



Media Culture

Directions, goals, tasks, author's concepts of audiovisual media interpretations of the topic of the school and university in the Russian cinema (1992-2017) *

Prof. Dr. Alexander Fedorov,
Rostov State University of Economics,
B. Sadovaya, 69, Rostov on Don, 347902, Russia
1954alex@mail.ru

Dr. Anastasia Levitskaya,
Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics,
Petrovskaya, 45, Taganrog, 237900, Russia
tina5@rambler.ru

Dr. Olga Gorbatkova
Rostov State University of Economics,
B. Sadovaya, 69, Rostov on Don, 347902, Russia
gorbatkova.olga@yandex.ru

PhD Candidate Elena Huston
The University of Southern Queensland, Australia
West Street, Toowoomba, QLD 4350, Australia
w0066369@uqmail.usq.edu.au

Abstract. Analysis of Russian films in 1992-2017 on the school-university topics shows that:

- the educational / educational process left in the past the Soviet framework of communist orientations and anti-religious orientation;
- the number of entertaining interpretations has sharply increased;
- the stories are not directly related to key international political events, although they are to some extent dependent on domestic political attitudes;
- the main conflicts are built on the confrontation of extraordinary teachers and students with stagnation, bureaucracy, the grayness of the bosses / colleagues / team; very often the focus is on problem zones (crisis, disappointment and fatigue, professional "burnout" of teachers, bureaucracy, corruption, pragmatic cynicism of students, teenage cruelty, etc.);
- Among the characters distinctly manifested materialistic differentiation;
- the pupil characters are mainly divided into the following categories: optimistic and vital perspectives (often associated with material status and hedonism), or in a state of depression and hopelessness;
- activity of students is more directed towards entertainment, sex and material gain;
- the attitude of teachers and students has lost the barriers of subordination, largely because the prestige of the pedagogical profession in the eyes of students and the public continued to fall;
- in the pedagogical collectives, the images of female teachers, often lonely and unsettled, still come to the fore;
- the appearance of students and teachers has become even more "free", vividly denoting female sex appeal;
- film stories about students, in contrast to a number of Soviet counterparts, are virtually devoid of intellectual disputes, but are densely immersed in the genre element of melodrama and / or comedy; and in general, the theme of love in the cinema on the school-university theme is for the most part given accented comedic and / or melodramatic.

Keywords: audiovisual text, film, Russia, school, students, pupils, teacher, cinematography, cinema.

* This research was funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF, project No. 17-18-01001) at the Rostov State University of Economics. Project theme: "School and university in the mirror of Soviet, Russian and Western audiovisual media texts". Head of the project is professor A.V. Fedorov.

Introduction

In this article we address the goals, objectives, author's concepts of audiovisual media interpretations of the theme of school and university in Russian cinema (1992-2017). Here, as in our previous work [Fedorov, Levitskaya, Gorbatkova, 2017], we, relying on technologies developed by Bazalgette [1995], A. Silverblatt [Silverblatt, 2001, pp. 80-81], W.J. Potter [Potter, 2001] and U. Eco [Eco, 1998; 2005], on the theoretical approaches of O.V. Aronson [Aronson, 2003] and N.A. Khrenov [Khrenov, 2006; 2008], we make a generalized hermeneutic analysis of media texts of Soviet feature films of this era on the theme of school and university, taking into account such key concepts of media education as *media agencies*, *media / media text categories*, *media technologies*, *media languages*, *media representations* and *media audiences*.

Materials and methods

The materials of our research were audiovisual media texts on the school and university topic. The main method is the comparative hermeneutic analysis of the films, concerning this subject (including the analysis of stereotypes, ideological analysis, identification analysis, iconographic analysis, plot analysis, and character analysis). We also analyze books and articles devoted to school and university in films.

Discussion

We agree that "only the most inconsiderate, uninviting and conservative Russian viewer can now state that in our country there is no children's and teenage cinema. A revolution has been taking place on this front for a long time, both bold debutants and venerable pros work here, large budgets are purposefully allocated for this purpose, and the popularity of any finished products among its audience acquires" [Ukhov, 2017]. It's another matter, what is the quality of this film / television product on the school and university topic, and what are the trends in it.

Deprived of the ideological and moral guidelines of the socialist era, Russian films on the school and university theme, taken after the collapse of the USSR, underwent a number of quantitative and genre transformations:

- after the dramatic rise in the number of such tapes during the perestroika period in the Russian "low-picture era" of the 1990s, there was an equally sharp decline, provoked by the almost total displacement of domestic products from cinemas by Western films and the difficult economic situation in the country that caused a reduction in film production in general;

- in the 21st century, along with the revival of the Russian film production, a kind of reformatting of the tapes about the school and university from the cinematic to the television show happened: modern multiplexes began to focus on spectacular action movies and full-length animated pictures (shot mostly in 3D), so the producers preferred to switch stories about schoolchildren, students and teachers on the television audience;

- the dominant of the dramatic genre, customary for the cinema of the Soviet school and university, replaced the realm of comedy in the 21st century (mostly "long-running" series).

There have also been changes in the casting: if in the Soviet times the roles of schoolchildren was basically performed by the schoolchildren themselves (*Welcome, or No entry*, *By the windows go trains*, *Call, open the door*, *Transitional age*, *The woodpecker's head doesn't hurt*, *Scarecrow*, etc.), then in the Russian TV series of the XXI century almost became the norm, when professional actors from twenty to thirty years play the roles of schoolchildren. Apparently, producers and directors believe that 1) many months (and many serials are shot for several years) shooting with a tough, exhausting work schedule is too much for real schoolchildren; 2) in connection with the rather slippery plot situations of a sexual and lexical nature, laid down in the script of modern films about the school, try to hedge, in order to avoid accusations of "corrupting" the under-age performers on the set.

Comedy

Of the seven Russian films about the school and university, filmed in the 1990s, three relate to the comedy genre. And the short films of S. Bagirov *Equality* (1993) and *Rypkin's Love* (1993), rather, resembled the good old *Patchwork*, however, with grotesquely negative images of teachers (especially vulgar and insignificant in *Rypkin's Love*). But the series *ABCD Ltd* (1992-1994) already affected the

capitalist tendencies, which replaced the "developed socialism". Perhaps it was a kind of reaction to gloomy perestroika films, where boarding school life often resembled a prison ... It should also be noted that the post-Soviet issues of *Patchwork* also quickly mastered the attributes of the bourgeois world, turning in one of the issues an English teacher into ... a stripper .

The comedy continued to be the main genre of Russian cinema about the school and university theme and in the 21st century: of the 86 films on this subject, 35 were shot in a comedic manner.

It all began with a simple situational comedy *Dormitory* (2001), built according to American standards, which became a sketch for the comedies about student life that followed: *Theater Academy* (2002), *Merry Company* (2003), *Students* (2005), *Touched* (2005), *Students-2* (2006), *Students International* (2006), *Univer* (2008-2011), *Univer: Open Doors*" (2013), *"Univer: New Dormitory* (2011-2016), *Philological Faculty* (2017). By the way, never before the student topics did occupy such a prominent place in the Soviet and Russian cinema / television repertoire. By rejecting the gloomy interpretations of the educational process that prevailed in perestroika years, Russian TV series competed with each other in terms of sexually and funny scenes, mockery of teachers' corruption and general old-age mockery. For example, in the *Touched* (2005) student jokingly at first imitated his "self-immolation", and then with the same enchanting success engaged in fake urination in front of a shocked university professor.

All these student comedy series are built in the spirit of the well-known to everybody phrase "from session to session the students live cheerfully": the university itself is given a minimum of screen time, but in detail and with enthusiasm it is told about student rallies, parties, love adventures and other amusements.

Naturally, among the entertaining students there must be a certain "botanist", that is, contrary to the story, a student immersed in studies, whom his friends (neighbours in the dormitory) are trying to convert into their hedonistic faith. Likewise, images of female students are arranged: among the smart and flirtatious intriguing beauties (one of which is a stereotypically stupid blonde), there often appears the figure of an honest and modest girl ("blue stocking", "gray mouse"). Sometimes (for example, in *Students International*) on the screen appear students-foreigners (from Africa, China, etc.). Teachers in such serials are given a secondary role of retrogrades, bribe-takers / schemers or objects of love of cute female students. Humour in these films, as a rule, unpretentious and flat, and vocabulary every year becomes more coarser and vulgar. The music in these series is often associated with a specific year of release of the series on the screen, since it includes hits of fashionable pop bands during the relevant time period. In order not to contact young and inexperienced debutants, the creators of serials often invite to the role of students actors (especially men) older than thirty years. Artistic bar of this kind of works, as a rule, is lowered already at the level of design, after all it is not about "piece goods" intended for cinemas and / or festivals, but about daily displays of multi-series television production.

