenting culture, adolescence, and family film in the United States (Antunes, 2017); the screen image of adulthood based on the family life cycle (Fulmer, 2017); portrayals of couples and families in Disney animated films (Tanner et al., 2003); depictions of intergenerational families in Disney animated films (Zurcher et al., 2018); analysis of the diaspora family in contemporary European cinema (Lloyd, 2014); family images in post-war British amateur films (Kerry, 2016). R. Shand also explored the structure of the post-war British family in amateur films (Shand, 2015). B. Kümmerling-Meibauer examined new perspectives for children's film studies (Kümmerling-Meibauer, 2013). E. Levy studied thoroughly the representation of family in modern mainstream American cinema and the American dream of family in cinema (Levy, 1991).

Various aspects of the sociocultural context and the periodization of the main developing stages of family and family education are presented in Russian scientific literature (Ekhayeva, 2021; Grankin, 2003; Naumov, 2004; Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016).

For instance, historical and methodological approaches to the educational potential of the family are analysed in the study carried out by A.I. Sannikova and V.V. Korobkova (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016). The authors, describing the characteristics of the Soviet period, where the main priorities were public interests, adherence to the ideas of collectivism, and communist morality, note a close relationship between the subject-object orientation in the guiding role of the school and identify several major methodological approaches to the pedagogical guidance of family education:

– the cognitive-informative approach was dominant and promoted the ideas of family education in the spirit of state policy and its priorities and was to "equip parents with a system of psychological and pedagogical knowledge in order to apply them in their life practice" (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016: 58);

– a system-integrated approach assumed the development of an interaction system between education and family upbringing with the active inclusion of "parents in joint socio-cultural activities. At the same time, the school is more focused on solving educational problems regarding the child, rather than on pedagogical support for the family. The family is considered as an object, as a static component included in the educational system of the school, or as an educational space created and controlled by the school" (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016: 58);

– from the point of view of the socio-oriented approach, education in the family, as well as in school, is considered in inextricable connection with the sociocultural space and the influence of the environment that shapes the personality. At the same time, "the multi-subjectivity of the educational space, the synergistic nature of the interaction between family and society, which

determines the dynamism of the educational potential of the family," are recognized (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016: 59).

Numerous studies carried out in different years of the Soviet period, both pedagogical and psychological concepts, dedicated to the interaction between family and school in the Soviet period were widely reflected in educational work with parents, published in brochures for the parent society, and discussed at parent training sessions where families were provided with assistance in matters of family education.

In the Soviet educational system, the inextricable connection between family and school education was considered as an crucial factor in raising a harmoniously developed child's personality, and it was "during this period that a scientific substantive basis was laid for the development of the cognitive component of the pedagogical competence of parents, revealing various issues of supporting the child in the family and the substantive foundations of opportunities modelling an open educational space focused on the development of the educational potential of the family" (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016: 59).

In the post-Soviet period, which was characterized by fundamental changes in ideology, politics, economics and sociocultural sphere, the relations between school and family underwent significant transformations. They were associated, first of all, with the changes in the educational policy, the need to identify the value priorities of modern society which consisted in supporting the institution of the family and preserving the best family traditions. At the present stage, "developing the educational potential of the family is considered in modern research in the context of recognizing the partnership between the family and educational institutions, the subjectivity of the family, its ability to self-actualize and develop its internal resources" (Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016: 59).

A retrospective analysis of the relationship between family and education is considered by R.M. Ekhayeva who highlights the Soviet and post-Soviet stages of this theme and notes that "the Soviet period is characterized by increased attention to the family and its role in raising children. Preschool institutions and schools paid a lot of attention to parents: the conditions created in the family for children were monitored, the fulfilment of parents' responsibilities for raising children was checked (feedback in the school student's record book), parents were required to attend lectures on raising children. The ideological line of the CPSU was obvious, and the school interacted with parents as a representative of the party and the people. Russia's transition to new economic and social relations influenced the relationship between family and school: there was a transition from control and consulting relationships to relationships of interaction and cooperation. However, in many ways, the interaction in the triad "teacher – student – parent" remains formal, and the pedagogical community is looking for methods, forms and means of transition from the formal level to the practical one" (Ekhayeva, 2021: 316).

It is worth mentioning, that "a family is influenced by the economic, social, and political spheres where society, represented by the state, legally regulates the relations within the family. Representing the centre for keeping traditions, moral and religious values, a family, as a unit of society, is responsible for the socialization and inculturation of the individual" (Topchiev, Kholova, 2020). Numerous factors influencing the transformation of the family institution provoke the continued interest in this topic in a wide field of social sciences and humanities. Various images of family and family education are reflected in fiction, music, painting, and cinema.