Many serials on the topic of school and university are free adaptation or direct versions of foreign television production. For example, one can notice similarity of the concept *Philological Faculty* (2017) with the American *Big Bang Theory*: the authors "copy and bring to maximalist extremes both storylines and characters and the output is extremely exaggerated *Big Bang Theory*. The creators are well aware and similarities ... , therefore already in the pilot series they protect themselves from all attacks by a single phrase from those of *Philology Faculty*: "This all reminds me of the *Big Bang Theory*." However, the recognition of plagiarism is far from a reason to forgive him "[Golubev, 2017]. We completely agree with the fact that "from the same *Univer* of the sample of the first season, *Philological Faculty* if different, then purely cosmetic. Yes, the scenery is no longer three cardboard walls, yes, the picture is richer and, yes, the soundtrack is more fashionable, but in general the circuits of the series are similar – and Lena ... not too far away from Allochka "Pipets" from *Univer*. Guys without a special fantasy, but effectively disintegrated according to archetypes: one is a self-assured "Kazanova" – a failure, the second does not get out of online games and in our reality is oriented with variable success, the third is a typical "main character", that is, neither meat, nor fish" [Khokhlov, 2017]. Against this background, are shown in bold strokes played ironic swearing person (taboo language in *Philological Faculty* , is however, bleeped out) Prof. Gudkov and his ex-wife, who is also a educator in this university.

D. Golubev reasonably concludes that "Russian television in development has been stalled for some time – the viewer is not trying to lure something new and unusual, he is being fed again and again exactly what is being hijacked, and no matter with which grimace these products are absorbed ...

Philological Faculty just serves as a confirmation of this opinion: the TV channel simply rolled out to us a slightly modernized, rejuvenated and changed version of the *Univer* [Golubev, 2017].

Comedy on a student theme, shot for cinemas, were made, of course, a bit more quality television series. So *Freshman* (2002) tells the story of bored student flirting with masturbating at night assistant professor, not wanting to put her top three in the exam...

In any case, all these comedies are unlikely to target intellectual students and an educated adult audience. Rather, their authors want to make them laugh at schoolchildren (from those who have not fully gone online) and the older audience, but with a low threshold of media inquiries...

Comedy (mainly – also television) about the school life was also a lot: a series of anecdotes about the ten-year mischief (*Vovochka*, 2000-2004), unpretentious stories about high school students (*Lessons for Security of Life*, 2000-2005; *Potapov, to the board!*, 2007), diligently imitating not the best Soviet films of the Soviet Children's and Youth Films Studio.

Not any higher in terms of artistic quality, in our opinion, turned out to be built according to the standards of American sitcoms for children *Fun during the break* (2007-2008) – 33 series of 5 minutes. Rating success with the audience was *Ranetki* (2008-2010) – a simple musical comedy about high school students performing in a rock band.

How did these comedies try to make the audience laugh? Here are two typical examples. The series *Lessons for Security of Life* (2000-2005) shows a lesson in biology on "Fertilization". Schoolgirls first perceive this material with embarrassment, but after a conversation with a psychologist they dress in miniskirts, do their make-up and with dashing coquetry brilliantly answer the lesson, this time embarrassing the shy teacher ... In the dramatic comedy *School No. 1* (2007) the problem of mutual relations comes to the fore with high school students from rich and ordinary families, true, with an emphasis on parties, shopping, sex, etc. Senior students, as is customary in most Russian TV series of the XXI century, were played by actors aged 21 to 30 years, which also did not add credibility to the plot.

The film by V. Menshov *The Practical Joke* (1976) was watched in the first year of the rent by 34 million viewers. However, his remake of the same name, made for television in 2008, did not receive a special resonance, perhaps because of the fact that in 1976 Menshov's schoolchildren "answered ethical questions with varying degrees of complexity and timelessness (is it permissible for the sake of general goals to sacrifice the principles? and should the students earn by playing a game at weddings?) and generally decide how to live on. In Kudinenko's in 2008 ... in general, nothing is decided." [Lyashchenko, 2008]. Money, sex, domination in one's peer circle ... In the *The Practical Joke* (2008) "the girls painted in gloss and the hanging out guys do not cause the slightest feeling that they need something more from life" [Derenkovskaya, 2008].

Perhaps the most dashing Russian comedy from school life was the series *Physical Education Teacher* (2014-2017), where D. Nagiyev with a cynical foul played a bandit dismissed by the "underworld boss" named Foma, who tries to enter the confidence of the boss's child in the guise of a physical education teacher with his help to return to the "business".

Of course, *Physical Education Teacher* is "a fairly standard by the form of a through net. ... a large part of it is based on references to Western comedies – to *Freaks and Nuts*, to *Bachelor Party in Vegas*, to *Rock School* and so on" [Sobolev, 2014] and, by and large, is an inverted plot of the legendary comedy *Gentlemen of Fortune* (1971), where, the director of a kindergarten by the will of fate is compelled to pretend to be a bandit...

Foma on the screen is natural bull "straight from the 1990's, communicating exclusively in "thieves' slang" and used to solve problems by breaking doors and breaking skulls. This is witty, funny and accurate already in itself, but Nagiyev goes further and gradually turns a funny caricature into a voluminous portrait of a difficult and certainly charming man. The way Foma is extinguished, faced with the problems of children, with the need to seek a common language with a girl who intellectually looks down on him, and generally with life outside the "big business", is played really brilliantly - in semitones, supposedly random sights, nervous grins" [Khokhlov, 2014].

However, the ardent supporters of this series go even further, arguing that "from something as crude as the material on which *Physical Education Teacher* is based, there has never grown something so native to all, without exception, the inhabitants of one eighth of the land. ... *Physical Education Teacher* is not just a native thing, but also beyond incredible cleverness, subtle, fascinating and sincerely touching the soul. A classic two-sided novel of upbringing, in which those who according to all the usual laws of

the genre had to be re-educated, eventually become re-educated not completely, but remain hostages simultaneously of their own stupidity and hopeless domestic problems"[Sobolev, 2014].

On the other hand, the situation in itself, when an arrogant bandit, who by fate has become a school teacher by fake documents, becomes a positive character against the background of "sucker" teachers and their corrupt district headmistress, is, in our view, a rather sad phenomenon, although symptomatic for modern Russian television, in the pursuit of ratings for a quarter of a century, fond of stories about bandits, thieves and other evil spirits...

To some extent, we can also say that the authors of *Physical Education Teacher* learned well the lessons of the cheeky comedy *Bitter!* (2013). A. Dolin believes that the film *Bitter!* (2013) "opened some secret door in the minds of the public, legalizing the most shameful – and at the same time having allowed to laugh at it or be proud of it, depending on someone's tastes. Achieving such a level of frankness and screen truth in combination with the reckless humour has shocked many. *Bitter!* in a purely Russian spirit, combined touching with the disgusting, and terrible – with the most native. He also patented the genre of the "holiday film", a ritual action where the plot recedes in front of the pure alcoholic euphoria of unity – the transformation of a number of frustrated individuals into a community, which with some caution can even be called people"[Dolin, 2014].

And here is the comedy *Graduation Party* (2014), where eighteen-year-old schoolchildren are played by actors who are already over twenty, went even further: thanks to the recklessness of the plot about the graduation party in the provincial school, "sterile New Russian comedies with their obsessive "kindness" they lost their innocence ... Well, humour cannot and should not be extremely kind. ... With sexual content – the lack of it was always the weak point of the generally powerful Soviet cinema tradition about high school students – in *Graduation Party* everything is all right"[Dolin, 2014].

On May 5, 2014, amendments and additions were introduced to Federal Law No. 53 of the Russian Federation "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" (dated June 1, 2005). [Changes ..., 2014], according to which, from July 1, 2014, the film "containing obscene language" ceased to be issued a rental certificate, and when television showed films of past post-Soviet decades containing obscene language, such words started to "bleep out". The comedy *Graduation* was released on October 9, 2014 and became one of the first Russian films, which took into account the changes in the legislation of May 5, 2014: despite all the general rudeness of the lexicon in the film, there is not one real swear word. As a result, it turned out to be an "easy movie, with a terrible force lacquering reality. Of course, real high school students with their brains boiling from hormones and burst outs, one must think who mostly swear and live inside their rather tough showdowns. But this is not the *School* of Valeria Gai Germanika, it is a film of the kings of TNT, a channel not scandalous (as it seems to the elderly and fierce zealots of morality), but simply serving the petty bourgeoisie to laugh at it" [Korsakov, 2014].

Of course, "the sophisticated viewer will see in the film" ears "of various films – here is the unforgettable Soviet classics *You never dreamed* (its authors in *Graduation Party* quoted right up to the jump in the window!), And the Hollywood comedy *I can not wait* (From which a trio of juvenile rappers with Seth Grin at the head is borrowed), and a little John Hughes (the final phrase of the protagonist Demian is distinctly given by Bender from the *Breakfast Club*), and, of course, the *Project X* with the school's rampant get-togethers. It is interesting that these things are not perceived as impudent borrowing, but rather give an additional charge of positivism because of the joy of recognition"[Khokhlov, 2014].

For all that, the opinions of the critics about *Graduation* were polarized. Some thought that "the eternal theme of doublethink and hypocrisy with which adolescents enter into a spontaneous conflict in the *Graduation Party* was solved extremely successfully [Dolin, 2014], but "in the dialogues there are a lot of good jokes ... in general *Graduation* is a head above all that we shot in the genre of youth comedy over the past twenty years – and, most of all, despite the tough age rating, it remains a film quite "right" and useful for young people. Yes, in the finals high school students will arrange a rowdy, but this is the most strained part of the film. Because Generally *Graduation Party* is not exactly about this, but about responsibility, about entering into adulthood, about how to find a common language with those who cannot be understood as it seems. And about that childhood passes, but remains with us forever" [Khokhlov, 2014]. Others were sure that this is "an ideal picture for people who do not like to think about cinema. After viewing the head is clean, clear and does not contain a single question to the creators or the surrounding reality. ... Wherever it was possible to bend the stick, the creators of the *Graduation Party* bent it. Yes, in schools, what does not happen only, and graduation parties are celebrated with modern 11-

grades in a way that many of us did not dream about, but you do not need to paint them all with the same brush. ... One can feel for a mile that *Graduation Party* is the desire to earn as quickly as possible on a gullible spectator. ... A clumsy comedy about 11-graders, full of platitudes and clichés"[Loshakova, 2014].

No doubt, *Graduation Party* is filled with stereotypes in the spirit of *Univer*, but there are newfangled (for Russian cinema, of course) politically correct trends. For example, one of the graduates to get away from a trip to study in Holland, admits (deceitfully) to his father in his unconventional sexual orientation ... And the father responds in the same manner.

However, for all its frivolity *Graduation Party*, in our opinion, is far from audiovisual ease of the comedy series *After School* (2012). Judging by the name of this film, its authors "with their intellectual fiction and irony, modern speech, love for pop and genre games, were to stylistically oppose Germanika (the director of the acclaimed series *School*, 2010 – authors), exploiting documentary style and life-likeness. ... Of course, the series is primarily addressed to young people: for them there are music, clips, dialogues, jokes, sports, constant connection of the story with social networks and videos on *YouTube*. But still the film is for families. For a simple reason: the parents of heroes are 35-40 years old, for them it is all the same integral part of life" [Lubarskaya, 2012].

From the very first shots the series *After school* carries with its intricate clip-type visual series, stop frames, solarization, styling under TV interview, parody, funny letters of the character-schoolboy to the actor and director Nikita Mikhalkov, the atmosphere of an endless carnival. It is clearly seen that although "the authors have studied not only the range of interests of Russian high school students, but also the recipes for the success of American consumer goods" [Bednov, 2012], the theme touched by the series is not at all empty – "this is the place of man under the sun, regardless of age, and his mentality, and the relationship of husband-wife-child, and the creation of idols, and friendship is not friendship, and even the eternal dilemma of "being or seeming" [Kuzmina, 2012, p. 5].

Is it shown (in orientation to the audience of "hipsters"?) On the first channel at midnight, the series *After school* caused the expected polemic in the press [Bednov, 2012; Kuzmina, 2012; Lisitsyna, 2012; Lyubarskaya, 2012; Narinskaya, 2012, etc.], but because of its original "elitism" did not cause such an outbreak of spectator passions as V. Gai-Germanika's *School*.

In the second half of the tenth years of the 21st century, another characteristic tendency of the comic genre on the school theme was clearly identified: stylization for the best examples of Soviet cinema about children and adolescents of the 1960s and 1970s.

So A. Karpilovsky made a trilogy called *Private Pioneers'* (2012-2017), initiated by the stories written in post-Soviet times by M. Seslavinsky. However, this "is not a parody, no banter, and certainly not agitation. It's just a memory of something very naive and very light" [Alenushkina, 2013]. The first two films of the trilogy take place in the Soviet province of the second half of the 1970s. Unlike the "film standards" of the XXI century, the role of schoolchildren here played real schoolchildren, not cinema faculty students. Brilliantly chosen by the director, the young performers of the leading roles, thank God, "do not possess modern cine-puppet beauty and ideal diction, they are real and alive, and therefore organically fit into the space of the film, provoking sincere sympathy and a desire to empathize. Not for example, the chairman of the school council – the sleek upstart Bykov – is caricatured as serious, he is an intermediate link between the warm, sincere child's soul and the stiffened heart of an adult, the allegory of that transitional state that turns an open child into a blindly devoted builder of communism"[Kotov, 2015].

In the first part on the screen is a touching story about how the boys save a dog from death, in the second no less typical for a teenage movie the story of the first love. And with the exception of some minor details (for example, in the second series one of the schoolchildren from pranks makes the bust of Lenin look like a dashing Indian), it's easy to imagine these stories on Soviet screens of the *100 Days After Childhood* (1975).

Actually, this is precisely what "strains critics, and all this is liked by the audience who gave the film the prize of their sympathies. Such two sides of the barricades are in the cinema and in the whole society. Some people feel sick at the very thought that there was something good in the USSR, others remember this well as if they were coming to a clean source. The film falls into the very heart of the split. You look at it and suddenly you find yourself in a world where there are clear coordinates: what is good, and what is bad. What is commendable and what is embarrassing. Children do not hang around yards with

a cigarette, but something is rehearsed, something is discussed. They argue. Sincerely they want to be useful to the country, and Gaidar with his Timurovites marches ahead. Critics of the movie consider this action as stupefying, his fans – upbringing. Critics say: it's all lies. Fans: that's how it was. All according to the proverb: you want to be happy – be it. And really: how else could a country where there is nothing good, write good books, write talented music, win in a big war and first go out into space? Yes, the film shows a world where people have a purpose in life – self-improvement. And then the comparison comes by itself: what is the best way: to grab the cash and run away? And there comes nostalgia for something more real. As the eternally oppositional author wrote in polemical fervour: "We had a great epoch" [Kichin, 2013].

As a result of all this a tactful and intelligent "timeless story of friendship, honour and mutual assistance, relevant for young people of any generation, has turned out. The destructive anti-capitalist battles and selfless struggle with the bourgeoisie take place here only in the amateur scenes of the play, played by the sixth "B" [Kotov, 2015].

Another successful stylization for Soviet school movies was the comedy *Good Boy* (2016), which became the winner of the film festival "Kinotavr". As M. Trofimenkov rightly noted, "the good and harmful children who meet melodramatic relationships in adults are the same typical heroes of the Soviet "new wave": from Vitaly Melnikov's *Mom got Married* (1969) to *Children as Children* (1978) by Ayan Shahmaliyeva. If you recall the later, still soft versions, but already versions of the youth riot, then in the memory emerges *Courier* (1986) by Karen Shakhnazarov. The fact that Oksana Karas's film evokes such associations makes him an honour" [Trofimenkov, 2016].

Of course, even here the strict voices of critics immediately came to the conclusion that the *Good Boy* is "essentially a collection of jokes that are not even discussed and sometimes even conflicting with one another, which are not reduced to nothing but a general optimistic message" [Korsakov, 2016].

But we fully agree with V. Khlebnikova that in genre determinism, light jokes and the lack of didactics of the *Good Boy* "read the desire to entertain the viewer, provide the mass audience with that comfort zone that the intellectuals regularly, although not quite at the right place, call to leave. *Good boy* achieves this goal with the help of the stylization of Soviet children's cinema in the mid-1970s and early 1980s, who either forcedly or voluntarily "did not notice" reality and its mismatch with propaganda and embodied the utopian ideal of a carefree and prosperous existence for several generations of compatriots, often identified with the norm. The model of ideological quarantine, a sterile zone free from subtexts, hints, social and political topicality, is being modelled. The space thus cleared is given in the *Good Boy* chamber, alien to the vivid artistic effects and, as a rule, the confirmation of the basic norms of behaviour. In the *Good Boy*, as the norm, not the most popular in the country emancipation of personal choice from the influences of the family and the community is claimed, personal responsibility for actions of their own, and not of the neighbour or the organization, and thus the mirror emancipation of other people from oneself. Moscow is immersed in an eternal golden age in the *Good Boy*. There are no vulgar signs of the sociological context of 2010-2016. This Moscow takes sunbaths, basking in the light of an artificial day, which replaces the artificial night of cinematography of zero. Here they live by the river, as if on the sea, do not know the transport collapses and costs of sleeping urbanization, the interiors with antique furniture are spacious and light, windows – greens, spires and vistas, the eternal and prosperous noon of the world. ... Students are not drug addicts, not Nazis or hipsters, participate in dance battles, but can also polka, independently learn Chinese ... Authors of *Good Boy* pragmatically stop the time so that its annoying features and radical physiognomy do not distort the classic plot of the personality formation, they didn't imposed on him the character of youth revolt and the world denial. About that and speech, that a mature person assumes reality not because he cannot change it, but because his transformational efforts are directed mainly at oneself" [Khlebnikova, 2016].