An interdisciplinary approach to the theme of family and family education in Russian feature films (1920–2020) predetermined our interest in the context of periodization and identifying the main developing stages based on scientific research in pedagogy (including media education), psychology, cultural studies, and sociology.

4. Results

The transformation of the family image reflected in feature films of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods was researched by many Russian scholars (Chelysheva, 2016, 2022; Fedorov, Chelysheva, 2002; Kosinova, Solgi, 2022; Shestakova, 2006; Razlogov, 2019; Zhabsky, Tarasov, 2019). As evidenced by the content analysis of feature films of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, the following factors can be identified among the main reasons for transformation processes: ideological and sociocultural changes that in one way or another left their mark on the representation of family images in Russian feature films. State family policy was also formed in close connection with ideology at different stages of social development.

Over the course of the historical development of society, ideas about family roles and models of family interaction have changed, the dominant attitudes of the younger generation to the family have shifted, which have been reflected in feature films of different years. Accordingly, both value priorities and axiological ideas about screen characters in films changed. In this regard, we can agree with the opinion of M.I. Kosinova and T. Solgi that "the screen hero accumulates the values of the era, through which he becomes a kind of sign of the times. It is the quintessence of public attitudes, desires, fears, as well as traumatic events on a national scale. An era gives rise to a screen hero, and he, in turn, becomes its axiological manifestation and document of time" (Kosinova, Solgi, 2022: 221).

The increasingly close relationship between the sphere of culture and social transformations in modern society has had a significant impact on media culture, including feature films, and influenced the approaches to media education as an interdisciplinary phenomenon. According to K.E. Razlogov, "new phenomena in pedagogical practice and media education in general predetermined the integration of cultural studies and media theory, philosophy and sociology of culture, as well as pedagogy, political science (in particular cultural policy and political economy), ethnology, social and cultural anthropology, art history (especially film studies) and religious studies" (Razlogov, 2019: 145).

At the present stage, it has become obvious that all areas of social development should be aimed at strengthening the traditions that are laid down in the family and are reflected in the family education of the younger generation. Therefore, reliance on pedagogical approaches related to the theories of family education (Grankin, 2003; Noskova, 2021; Novikova, Pristupa, 2021; Selezneva, 2022) is essential. As evidenced by the analysis of the scientific sources, the most comprehensive systematic analysis of the major developing stages of pedagogical approaches to family education, based on key theoretical concepts of Russian pedagogical thought, is presented in the dissertation research carried out by A.Y. Grankin (Grankin, 2003). The author has identified several main developing stages of pedagogical thought in family education in Russia during the Soviet period.

The first stage of the Soviet period (1917–1931) is considered as a period of active development of basic approaches to family education. It was during these years that the foundation was laid for ideas about the leading social role of education and family issues, where "raising children in the family was a purposeful activity of parents to shape the personality of the child – a future member of a socialist society, ready for work, conscious life" (Grankin, 2003: 12). Collective education became a priority ensuring the full development of the child, including moral ideals, work skills, consciousness, independence, and determination.

The next stage (1931–1945) fell on the years of emerging Soviet theoretical approaches to family education. This stage was based on the concepts of collective education, taking into account the age characteristics of children, promoting moral principles in the family, the systematic and purposeful nature of education. The key positions of family education at this stage were "disclosure of the ideal and goal of family education (comprehensive personal development achieved due to combined means of mental, aesthetic, moral, labour education and polytechnic training)" (Grankin, 2003: 13).

The third stage in developing family education concepts of the Soviet period (1946–1964) was determined by anthropological-humanistic pedagogy where family education assumes a leading role in forming a full-fledged personality, ready to live in society in accordance with the generally accepted moral and social norms. The anthropological-humanistic theory of family education (1965–1991) is characterized by a turn towards the harmoniously developed personality of the child, the humanization of the entire education aimed at developing interests and capabilities of the younger generation, when the main principle of relationships in the family is "education in the spirit of universal human values, respect for the child's personality, their freedom, fostering high ideals of goodness, love, duty, conscience, mutual assistance, and cooperation; humane relations based on the spiritual community of parents and children" (Grankin, 2003: 14). Therefore, the main objectives of the post-Soviet pedagogical views on family education included: "preserving the spiritual and moral traditions of family education; activation of family life as a means of improving its educational function; participation of every citizen in education of children in unity and relationship with the family, etc." (Grankin, 2003: 39). Thus, these tasks have not lost their relevance at the present time either. The main priorities of preserving and strengthening the family

and the best traditions of family education, respect for the value of family still remain vital in the modern socio-cultural situation.

As the analysis showed, psychological approaches to family and family relationships were also ambiguous at different stages of the development of our country. A historical and psychological analysis of these stages is presented in the study by A.V. Litvinova (Litvinova, 2020). For example, the period of the first years of Soviet power (1917–1936) is defined as the stage of a new psychological approach to the family model, where "changes in the psychological structure of the Soviet family determined the views of the founders of communist ideology" (Litvinova, 2020: 17). New ideological priorities had a significant impact on the psychology of family relationships which were practically levelled out in favour of the priorities of social consciousness.

The next stage of family psychology (1936–1985) was negatively influenced by the years of mass repression when "independent people, capable of free choice and responsibility" passed away (Litvinova, 2020: 17). Consequently, this could not but have psychological consequences. In addition, during this period, ideas about femininity were practically eliminated and replaced by ideas about complete equality of the sexes to fulfil the tasks of industrialization, the production sector, and work in agriculture.

In the years of post-war devastation, the focus on labour productivity and the need to solve the problems of rebuilding the country led to a weakening of intergenerational ties, "there is a massive emergence of structurally destroyed families, orphans, which deepens the developmental disorders of male and female characters, which are the result of centuries-old evolution and historical interaction. Direct emotional contact in interactions with children is disrupted. Primary attachments and the resulting identification with parents are destroyed, as well as socialization in a family based on the parents' example" (Litvinova, 2020: 19).

Later, during the years of developed socialism, the psychological accents of family interaction patterns changed: "the relationships of spouses, children and parents are transferred from economic to moral, psychological and aesthetic. In this situation, an aggravation of the contradiction between the desired and the actual is manifested. It was proclaimed as desirable in the country that the spiritual world of Soviet people at this stage was characterized by comradeship, paternal and maternal concerns, and maintaining contact with the life of the entire Soviet people. The reality was the deformation of family values, the "fall" of the role of the father (the Soviet Union was considered a country of "lost men"), an increase in divorces, single-parent families, which aggravate the problems of raising children" (Litvinova, 2020: 22).

The post-Soviet period is characterized by A.V. Litvinova as a stage of a radical revision of attitudes towards the family, the revival of family based on a value-based attitude towards the family as the foundation of mutual support. Thus, "there are hopes for the return of property rights to the family and its acquisition of sovereignty in the sources of existence, the social resuscitation of the historically developed symbolic habitat and way of life destroyed during the Soviet period, public recognition of the priority of the family in the upbringing and socio-cultural adaptation of younger generations" (Litvinova, 2020: 24).

When identifying the sociocultural context of family issues and highlighting the key stages of the family image in Russian cinema from the point of view of media education, we should take into account the sociocultural determination of feature film production in Russia. In I.V. Shestakova's dissertation research, the main stages of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods (in our study we limit ourselves to 1920–2020) are presented as follows.

In the 1920s, accompanied by the NEP market model of film production in Russia, "a union spontaneously formed between market production and state control. Within the framework of the market model of the film process, an economic and political compromise was observed: the government yielded to commercial priorities in politics and ideology" (Shestakova, 2006: 13).

In the 1930s – 1950s, the leading one was the "authoritarian-bureaucratic model of the film process," when all films were created within the strict framework of the ruling ideology, and the "film distribution itself, which monopolized film services to the population and worked as a well-oiled mechanism, ensured an inextricable, automatic connection between the production of domestic films and their film exhibition, during which the sociocultural significance of the created films was revealed" (Shestakova, 2006: 14).

The next stage in the development of film production (1950–1960) was associated with the period of the political "thaw", when "the aesthetic, moral-psychological and educational-cognitive functions of cinema began to dominate" (Shestakova, 2006: 16).

The period of the 1970s – 1980s is considered by the author in the context of the "stagnation" era, when "the burden of ideological dictate, requiring the creation of the so-called "correct" films, formed very specific mechanisms of film production. By influencing the viewer through the direct demonstration of certain patterns of the characters' behaviour in the films, cinema performed an ideological function" (Shestakova, 2006: 18).

The period of the 1980s – 1990s (the stage of political, ideological "perestroika" and the active building of a market economy) is characterized by I.V. Shestakova as follows: "as the totalitarian one-party system of political power in the country collapsed, those tasks, for which Soviet cinematography was created, ceased to operate. On the other hand, the factor that had the strongest destructive influence on the development of the film industry disappeared. In these conditions, great opportunities opened up for the directors of the cinematography to improve its management system" (Shestakova, 2006: 20).