But then V. Khlebnikova clearly does not pay attention to the fact that, unlike the *Private Pioneers*, there are a lot of scenes in the *Good Boy* that are absolutely impossible in the Soviet cinema of the 1970s: the teacher of English watches with her student *Nine ½ Weeks* (1985), balancing on the brink of erotic contact with a young character; director of the school leads all the same "good boy" in an underground casino, and a maniac-exhibitionist, adoring publicly to perform a small need, runs around the district.

However, despite all these "innovations", the *Good Boy* is on the territory "between the movie of good mood and the problem teenage drama about the school", here "a surprisingly lively and nice

atmosphere, although the action under the scenario takes place in an ordinary Moscow school, where one immediately wants to be admitted and spend there all the time. Teachers, even the head teachers and the director himself-in the performance of the inevitably charming Mikhail Efremov – are strikingly liberal: there is no depressing or ideological obligation among the subjects. And growing up children think more about the knowledge of the world and, worst of all, about sexual education: for example, the main character hesitates between a pretty girl and a young teacher, and the film will never fall down beyond a dangerous border, with all its atmosphere of unobtrusive flirting. In short, a cute movie that has nothing to do with life and reality is absolutely irrelevant: really good and not even fake – just blissful" [Dolin, 2016].

At sunset of thaw, a fantastic comedy *Wake of Mukhin!* (1967) appeared on screens, where the main hero from the USSR of the late sixties was transferred to the year 1837 to protect Alexander Pushkin from the fateful duel. Authors of the fantastic comedy *To Save Pushkin* (2017), on the contrary, send Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin from 1837 to Moscow 2017, but the schoolchildren are also trying to dissuade the great poet from a duel with Dantes. Despite a number of critics noted [Arkhangelsky, 2017; Potapova, 2017; Ukhov, 2017] of merits (lightness, sincerity, humour, interesting and topical detective and satirical plot, dynamics and intrigue, unexpected, witty finale), the film failed at the box office, unable to withstand competition with Western blockbusters. Probably, its appearance in the TV format would be more appropriate, and then the target audience would have a much greater chance of understanding that "our everything" here is not a figurative but an aesthetic value. A guest from the past the authors show the invariance of the meanings of words honour, duty, respect, responsibility, truth, politeness, tact. Of course, these concepts have been polished for two hundred years, but their inner strength has remained the same, and it is important to understand it at a young age" [Ukhov, 2017]. In addition, in *To Save Pushkin* ridiculed "thirst for glory and ubiquitous media, when any news is immediately on the screen to confirm or debunk, and every second student gets the opportunity to run his own video blog using improvised means" [Potapova, 2017].

Much greater public success fell to the share created by the American recipes of the fantastic comedy *Ghost* (2015), where a ghost in the bright performance of Fedor Bondarchuk gives lessons on the male education for a schoolboy played by the star of *Private Pioneers'* and *Good Boy* Semion Treskunov.

Dramas

The post-Soviet period dramas narrated about school life in three ways.

Firstly, these were the pictures that largely inherited the traditions of socially and critically biased "perestroika" films of the second half of the 1980s.

The closest to "perestroika" motives was *Teacher in law* (2007). Here, the "thief in law", having learned that he has a cancer, and little of life is left, decides to do at least something good and ... is getting a job as a literature teacher in a provincial school. The story line resembles the *Teacher of Physical Education* string, but it's not a comedy, it's a drama: there's a whole heap of gloomy genre going on, as there is a whole gang of high school students-drug dealers with whom the reformed thief enters into a deadly duel ... Despite the topical theme of drugs in educational institutions, the level of reliability in this drama is clearly underestimated, and impudent schoolchildren, who are engaged in "drug", are depicted too grotesquely to be psychologically convincing.

Sexual (however, submitted very gently) motifs of "perestroika" movies were played in the drama *Let's Make Love* (2002), where with a noticeable amount of irony was told the story of a student trying to part with his protracted virginity.

In P. Todorovsky's drama *What a wonderful game* (1995) socio-political motives came to the fore. The film unfolded in the cold winter of 1951, when students of one of the Moscow universities decided to play a joke on their neighbours in a hostel: they secretly connected the microphone to the radio receiver and on behalf of the Kremlin they transmitted a message about the abolition of censorship and residential registration, a fivefold fall in prices and many other joyous events. The payoff did not take long to wait: the "instigators" were arrested and shot in the cellars of the Ministry of State Security... As in the previous films of the director (*Military Field Love* and *Encore, more Encore*), it was again a retro-style drama with impregnations of comedy. It is a pity only that this time the script did not have the bulk of the characters and the original plot moves. Throughout the action of the film students play jokes, make

love, make noise, drink vodka, etc. etc., but after the end of the session, you can hardly recall what exactly one student is different from the other: except that he was a shy person with glasses, and the other was a giggly fat man. The characters at the level of the *Military Field Love* in the *Game ...*, alas, there is no trace, although good actors do everything possible to give their characters at least some kind of personality... And the very situation with the draw on political theme looks more like from the times of the Nikita Khrushchev' thaw than from the harsh Stalinist times, when people sometimes were afraid to publicly tell even quite harmless jokes. Still, the fear of 1951 was significantly different from the fear of 1957 or 1959 – the times of so-called "good hopes"...

Much more successful turned out another retro tape – *Tender Age* (2000). Its director, Sergei Soloviev, used his "perestroika achievements", making a kind of cocktail of poetic style of the *100 Days After Childhood* (1975) with the ironical drive of *Black Rose ...* (1989) and *The House under the Starry Sky* (1991). Talking about the school life of the first half of the 1980s, S. Soloviev, not trusting in the "seriousness and drama of the story told, largely based on the true facts from the life of fellow practitioners and his son's friends, as if afraid to look boring, saturates the action with repeated divertissements (sometimes sinful on the part of taste)" [Kudryavtsev, 2007]. But in general, all the shocking "late perestroika" scenes (well, perhaps, more "advanced") were in place: the teacher cursing American expansion, smashed his head with a brick because of the loss of the USSR of the Cold War. Schoolchildren smoked and looked at photos in the porn magazine. The chemistry teacher fainted at the sight of the student, who appeared in the nude at the height of her lesson. A little later, there was a bold scene of sex pioneer and the same "chemist" (ironic greetings to *Doll* in 1988). And (oh, God!), The naked pioneers had sex in the pool...

But here's what is typical: in 2001, having received the main prize of festival "Kinotavr", *Tender Age* for all its shocking reality did not provoke any outrage of the public. The main reason for this was the fact that the film was actually ignored by mass rent, filled with American entertainment pictures. But there were also reasons for another property: Russia only recently began to recover from the economic shock of 1998 and was still in the field of the officially oriented to the West (cultural) policy of "permissiveness".

A softer retro variant (this time the life of Soviet students in the 1970s) was presented in the drama *The Vanished Empire* (2007) by K. Shahnazarov. Along with criticism of the Soviet system, notes of restrained nostalgia were felt here: "The Soviet empire was taken from Shakhnazarov at flight, in thinning, in half-decay – in the most attractive form, when its vices were not so obvious; when she softened, slowed down, passed into oblivion, when everyone was already hypocritical and lied. But there was movement in it, perhaps it was growing up, there were concepts of good and evil – and in the ensuing timelessness everything was levelled off" [Bykov, 2007].

Secondly, these were films about the present, but close in style to the Soviet cinema of the 1970s. For example, a series about the school life *Simple Truths* (1999-2003), the action of which unfolded in one of the Moscow's schools. Contrary to perestroika gloomy genre, there were a lot of good high school students and teachers in the *Simple Truths*, there were almost no scabs and bed scenes with "nudity". In a similar vein, but this time with a focus on the ecological theme (a biology teacher with her students struggling with the pollution of nature) was posed *The Adult Life of a Girl Polina Subbotina* (2008). The *Village Teacher* (2015) also fits in well in this row. In this "socialist realistic" drama, an astonishingly similar (and outwardly and character traits) to the charming Shurik from the famous Soviet comedies of Leonid Gaidai, a graduate student of the pedagogical faculty and a history teacher, Lev Sergeevich comes into conflict with the retrograde of the director and sent to teach in a rural school. And there he soon won the respect of high school students, and the love of the local beauty.

Thirdly, these were films about the school and university, taken from the new Russian moral paradigm of the 21st century, that is, instead of the strict moral guidelines of Soviet "developed" socialist realism and the "perestroika" (and continuing "perestroika") social criticism, the films with characters without humanistic ideals, living in a world of money, violence, sex and entertainment, to which the authors are emphatically neutral, treating them as guinea pigs, came out on the first plan.