Representing the post-perestroika years (corresponding to the current developing stage of film production), the author puts forward the main priorities for Russian cinema which are still relevant today and set the task of strengthening "in Russian cinema the traditions of domestic cinema, preserving Russian film as a phenomenon of national culture" (Shestakova, 2006: 25).

Generalization and systematization of the studied research in sociocultural dynamics, the analysis of Russian feature films focused on family and family education (1920-2022), as well as an appeal to the main approaches in the context of media education in the USSR and in Russia based on leading Russian research findings (Chelysheva, 2013; Chelysheva, 2016; Chelysheva, 2023; Chelysheva, Mikhaleva, 2016, 2024; Fedorov et al., 2014; Fedorov, 2015; Mezentsev, 2021; Mikhaleva, Lozovitskaya, 2024; Ogorodnikova, 2015; Pshenitsyna, 2023; Rabzhaeva, 2004; Razlogov, 2019; Zhabsky, Tarasov, 2019) allowed us to identify the key transformation stages of family and family education in Russian feature films from the point of view of the main conceptual approaches, goals, and objectives of media education.

1. The emergence of ideas about the new family in Soviet cinema (1920–1934). This period was characterized by a new look at the family presented on the screen. In accordance with the Marxist theoretical approach to media education, the tasks of propaganda, agitation, revolutionary struggle and a new type of family aimed at building a socialist society, came to the fore. The rejection of the old, patriarchal family foundations in favour of public education with the leading role of the state presents new family images and principles of family education, where there was no room for compromise in favour of the old views. Family well-being and a happy childhood were considered in feature films of this period in inextricable connection with, first of all, public interests, collectivism and revolutionary ideology.

In media education of this period, a key role belonged to the educational and developmental role of cinema, which became a mouthpiece and conductor of new ideals, including family values.

2. Strengthening the status of the Soviet family and moral ideas in family education during the years of "Stalinist" transformations" (1935–1954). At that stage, Russian feature films contributed to strengthening the Soviet family institution and building an ideal image of family relationships, where both adults and children were included in social and production activities. In accordance with these tasks, family images were presented. From a very early age, children were brought up in a team building spirit: they became participants in social and industrial activities, technical creativity, demonstrated independence and determination. Also, the educational and ideological tasks of media education related to developing the younger generation's correct ideas about family behaviour patterns, where parents are actively and consciously involved in labour activities and carrying out public assignments, came to the fore.

The educational and developmental role of cinema was seen at that stage in promoting clear goals for the audience related to the Soviet family which was supposed to become a role model for the mass audience. The theme of a happy childhood, actively promoted in Soviet society, was also reflected in feature films about family.

Strengthening ideological control over all spheres of Soviet life had an important impact on the image of family education presented in films. Accordingly, in media education, film studies, which took place in clubs and electives, and film lectures were subject to strict regulation and control. Along with Marxist approaches to media education, a key role was increasingly played by the practical approach associated with amateur filmmaking. Moreover, little attention was paid to the artistic and aesthetic components of amateur films during that period, and the main emphasis in media education was on studying the technical capabilities of cinema.

3. The image of family and family education during the revival of Russian media education on the Soviet screen (1955–1968). In that period, the issues of liberalization and democratization, addressing the individual, their artistic moral development, and the inner world came to the fore. The stage was represented by a significant number of films focused on family education. Unlike the previous periods of development, the mass audience met with different types of families in cinema which were not always ideal and worthy of emulation. However, one of the central themes of feature films – the theme of a happy childhood – continued to dominate on the Russian screen and was reflected in the vast majority of family-themed films.

Along with the leading concepts of media education (Marxist and practical), at that stage, the aesthetic theory began to develop in media education and predetermined the central goal of film education in those years. Gradually, the artistic and aesthetic development of personality based on the material of feature films became major in media education.

This theoretical approach gave impetus to various forms of film education. Thus, during that period, film electives, school and student film clubs began to actively open, film circles appeared. Discussion of feature films, including those on the topic of family life, became the best practice of film education in those years.

Although the dominant role of upbringing and education was assigned to school, at that stage there was a rapprochement and cooperation between the teaching and parent communities. The trend made it possible to involve families of children and adolescents in media education. For example, film clubs for parents appeared where films focused on family education were discussed and the most pressing challenges of parent-child relationships were debated.

4. Family and family education in the cinema of the "stagnation" era (the 1970s–1980s).

That stage was characterized by the active interest of the mass audience in feature films, and was quite complex and contradictory. That was due, on the one hand, to powerful state support for the release of feature films, and on the other hand, to the approaching crisis in society, which could not but have an impact on all spheres of the country's cultural life including Soviet cinema. In addition, at that stage there was a strengthening of state control over the content of feature films which should have been fully consistent with public ideology.

The ideological and artistic component of feature films about family education came to the fore, which, as in previous periods, positioned the theme of a happy childhood for Soviet children. Life in a complete and friendly family where each person had strong prospects and confidence in the future – the ideal image that became one of the important guidelines for the wide screening of the film in cinemas across the country.

The educational role of films about families was seen in raising young builders of communism – principled towards enemies, brave, decisive, and hardworking. At the same time, the increased attention of the state to strengthening the institution of family served as an important factor in the increase in the number of Russian films on this topic. Their educational significance lay in promoting the model of a strong family, caring for children and their comprehensive development, and fostering communist morality and morality.

During the period, various forms of media education based on cinema continued to intensively develop: film clubs, school electives, a network of lecture halls at cinemas. The family theme, based on feature films, began to be actively discussed at parent meetings and at teachers' meetings aimed at educating schoolchildren's parents. By the beginning of the 1980s, when the elective "Ethics and Psychology of Family Life" was introduced in schools, films about families became the subject of discussion in the classroom.

5. The image of family and family education in films of the "perestroika" era (1985–2000). This period was associated with serious financial difficulties that affected all spheres of our society, including Russian film production. The rejection of the ideological principles of socialism and the country's transition to a "market economy", the fall of the "Iron Curtain", the growing crime rate, the levelling of moral ideas and traditions, the increasingly strong influence of Western mass culture – all these processes became the trigger for the search for new guidelines and values in post-Soviet society.

At the stage of serious social, economic, and political transformations, the topic of family and family education became one of the most pressing on the Russian screen. The family that found itself in a difficult situation of changes in all spheres of life – financial difficulties, stratification of society along financial lines, violence and cruelty in the family – these and other hardships were raised in feature films of that difficult time. The loss of the previous educational functions which

were dominant in films of the Soviet period led the audience to the need to make independent decisions and choose life priorities.

Media education was also going through a difficult time during that period. Many film electives, media clubs, and study groups ceased to exist in schools and additional education organisations due to financial instability. However, thanks to the efforts of enthusiasts who, despite the difficulties, continued to carry out film education of the younger generation, the best forms and methods of working with film continued to be implemented.

6. The image of a modern family and the challenges of family education on the Russian film screen (2000–2020). Family issues are becoming one of the central ones in Russian feature films at the present stage. This is due to the increased attention of the state and the entire society as a whole to strengthening family foundations and preserving traditional moral values, including family well-being and stability.

The topic of family well-being and the importance of family education and care for children has become vital in media education. It is the subject of discussion in film and media clubs, media schools, and is debated at round tables and seminars. In a modern school, feature films about the family and their discussion are integrated into some academic subjects of the humanities.

In addition, today in our country there are many interesting media education projects based on feature films related to family issues: films focused on family issues are actively discussed in work with parents, at meetings of parenting schools, and in courses for young families. Films about families are presented in many thematic online communities, forums, blogs, information platforms dedicated to family education. Teachers, psychologists, representatives of school administrations and educational authorities take an active part in these events.

5. Conclusion

The transformation of family images in feature films of the Soviet and post-Soviet periods is closely related to social, economic, political, sociocultural processes occurring in society. Among the main reasons for transformation processes are the following: ideas about family roles and models of family interaction have changed over the course of the historical development of society; the main accents and attitudes of the younger generation concerning the family, its well-being and the way of the family as a whole have shifted; one cannot ignore the ideological and sociocultural changes that left their mark in one way or another on the representation of images of family and family education presented in Russian feature films.

As evidenced by the analysis, the control functions in relation to the family in terms of the parent community's fulfilling the responsibilities in education, characteristic of the Soviet system, today are replaced by the priority objectives of supporting and strengthening the family, respect for family traditions and strengthening intergenerational ties.

The role and importance of family and family education, as well as the reflection of these issues in Russian cinema, is becoming increasingly vital in modern society and has significant potential for school and university media education. It is especially essential to study this theme in media education of future educators, psychologists, and teachers who will soon have to educate the younger generation and organize work with the parent community.