The most revealing of such films types was the drama *Everyone will die, but I'll stay* (2008). The characters of this film live "according to the laws of pride: the strong dominate, the weak are humiliated and thrown out of the habitual circle. Emotions are polar" – either rapture or malicious anger. Nobody, for example, has seen the mink surmise, philosophize, fall into a reflection. What can we say about a simple

high school student? The nymphs of Germanika are cracking down on rivals with instinctive cruelty, and a jar of alcohol is rejoicing in the same way as the Whiskers who found a delicious worm found under the stone. The animals eat grass, the children smoke it" [Belokurov, 2009].

The director of the film, Valeria Gai Germanika, clearly wanted to prove to the whole world that she would finally say "the whole truth about the modern school". So in her tough tape, ninth-graders smoke, drink wine, have sex, adore obscene gestures and slang vocabulary ("shorter", "damn", etc.), swear (in fact, without "bleeping out": tape removed for six years before the strict amendments to Federal Law No. 53 "On the state language of the Russian Federation" adopted in 2014 [Changes ..., 2014]), attempt suicide and then go to a disco.

Here are just a few characteristic phrases, which are pronounced in the film by 15-16-year-old schoolgirls:

- *It would be nice if all adults died!*
- *Lucky – she was fucked by a whole company of soldiers!*
- *Let there be a disco, and I will have a boyfriend!*

You can probably agree with the fact that Gai Germanika – "a real evil demiurge, who pulls the thread. And at the bottom of the handle stupid, ridiculous and pathetic, in general, a creature called a "teenager", torn by galactic dimensions of narcissism and a huge desire to squeeze the brain with a juicy pimple. Alas, these strings pointlessly point to young creatures who do not yet know that everyone will die without a trace, and put on their t-shirts "Parents, fuck you!" [Kulikov, 2008].

And here it is difficult to agree that the tape, thanks to the "flying camera" of the operator, "included the very same air and light, without which the film could only pass through the category of "youth gloomy". Because, in fact, after deducting this air and this light, we would be offered several important and, most importantly, fresh news: there is no love, there is no hope, there is no faith; adults – goats, children – bitches; everyone will die, but I'll stay" [Fanailova, 2009]. In our opinion, *Everyone will die ...* returns precisely to "perestroika" gloomy, but without the characteristic humanistic pathos, replacing it with cynical naturalism.

However, even this naturalism is very specific. Is it possible to take seriously the film *Everybody will die and I'll stay* as the most truthful post-Soviet film text about a modern school and schoolchildren, if 15-16-year-old characters are played by experienced actors from 22 to 28 years old?

So we are not inclined to share the enthusiasm of the researchers of the creative work of V. Gai Germanika who say that "we have a director who does not doubt the reality, does not submit to it, does not load it with reflections, does not blunder it, says that in this reality it is possible to live and, consequently, to shoot about her non-abstract, clear cinema" [Gusyatinsky, 2009], answering the "important question" [Volobuev, 2008].

About the film *Everyone will die, but I'll stay* (2008) argued mostly professionals – film critics and culturologists, it had no wide rental. But about the television series of V. Gai Germanika *School* (2010), shown in prime time on the Russian first channel, argued already "the whole country". In fact, it was a lighter version of the previous film directed by the producer, deployed for several dozen episodes: "In fact, the series *School* is quite vegetarian. Nothing in the ideological sense is extraordinary in it, no radicalism, protest moods. In comparison with the programs-mischief's channel NTV (*Pure confession, Especially dangerous!* or *Emergency*), "pearls" of Sunday prime, the series *School* is just a pioneer morning performance. Except for an informal visual and behavioural context" [Dondurei, 2010]. In fact, this is a series is "a one-to-three version of *Everyone dies...*, but without a filthy language, tits and an director of the photography is worse... Even the inevitable game of give-away with the TV audience, very cleverly framed. Each time they go playfully to the point at which something very indecent should begin, and when the spectator begins to get an epileptic fit from surprise, they also play back playfully: a collision with a teacher who has fallen on a girl is brewing, and then the teacher takes up the pedophile, the potential gay line looms (very timidly) and then, no, sorry, it seemed to you. In the first series there is a charming moment, this method is illustrative: the girl writes a word on the glass ... and as soon as she writes the a swear word, but the grandfather enters at the beginning of this act"[Volobuev, 2010].

Again, obscene gestures, rough slang vocabulary (but already due to evening TV shows without foul rough language), sex and suicide of schoolchildren. Plus exposing teachers who are bribe takers and retrogrades.

Here are just some of the characteristic, humiliating human dignity of students, teachers' phrases from the *School*:

- *You are not a person, but a nonentity.*
- *Why are you so stupid?"*

And again, despite the mobile camera, which removes "under the document", the disagreement with the age of the performers of the roles of ninth-graders: only one of the actors at the time of filming (2009) was 18 years old, the rest from twenty-one to twenty-four. And they play 15-16-year-olds... However, other analysts saw their advantages here: "It's embarrassing that the ninth-graders play huge foreheads for 22 years, but, firstly, you quickly get used to it (in *Beverly Hills 90210*, for example, the actors were almost thirty, and that's OK), and secondly, they play in a naturalistic way: their young heroes are dull, limited, inhibited, close, nervous. And delightfully tongue-tied!" [Gordeev, 2010].

The authors of the *School*, relying on previous developments, refer to "spontaneous, idolatrous worldview, offer undiluted, concentrated being", promise "recipients a shelter from the painted in local colours heroes" cardboard "TV installations – youth soap operas, solved in the genres of the romantic comedies and sitcoms" [Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 24], although for all this V. Gai Germanika "one cannot avoid the monotony, inevitable for the format of tightening, savouring the same type of conflicts, dotted manner of filing images. Often, getting carried away with the technique of shooting, perspective interpretation of the character, she jumps into tedious ordinary life description [Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 25].

Y.A. Bogomolov wrote about the *School* very accurately: "The art in this series is just so much that the viewer could imbue with the drama of the situation – and not just in the school environment. Simply for many, including for aesthetically advanced viewers, the language of this artistic expression is unaccustomed. Not because it is so new in principle. He is unaccustomed in the format of the so-called "serial product". The mobile camera is not used. It's like a movie from a mobile phone. Not in the rules of the format – the super size of plans, exacerbating the subjectivity of the view of what is happening, the rapid patter of dialogues, kaleidoscopes and the compactness of the plot motifs. ... The level of authenticity taken in the framework of the frame of reality is also unaccustomed, which, however, is not simply mechanically transferred to the screen, but impressively, figuratively processed and submitted. At the same time the intervention of the director, operator, artist in the "picture" is minimal. That is why the illusion of improvisation of the current of the spied life arises. ... an acquaintance with the wrong side of the average school shocking: the exclusion of students, the helplessness of teachers, the smoking of drugs, the hormonal problems of young children and adolescents, etc. ... They say that the Germanika series is a crooked mirror. Maybe. But let me note that the crooked mirror not only distorts the beautiful features of beautiful phenomena, it sticks out defects, flaws of what is not very fine, and especially that which is very ugly. This is exactly what the *School* did, both in relation to the school itself and in relation to today's social order" [Bogomolov, 2010].

For all that, one cannot but admit that "this series does not reveal anything new on the material. Germanika shoots a movie about what she knows well, even the school and the interiors are the same as in her first film *Everyone Dies and I'll Stay* [Karakhan, 2010]. *School* did not become an opening for a sophisticated audience in media culture. But for the audience of the mass, not familiar with the previous tapes of Gai Germanika, nor with many other Russian and foreign films about the school and schoolchildren (among which were very sharp, we recall, for example, *Tender Age*), the television show *School* kind of revelation, shock. But there are two more reasons for the noisy reaction of the public: "First, the entertainment specifics of our television have been disrupted. This work is not only in its artistic level several orders of magnitude higher than traditional serial production, but also quite different in its aesthetics. The second is the violation of the taboo of the genre resolution of various conflicts on the television screen" [Razlogov, 2010].

Many spectators "were struck and indignant at the fact that the show goes on prime time on the main TV channel of the country. Many interpreted this move as an official statement of the state. ... Summing up, all opinions can be divided into four groups: a) the demonstration of children who drink and smoke propagates such behaviour among pupils, making it normal, legitimate, corresponding to the "spirit of the times"; b) there is a corruption of the younger generation, its zombification, since it is so much easier for the government to subordinate it, but it does not seem to be against it; c) the series is an attempt to draw attention to the problems of the school, albeit not in the most reasonable ways; d) all these are

intrigues of the First Channel, which, like air, needs high ratings" [Paisova, Dementieva, 2010]. Moreover, the head of the Moscow department of education O. Larionova spoke against the show *School* on the First Channel, stating that "on the Internet there were sharply negative reviews of teachers and parents and students for this program," created in the year of the teacher in Russia [The series ..., 2010].