6. Acknowledgements

References

Albada, 2000 – Albada, K.F. (2000). The public and private dialogue about the American family on television. *Journal of Communication*. 50(4): 79-110. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02864.x

Antunes, 2017 – Antunes, F. (2017). Attachment anxiety: parenting culture, adolescence and the family film in the US. *Journal of Children and Media*. 11(2): 214-228. DOI: 10.1080/17482798.2016.1269354

Bitney, 2022 – Bitney, J. (2022). Rethinking the family melodrama: Thomas Elsaesser, Mildred Pierce and the business of family. *Screen*. 63(3): 327-345. DOI: 10.1093/screen/hjac026

Bruzzi, 2005 – *Bruzzi, S.* (2005). Bringing up daddy: fatherhood and masculinity in post-war Hollywood. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Chelysheva, 2013 – *Chelysheva, I.V.* (2013). Teoriya i istoriya rossiyskogo mediaobrazovaniya [Theory and history of Russian media education]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Chelysheva, 2016 – *Chelysheva, I.V.* (2016). Razvitiye rossiyskogo mediaobrazovaniya vo vtoroy polovine XX – nachale XXI veka: teoriya, metodika, praktika [Development of Russian media education in the second half of the 20th – early 21st centuries: theory, methodology, practice]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Chelysheva, 2022 – *Chelysheva, I.V.* (2022). Schoolchildren's family values formation in Russian national cinematograph works: media education aspect. *Media Education.* 3: 342-348. DOI: 10.13187/me.2022.3.342.

Chelysheva, 2023 – *Chelysheva, I.V.* (2023). Prosvetitel'skaya rabota s roditel'skim soobshchestvom kak faktor razvitiya massovogo mediaobrazovaniya. Mediasfera i mediaobrazovaniye: spetsifika vzaimodeystviya v sovremennom sotsiokul'turnom prostranstve: Sbornik nauchnykh statey X Mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-metodicheskoy konferentsii [Educational work with the parent community as a factor in the development of mass media education. Media sphere and media education: specifics of interaction in the modern sociocultural space: Collection of scientific articles of the 10th International Scientific and Methodological Conference]. Mogilev. [in Russian]

Chelysheva, Mikhaleva, 2016 – *Chelysheva, I.V., Mikhaleva, G.V.* (2024). Sravnitel'nyy analiz istorii, teorii i praktiki rossiyskogo i britanskogo mediaobrazovaniya [Comparative analysis of the history, theory and practice of Russian and British media education]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Chelysheva, Mikhaleva, 2024 – *Chelysheva, I.V., Mikhaleva, G.V.* (2024). Portrayals of families and family upbringing in Russian films: prospects for film and media education. *Media Education.* 20(1): 25-31. DOI: 10.13187/me.2024.1.25

Cheung et al., 2022 – *Cheung, M., Leung, C.A., Huang, Y.J.* (2022). Absentee parents in Disney feature-length animated movies: What are children watching? *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal.* 39(3): 323-336. DOI: 10.1007/s10560-021-00799-0

Douglas, Olson, 1995 – *Douglas, W., Olson, B.M.* (1995). Beyond family structure: the family in domestic comedy. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media.* 39(2): 236-261. DOI: 10.1080/08838159509364301

Ekhayeva, 2021 – *Ekhayeva, R.M.* (2021). Istoriya vzaimootnosheniy sem'i i shkoly v Rossii [History of the relationship between family and school in Russia]. *Problemy sovremennogo pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya.* 72(1): 313-316. [in Russian]

Fedorov et al., 2014 – *Fedorov, A.V., Chelysheva, I.V., Muryukina, E.V., Gorbatkova, O.I., Kovaleva, M.E., Knyazev, A.A.* (2014). Massovoye mediaobrazovaniye v SSSR i Rossii: osnovnyye etapy [Mass media education in the USSR and Russia: main stages]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Fedorov, 2015 – *Fedorov, A.V.* (2015). Mediaobrazovaniye: istoriya i teoriya [Media education: history and theory]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Fedorov, Chelysheva, 2002 – *Fedorov, A.V., Chelysheva, I.V.* (2002). Mediaobrazovaniye v Rossii: kratkaya istoriya razvitiya [Media education in Russia: a brief history of development]. Taganrog. [in Russian]

Fulmer, 2017 – *Fulmer, R.H.* (2017). Rebel without a cause: a psychoanalytic and family-life-cycle view of emerging adulthood in the film. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly.* 86(3): 665-691. DOI: 10.1002/psaq.12162

Gálik, Gáliková Tolnaiová, 2022 – *Gálik, S., Gáliková Tolnaiová, S.* (2022). Media coverage and its determinants in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Communication Today.* 13(1): 46-58.