We believe that critics of the *School* managed to feel the main feature of the author's position in the series: moral relativism, which was clearly recorded by the sociologist D.B. Dondurei (1947-2017). He noted that the minuses of the *School* "are obvious and already fixed: tendentiousness in the selection of material, no one teaches anything, the lack of minimal intellectual requests from heroes, flat-footed drama" [Dondurei, 2010].

But against this background, D.B. Dondurei was able to distinguish the most, perhaps, the most important: "*School* is a sample of producer's creativity in all its components. ... The main thing in this project is an experiment with the accumulated, but not yet realized, feeling of long-resolved freedom with its borders, corridors, horizons and also with the latest, though not obvious, technologies for promoting modern virtual products. *School* probes the soil of impending or, rather, ripening content changes, not so much foreseeing how many are exploring here possible ideological twists and turns. The series diagnoses and fills the emptiness formed in recent years in the "picture of the world" that has settled on TV, shakes the habitual grid of the serial chewing gum and status (regardless of the outcome and claims) screenings. He touches on the problems and those realities of our life, which recently could not be touched. Or did it only seem to us? Who could have imagined that the sixteen-year-old heroine would curiously unwrap, feel the condom received from her mother as a gift twice a day at the main point of distributing the "meanings of life", under the supervision of grandmothers and junior students? This is a slap in the face of Russian public taste. To look at numerous murders, at dismemberment it is possible, and at a condom – you will go blind. Who could imagine that a bribe to the teacher, the seduction of a young teacher or teenage cooperation with pornographic sites will be imposed on the proscenium of a multimillion-dollar tele-forum? Is it decent to include such weekdays in the domestic series or only – and more abruptly – in the program *Let them say* or *Maximum*?" [Dondurei, 2010].

Another lighter version of the film *Everyone dies, and I'll stay* was drama *The Roof* (2009): pupils sell drugs, smoke and fight in the toilet, teenage girls look at pictures of the Kama Sutra, and the director writes with a felt-tip pen on the student's forehead "I'm a freak." The main characters of the *The Roof* are three girlfriends: "learn in school, fall in love with a newcomer, smoke quietly, sing songs on the roof and from this very roof are going to jump. Parents of girls, who do what they can, work, change each other, and think little about their daughters"[Khrustaleva, 2009]. In *The Roof* there is no swear words, but there is a moral of the social order: "Parents! Do you know what your children are doing?"

Released on the screen four years after school, *Class correction* (2014) appealed not just to the fate of ordinary pupils, but pupils with disabilities. Like in films of Gai Germanika, the schoolchildren were played here by actors from twenty to twenty-five years old, which again can be explained by the fact that there are very risky scenes in this drama: for example, when violent classmates rape the main character – a disabled schoolgirl. For all that "there is not a single obscene word from the screen, and not because the prohibiting law appeared recently. The author consciously set himself a rigid framework: not to "play Germanika", not to try to confirm the authenticity of what is happening with dirty vocabulary"[Lyubarskaya, 2014].

In the professional environment, the *Correction Class* (2014) was met ambiguously, in fact, two opposite interpretations were proposed: 1) "This is the flagship of the "new wave", a masterpiece of realism (all as in life!), a sob of teenage despair and "Scarecrow XXI century"; 2) This elegant postmodern trick, grotesque, own universe, glowing giraffe and the output of a young talented provocateur into the territory of Balabanov and Trier" [Kuvshinova, 2014].

The hot supporters of the film considered that the *Correction Class* is, of course, gloomy, but "far from full immersion in decay and despair. Most of the picture the viewer looks with pain, with fear, with experience, but also with hope. With a light feeling, with a sense of some higher justice, even if expressed in the fact that boys and girls with physical defects are also happy in their own way. ... love, hatred, stupidity, betrayal, rage and fear are shown by bare nerves. The disabled are as vulnerable as the outside world, they are so vulnerable in the inner world" [Ukhov, 2014], and here "you begin to think about the insecurity of each and every one, in the order of self-defence giving birth to aggression ... about the total depressiveness into which any business has fallen, and before all school" [Kichin, 2014]; and

"the *Correction Class* is not strong just with cinephiles, but a phenomenal ability to find a common language with the audience, making it laugh and touching it in earnest"[Dolin, 2014].

Opponents were sure that the *Correction Class* is a brilliant trickery, a story that was not told, but they wailed through the voice of beggars in the subway. Everything is conditional there, as in folklore crying ... Tverdovsky entered the world of cinema context on a limousine with a convertible (but wheels from a wheelchair) and confidently rushes forward under the whistling and wooing of others" [Shakina, 2014]. Moreover, M. Kuvshinova is convinced that "Tverdovsky from ignorance of the chosen subject, from misunderstanding, what is provocation, brutality, betrayal, a miracle, but from the desire to show all this as if he raises before the viewer the signs *Provocation!*, *Revitalization!*, *Betrayal!*, *Miracle!*, And when it comes to the notice *Author!*, he demonstrates in the TV fragment of his own short film *Dog's joy* and puts into the mouth of one of the heroines a remark:*Why shoot like children strangle themselves?*" [Kuvshinova, 2014].

It seems to us that the film is an artificially constructed anthropological sketch "based on" the "black series" of "perestroika" films about the school and the first films of Germanika, where the story of the collective rape of a schoolgirl by her classmates remains completely unpunished, where the brutalized mothers fiercely fight in the director's office high school students, where the natural intonations of the dialogues, inconsistent speech of the characters creates the illusion of "truth."

Equally polar opinions were sparked by another drama on the school topic – *Geographer Burned the Globe* (2013), the authors of which transferred the story of the novel of the same title, written in 1995, to the 21st century. The plot of the film is simple: a heavily drinking provincial middle-aged biologist from desperation settles in school to teach geography and, confronted with a difficult class, tries to earn schoolchildren authority. At the same time, "everything that happens in the film is categorically wrong. The teacher, who should set an example, drinks, directly tells everything to children what he thinks about them. He even risks their lives, for which he faces a criminal punishment. And at his home everything is also wrong: he allows his wife to love a friend, seeking consolation from a colleague-teacher, secretly loves a student. And the students in the school are wrong: they are brave, they dare, and, it seems, they do not learn anything"[Kichin, 2013].

Arguments in favour of the film: "the conscious adherence to the Russian literary and cinematic tradition", "empathy", "spiritual enlightenment", "liveliness and amusement", "vitality", "a call for love for one's neighbour", etc.

Examples:

1) "Whatever one may say, Veledinsky's film is flesh from flesh and school dramas like *We'll Live To Monday* or *Dear Elena Sergeevna*, and the tragedy of unfulfilled lives, the first of which comes to mind *Autumn Marathon*. The image of teacher Sluzhkin is imbued with that very favourite "once-intelligentsia" with erudition, a romantic attitude, the ability to subtly joke, it is difficult to curse and beautifully deny women. It's strange, but with all the repulsive components, Sluzhkin is sympathetic, it's easy for him to empathize, his uneasy position forces him to scroll through his own actions, and it's always difficult to create such a screen character that almost any viewer can try on himself "[Ukhov, 2013];

2) "But most of all, he attracts non-petty character in the way he relates to our literary and cinematic tradition going from Onegin and Pechorin to Ivanov and Treplev and then to the heroes of *Duck Hunt*, *Flight in Dream and in Reality*, *Autumn Marathon* and other "superfluous people for rendezvous", with which he was immediately compared, noting mainly their undoubted similarity, although, the difference is no less significant. All the listed persons in one way or another had a romantic aura – in the largest Pechorin, in the least – Buzykin from the *Autumn Marathon*. Sluzhkin, on the other hand, is essentially unromantic and not even tragicomic, but rather a comic hero, but not in the usual sense of the word, but in the way Chekhov used it with his plays" [Matizen, 2013];

3) "Alas, the profession of the teacher is considered a dead end. What the main character himself admits. A story about a real man? Of course not. The edification of youth – do not be like him? Also not. Or maybe a new upbringing novel? In which pupils are brought up by teachers. Yes there is simply life. Clamped in the confusion of human prejudices and unfulfilled desires ... But – albeit not always, but still – bursting loose, triumphantly throwing up arms and saying: but still we have something to live for. Let's for a moment. For the sake of such moments and live. And this life – in most situations ridiculous,

ridiculous, not exemplary and unlucky – but leaving hope for spiritual enlightenment"[Govorushko, 2013];

4) "*Geographer Burned the Globe* is a surprisingly lively and funny film in which even imperfections and roughness go in plus. After all, this is, in the final analysis, a love story, with which deviations from the canons of beauty and truth are only beneficial. And this is a test for modern Russian viewers on the ability to enjoy the normal everyday cinema about real people like you and me "[Dolin, 2013].

5) The *Geographer*... managed to glorify the one who lives here, these days, and does nothing at all. It turns out that "nothing" in the end turns out to be the only possible strategy – but only for those who want to love the whole world, not to be a pledge of happiness to anyone, and to continue to hope that the world will love it in return"[Kuvshinova, 2013].

Arguments against the film: "turbidity," "lifelessness," "fiction," "no movie," "a cake with cream," "indecent sensitivity and fearfulness of the authors," "blunders," "ashamed to look," etc.

Examples:

1) "Forgive me for a ridiculous verbal allusion, but I need to despair to give out an ambitious turbid melodrama for a revelation, and so taken so lifeless that it was necessary to release immediately on TV" [Hoffmann, 2013].

2) "Director Veledinsky climbs out of the skin to make his film appealing to the simplest viewer: he sends to the Soviet classics about men searching for the meaning of life, cleans the source from all painful monologues, leaving only jokes with jokes, tensely peers into the eyes of a good artist Khabensky . But his Sluzhkin remains a fiction, a non-existent representative of a non-existent generation, which does not develop at all, does not grow, which really does not need anything. The movie turns out the same. That is, nonentity" [Ruzaev, 2013];

3) "The whole movie looks like a cake with cream. ... There is a feeling that the creators of the *Geographer* – people with quite a decent creative reputation, who ten years ago were a vigorous and brave front flank of Russian cinema – just grew old and became indecently sensitive and timid. The formula of Gogol: "love us black," which always worked in our art, it seems to them too risky, it is much safer to shoot another fairy tale for adults – even if it's a sin against the truth" [Zaretskaya, 2013];

4) "There is no portrait of the "hero of our time", because there is no hero, and there is no time as such: all his signs to the middle of the film because of the critical mass of various blunders simply become dead scenery. There is no drama, and there is not even a tragicomedy, because laughing at how a teacher gets drunk with the main school bully and reads rap becomes inappropriate and boring. And what is there? Never mind. There is a film that almost from the very beginning (Sluzhkin fights in the train with a policeman to the song "I'm free") is a shame to watch. In addition to the first episode, please, just a nonsense, a couple of shameful ones: the moment with the decantation of birch juice in a bottle of brandy, and the scene in the bathhouse – a schoolgirl in love with the teacher groans naked at the stove (for some reason one feels more awkward for the young actress), the teacher lashes himself with bath brooms until the blood – apparently, expelling the lustful demons" [Artamonova, 2013].

In our opinion, the *Geographer* like the *Correction Class*, looks like a secondary product, nothing new to add to either the development of the "school theme" or the tradition of stories about "unnecessary people"...

In the phantasmagoric drama *The Clinch* (2015) the teacher of the Russian language and literature "cautiously, clasps the shoulders with a cheap jacket, strives to slip unnoticed. ... He is not attracted to a long-time unloved wife ... neither an 18-year-old son who clearly lost any respect for his unsuccessful father ... nor a standing apartment waiting for repairs, torn to the bare concrete walls" [Lyubarskaya, 2015]. But he is not some romantic from "sixties": he sees in the window how "the older students beat the younger one, but he will not rush to save anyone. In the booth of the service toilet, a prelude to a sexual act is performed, and the teacher will not do anything either, he slams the door, shouting in his heart: "Was there no other place?" ... school – the ideal topic for demonstrating hypocrisy, deceit, falsity, boredom of life and hopelessness of existence. The school is, apparently, a serious mental shock for future filmmakers and subsequently serves as a source of "black inspiration," the forge of a nightmare" [Argangelsky, 2015]. True, further the plot of *The Clinch* goes away from the school in the direction of surrealism and absurdism, and, consequently, from the subjects of our research.

But in *Teacher* (2015), almost all the action of the film takes place in the school class. At first, it seems that we are dealing with serious dramatic problems: "here are the eternal relationships of the older and younger generations, the trampling of moral standards, the degradation of society and youth, the large-scale problems in Russian education, and the social stratification of society" [Nikolaev, 2015], "all relevant topics of the man in the street connected with the school, here and Ukraine with the US, here and culture with education, there are bandits with guards", but soon the *Teacher* turns into a farce. ... turns into some kind of skits" [Ukhov, 2015].

Studied by the life, a story of an elderly the wonderful actress Irina Kupchenko, who played once the most important pedagogical images in the Soviet cinema (*Aliens Letters*, 1975), plays here. However, in the *Teacher* the authors of the film put it in the same uncomfortable and false position that was in another talented actress – Marina Neelova in the perestroika film *Dear Elena Sergeevna*: an elderly and seemingly experienced teacher behaves with schoolboys the way as if for the first time in her life she was in the classroom and knew practically nothing about the intellectual level and morals of modern students. And in this class, the authors managed to collect amazing characters - "boors, loafers and hippies. Even excellent pupils and good guys under the influence of an unusual situation begin to demonstrate their exceptional egoism and anger. However, to perceive all this for some reason should be something natural and easily transformed into something healthy with the help of a wave of a magic bar. The amazing thing: just a few tens of minutes of communication abounding with mutual threats and insults – and such a universal Stockholm syndrome reigns that the viewer becomes uncomfortable" [Sosnovsky, 2015].

A similar exaggerated falsity, supplemented by the cost of replacing the German play into the Russian film, also appears in the much more professionally made *Pupil* (2016). This drama shows the "breakdown of the veils with the overwhelming Russian citizen of despair hilariously competing in aggressiveness with anti-clericalism. Here, in the office of the headmistress, a Russian flag must necessarily stand – in order to demonstrate the pseudo patriotism that pervades everything. And certainly – inverted, stressing: for this all, nothing but sycophantic behaviour, not worth it. If the school has a priest, then his watch will occupy about a third of the screen, and speech and habits will to testify the criminal past, and not so recent. The director, the head teachers, the "teachers" are nasty, screaming aunts (and the dull teacher of the physical culture, yes), in the classroom they tell about the positive aspects of Stalinism, and in the evenings, at the bottle, they howl awful low-grade songs. Brainless cops and guards are ready, having used all the swear words with all their heart, to cross themselves at anything that resembles a cross ... "The pupil" does not invite to reflect on the problems of the current Russian society, as claimed by its author. Instead, the viewer is given the opportunity to inflame his anger" [Sosnovsky, 2016].

This story about a high school student who uses religious extremism as a tool for rebellion, then and again, the cues and plot details that betray the western origin of the original slip through. ... The main misfortune of the *Pupil* in the other is that it is a warning film, not a film-study. The picture does not analyze the soul world of a guy who becomes a religious fanatic, does not show his inner struggle, does not give him the right to doubt and hesitate" [Ivanov, 2016].

M. Trofimenkov rightly writes also about the secondary nature of the *Pupil*: "Something like this the world has already seen half a century ago. In dozens of other films, other teenagers – from English and Polish to Japanese – also demonstrated their genitals. They also smashed their too-bourgeois sleeping-rooms and beat the adult overseers on the spot with paradoxical aphorisms. They brought condoms to school and dreamed of automatic bursts from the abdomen to cleanse the land of adult totalitarian pigs and peer conformists. Then it was called a youth riot against triumphant hypocrisy: teenage hooliganism should be admired" [Trofimenkov, 2016].

On the other hand, one should probably listen to A. Dolin's opinion: "The film is straightforward and even didactic, it is a kind of visual (even too much) demonstration of all the dangers of religion, private or organized. However, the artistic merit is much stronger than the rare shortcomings. *Pupil* – the film primarily about fanaticism and "insulting the feelings of believers", but is also about the modern education system, anti-Semitism, homosexuality, hypocrisy, all forms of totalitarianism. In this sense, the *Pupil* is absolutely a political picture, and the second such in Russia for all the recent time was never ever shot before" [Dolin, 2016].

Films by V. Gai Germanika, dramas *Geographer Burned the Globe* (2013), *Teacher* (2015) and *Pupil* (2016) told about ordinary schoolchildren from ordinary schools, choosing from them for the most

part the least socially protected. But the authors of the series *Barvikha* (2009) and *Golden (Barvikha-2)* (2011), which were shot according to American recipes, turned to the existence of an elite school where senior high school students usually learn. Like Gai Germanika, the role of schoolchildren was performed by professional actors. In *Barvikha* they were shot at the age of 20 to 29 years, and in *Golden* – even older. Having redesigned the American TV series *Veronica Mars* (2004-2007) and *Gossip Girl* (2007-2012), the authors of *Barvikha* designed stereotypes for the films about the "golden youth" of characters: Lovelace and his rustic friend, "Cinderella", trying to deceive into "higher society", the queen of the class and her retinue, and, of course, a charming and honest guy who, though rich, is responsive. The plot of the series revolves around such key concepts as friendship, love, envy, jealousy, sex, booze, deception and meanness. All this is filed with the same steady moral relativism as Gai Germanika, only softly, glamorous and without claims to the author's statement.

Approximately in the same spirit, however, without the exaggerated glamour of *Barvikha* and pedaled sexuality (including homosexuality) of the series *Physics or Chemistry* (2011), the series *High School Students* (2006-2010) was made.