Gáliková Tolnaiová, Gálik, 2020 – *Gáliková Tolnaiová, S.,* Gálik, S. (2020). Cyberspace as a new living world and its axiological contexts. In: Abu-Taieh, E., Mouatasim, A., Al Hadid, I.H. (eds). *Cyberspace.* London: 39-52.

Gáliková Tolnaiová, Gálik, 2022 – *Gáliková Tolnaiová, S.,* Gálik, S. (2022). Epistemic and ethical risks of media reporting in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, as challenges for the development of journalistic practice. *Media Literacy and Academic Research.* 5(1): 76-94.

Grankin, 2003 – *Grankin, A.Y.* (2003). Razvitiye teorii semeynogo vospitaniya v Rossii (1917-1991) [Development of the theory of family education in Russia (1917-1991)]. Ph.D. Dis. Pyatigorsk. [in Russian]

Jacoby, 2011 – *Jacoby, A.* (2011). Why nobody knows – family and society in modern Japan. *Film Criticism*. 35(2/3): 66-83. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/44019320

Kashkina, 2012 – *Kashkina, M.G.* (2012). Mediakul'tura informatsionnogo obshchestva v aspekte filosofskogo diskursa [Media culture of the information society in the aspect of philosophical discourse]. Ph.D. Dis. Krasnodar. [in Russian]

Kerry, 2016 – *Kerry, M.* (2016). Representations of the family in postwar British amateur film: family histories in the Lane and Scrutton collection at the East Anglian Film Archive. *The History of the Family*. 21(2): 231-242. DOI: 10.1080/1081602X.2016.1163274

Kosinova, Solgi, 2022 – *Kosinova, M.I., Solgi, T.* (2022). Komparativistskiy analiz semeynykh tsennostey v iranskom i rossiyskom kinematografe [Comparativist analysis of family values in Iranian and Russian cinema]. *Vestnik universiteta*. 5: 219-226. DOI: 10.26425/1816-4277-2022-5-219-226. [in Russian]

Kümmerling-Meibauer, 2013 – *Kümmerling-Meibauer, B.* (2013). Introduction: new perspectives in children's film studies. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory & Society*. 5(2): 39-44. DOI: 10.3167/jemms.2013.050203

Levy, 1991 – *Levy, E.* (1991). The American dream of family in film: from decline to comeback. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*. 22: 187-204. DOI: 10.3138/jcfs.22.2.187

Litvinova, 2020 – *Litvinova, A.V.* (2020). Psikhologicheskaya struktura rossiyskoy sem'i v raznyye periody istorii strany [Psychological structure of the Russian family in different periods of the country's history]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Lloyd, 2014 – *Lloyd, A.* (2014). Far flung families in film: the diasporic family in contemporary European cinema. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*. 22(2): 207-208. DOI: 10.1080/14782804.2014.923643

Mezentsev, 2021 – *Mezentsev, G.V.* (2021). Mediaobrazovaniye v Rossii i SSHA: analiz istoricheskogo razvitiya [Media education in Russia and the USA: analysis of historical development]. *Medi@lmanakh*. 1: 35-43. DOI: 10.30547/mediaalmanah.1.2021.3543 [in Russian]

Mikhaleva, Lozovitskaya, 2024 – *Mikhaleva, G.V., Lozovitskaya, A.A.* (2024). Issledovaniye politicheskogo i ideologicheskogo kontekstov razvitiya semeynogo vospitaniya v sovetskom khudozhestvennom kinematografe [Research of the political and ideological contexts of family education in Soviet fiction cinematography]. *Bulletin of the international centre of art and education*. 2: 312-320. [in Russian]

Naumov, 2004 – *Naumov, N.D.* (2004). Filosofskiye osnovaniya pedagogicheskikh teoriy v Rossii v XX v. [Philosophical foundations of pedagogical theories in Russia in the 20th century]. Ph.D. Dis. Ekaterinburg. [in Russian]

Noskova, 2021 – *Noskova, M.V.* (2021). Razvitiye pedagogicheskoy mysli o semeynom vospitanii v Rossii: vtoraya polovina XIX - nachalo XX vv. [Development of the pedagogical thought about family education in Russia: the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries]. *Problemy sovremennogo pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya*. 70(4): 261-263. [in Russian]

Novikova, Pristupa, 2021 – *Novikova, M.V., Pristupa, E.N.* (2021). Semeynoye vospitaniye v kontekste istoriograficheskogo podkhoda [Family education in the context of a historiographical approach]. *CITISE*. 4: 108-118. DOI: 10.15350/2409-7616.2021.4.11 [in Russian]

Ogorodnikova, 2015 – *Ogorodnikova, E.* (2015). Istoriya i teoriya mediaobrazovaniya. Mediasfera i mediaobrazovaniye: spetsifika vzaimodeystviya v sovremennom sotsiokul'turnom obshchestve: Sbornik statey ÍÍ Mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-metodicheskoy konferentsii [History and theory of media education. Media sphere and media education: specifics of interaction in modern sociocultural society: Collection of articles of the 2nd International Scientific and Methodological Conference]. Mogilev. [in Russian]

Potter, 2022 – *Potter, A.* (2022). Youth on screen. Representing young people in film and television. *Media Practice and Education*. 23(1): 91-92. DOI: 10.1080/25741136.2022.2048606

Pshenitsyna, 2023 – *Pshenitsyna, N.A.* (2023). Osobennosti vospitaniya zritelya sredstvami mul'tiplikatsionnogo kino [Peculiarities of educating the viewer through the means of animated films]. *Antropologicheskaya didaktika i vospitaniye*. 6(5): 87-95. [in Russian]

Rabzhaeva, 2004 – *Rabzhaeva, M.V.* (2004). Semeynaya politika v Rossii XX v.: istoriko-sotsial'nyy aspekt [Family policy in Russia in the 20th century: historical and social aspect]. *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost'*. 2: 166-176. [in Russian]

Razlogov, 2019 – *Razlogov, K.E.* (2019). Mediaobrazovaniye v sotsiokul'turnom kontekste [Media Education in the Socio-Cultural Context]. *Yaroslavskiy pedagogicheskiy vestnik*. 2(107): 144-152. DOI: 10.24411/1813-145X-2019-10363 [in Russian]

Sannikova, Korobkova, 2016 – *Sannikova, A.I., Korobkova, V.V.* (2016). Evolyutsiya idei razvitiya vospitatel'nogo potentsiala sem'i v otkrytom obrazovatel'nom prostranstve Rossii kontsa XIX - nachala XXI v.: istoriko-metodologicheskiy aspekt [The evolution of the idea of developing the educational potential of the family in the open educational space of Russia at the end of the 19th – beginning of the 21st centuries: historical and methodological aspect]. *Obshchestvo: sotsiologiya, psikhologiya, pedagogika*. 1: 56-61. [in Russian]

Selezneva, 2022 – *Selezneva, E.A.* (2022). Analiz predstavleniy doshkol'nikov o sem'ye i semeynykh tsennostyakh [Analysis of preschoolers' ideas about family and family values]. *Antropologicheskaya didaktika i vospitaniye*. 5(3): 163-174. [in Russian]

Shand, 2015 – *Shand, R.* (2015). The "family film" as amateur production genre: Frank Marshall's comic narratives. *The Moving Image*. 15(2): 1-27. DOI: 10.5749/movingimage.15.2.0001

Shestakova, 2006 – *Shestakova, I.V.* (2006). Sotsiokul'turnaya determinatsiya funktsionirovaniya kinematografa v Rossii i na Altaye [Sociocultural determination of the functioning of cinema in Russia and Altai]. Ph.D. Dis. Kemerovo. [in Russian]

Tanner et al., 2003 – *Tanner, L.R., Haddock, S.A., Zimmerman, T.S., Lund, L.K.* (2003). Images of couples and families in Disney feature-length animated films. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*. 31(5): 355-373. DOI: 10.1080/01926180390223987

Topchiev, Kholova, 2020 – *Topchiev, M.S., Kholova, L.A.* (2020). Spetsifika transformatsii instituta sem'i na postsovetskom prostranstve [Specifics of transformation of the family institution in the post-Soviet space]. *Kaspiyskiy region: politika, ekonomika, kul'tura*. 1(62): 148-154. [in Russian]

Zhabsky, Tarasov, 2019 – *Zhabsky, M.I., Tarasov, K.A.* (2019). Rossiyskaya sotsiologiya kino v kontekste razvitiya obshchestva [Russian sociology of cinema in the context of the development of society]. *Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya*. 11: 73-81. [in Russian]

Zurcher et al., 2018 – *Zurcher, J.D., Webb, S.M., Robinson, T.* (2018). The portrayal of families across generations in Disney animated films. Social Sciences. 7: 47. DOI: 10.3390/socsci7030047