Melodramas

In the 1990s, a lot of films were filmed, retrospectively comprehending the relatively recent past. Among them was the melodrama *American* (1997) by D. Meskhiev. Earlier, Dmitry Meskhiev (*Cynics, Over Dark Water*) was considered a skilled stylist and one of the leaders of the new director's generation. However, *American* has caused his image considerable damage. And all because Meskhiyev has lost, as they say, in his field. Instead of a nostalgic retro-melodrama about the love affairs and everyday affairs of Russian teenagers of the early 1970s, in our opinion, a carelessly cut and poorly crafted hand-crafted piece was produced. Of course, the authors of the film did not forget to dress their young heroes in their trousers and flap them with Beatles' styled hair. But for more they were not quite ready. The atmosphere of the 1970s in the *American* does not exist. It seems that the director, without a long thought, simply copied (primitively and without inspiration) the older generation's film memories of his post-war childhood. But, alas, what was admired in *Dudes* (1977) or in *Freeze-Die-Resurrect* (1989) in the interpretation of Meskhiev looked like a dull stamp.

By "average" patterns, many other "school-university" melodramas are also cut. It is clear that at the heart of melodramatic stories on the school material – love affairs, sometimes quite risky. Hence the even greater caution of the film-makers in relation to the age of the performers. So in the *Beloved Teacher* (2016) the eleventh-grader falls in love with the recent graduate of the pedagogical college, who came to teach at his school. For the reasons mentioned above, the actor was chosen as the amateur schoolboy of 22 years, which put the authors of the series before the choice: to invite a girl of the age corresponding to the graduate of the university (23-24 years) to the role of teacher, or, in order to avoid equalizing the age parameters of the actors, take an older actress. We stopped at the second option: the performer of the role of the young teacher in the year the serial was released on the screen was 33 years old.

It is clear that this kind of age casting from the very first shots destroyed the credibility of the plot of the series, especially since further it did not give special reasons for serious reflections (what is worth one scene of an attempt to rape the teacher at the graduation party by one of the friends of the main character). By the way, on the scene of rape (this time one of the graduates of the school), and the plot of the nondescript series *And the balloon will return* (2013) is also constructed.

In a boring melodramatic vein on the screen incarnated love stories of older characters: in *The Price of Love* (2013), a married university teacher falls in love with a twenty-year-old boy, in *Work on Mistakes* (2015), a schoolteacher meets after many years with a man who once abandoned her; in the *White Crow* (2011) a provincial from the pedagogical school becomes a victim of the machinations of his treacherous mother-in-law; in the *Children under 16 ...* (2010) there was a poorly supported scenario-based student love triangle, rightly received negative reviews of criticism [Nefedov, 2010; Favorov, 2010], since "the viewer sees instead of beauty the mannerisms of performance, glossy pretentiousness and blatant vulgarity" [Yushchenko, 2010].

In the melodramatic series *Teachers* (2014), the well-known TV talk show *We chat* quarrels with the leadership of the channel, loses work and ... gets a job at the provincial school as a teacher of literature (oh, this does not give a rest to the filmmakers on the school topic stories about the drastic change in the status of their characters, for the time being, it had nothing to do with pedagogy: let us

recall at least *Teacher in Law* and *Teacher of Physical Culture*. It's clear, at school, a recent TV star meets a modest beauty-teacher. But not only her: the glamorous English teacher has already put her eye on him, and two smart high school students are arguing which one of them will seduce him (why one of them reads A. Kuprin's *Sulamith* and rushes to the teacher with kisses, and the other tattooed on her breast and undress in front of him in the school room: do not worry, the roles of these schoolgirls were performed by twenty-year-old actresses). Against this background, everything in the classroom is like that of modern filmmakers: schoolchildren drink, smoke, have sex (see *Barvikha*, *Golden*, etc.).

In the melodrama *Freshman* (2016), too, a reception with a character turned upside down: a pretty young mother easily passes the entrance exams to the Institute of International Relations instead of her 18-year-old daughter and soon falls in love with an impressive assistant professor. The advantage of this film, in our opinion, is that it does not pretend to be a presentation of the "life of the university", but plays the romantic feelings unassumingly.

Among the melodramas about students and schoolchildren the greatest resonance was caused by the film *14+* (2015). Contrary to the unspoken film rules of recent decades, the young actors of this picture are not 20-25, but actually fifteen. And the value of the film is "not in dramatic conflicts. This is a very simple film about love, from which it is impossible to come off and which then is difficult to forget. Just in it (a rare case, especially in Russian cinema), absolutely everything is done right. The main thing in *14+* is a surprisingly light and natural intonation, with which the story is told. If you look for roughly similar films about teenagers, perhaps the *A Swedish love story* by Roy Andersson or even Truffaut's *Les quatre cents coups*, released in 1970 and 1959, may come to mind, respectively. Teenagers, can, and vary depending on epoch and the countries – the genuine tenderness with which they are looked at by directors does not change. The whole film sounds lively human speech – and after that dialogues in a lot of other Russian paintings and serials begin especially painfully to cut the hearing"[Korsakov, 2015].

In fact, in *14+* there are "dialogues" "torn from the language", precise reactions-wins, an elastic rhythm, many funny moments. The vitality of young performers, their non-professionalism (adolescents play teenagers) is relevant ... The girls here are absolutely adults (gin and tonic, dates, risky outfit, innocence and vice in one young body); boys are very kids (bolts, Lego, clockwork robots, T-shirts with the Simpsons, and they do not sell beer in the store). Incomplete-inexpensive rips over the topic of the lesson – "monomials", pray to the image of brother Danila Bagrov and in battles with hooligans imagine themselves as Supermen and Spider-Man. Ordinary children at the age of adulthood"[Malukova, 2015].

On the other hand, while watching, our "consciousness sinks at a time when adults with their problems were stupid and incomprehensible, and their own problems were the only important ones, when nothing further from tomorrow existed, and the heart beat more strongly from love experiences than from fear of being beaten. It is likely that such a metamorphosis will not happen to everyone. Someone *14+* just seems implausible and tense. But even it does get into resonance with the frequency of mental vibrations, this does not at all promise a positive effect. Imagine if you were immersed with a head to where it's warm and good, and then dragged back into the hostile environment by the scruff. Imagine that someone rudely and unceremoniously dug into your intimate experiences and put them on public display. Sensation is not pleasant, leaving behind a very strange feeling, a mixture of nostalgia and devastation" [Litovchenko, 2015].

It would seem, "this is exactly what you can only dream about: that Russian cinema, steeped either in arthouse snobbery, or in commerce" below the plinth, "turned its face to the audience, to the viewer, to real life. And he learned to dissect this life in modern artistic rhythms and intonations" [Plakhov, 2015].

And so, despite all this, the *14+* became the source of an action of angry protest: the authors of the melodrama accused the authors of propaganda for alcoholic beverages, teenage sex and paedophilia and in the corruption of minors. On the site change.org, a petition titled "Banning the film *14+*" in 2015 collected about two thousand signatures [Petition ..., 2015]. Here are just some of the comments posted on this site: "I urge you to ban the movie" *14+* "at the box office and to bring its creators to account for promoting the early onset of sexual activity, corrupting children. The people who allowed the Ministry of Culture to sponsor this film must be punished" (G. Rebenchuk, Kazakhstan); "We need films that call for children to strive for chastity, virtue, moral conduct! And this film simply cannot be watched by teenagers!!!" (I. Kolobova, Russia) [Petition ..., 2015].

Such storms did not cause either *Tender Age* or *Everyone will die, but I'll stay*, and this despite the fact that in *14+* there is neither a swear language, nor explicit sexual scenes, nor cruel episodes of violence. And the film was shot "already in a fundamentally different era than Gai Germanika. Much has been banned, and almost all bans are met: ... a night meeting of lovers is shown with chastity, worthy of the Soviet standards. But surprisingly, *14+* is a rare film in which falseness and conventionality are not felt in depicting the life of adolescents, and piercing it, especially closer to the finale, warmth and kindness do not turn into treacle. ... It is hardly the first time in our cinema that the film convincingly showed that, whether we like it or not, today the teenager's adult life begins on the Internet. However, another thing is shown: the virtual world does not give either real detente or experience: sooner or later you have to prove yourself "in real life" [Plakhov, 2015].

So why are not cheeky TV series about schoolchildren, filled with sex (one *Physics or Chemistry* is worth), namely, the modest melodrama *14+* caused such a storm of anger of the "working masses"? The answer to this difficult question is found in A.S. Plakhov's article: "Indeed, from the standpoint of radical art, the " *14+* "style is traditional, if not conservative – and this is absolutely justified by the goals and objectives of the picture. If she were more avant-garde, she would not have had a rent or scandal at all, nobody would have known about her except for a group of film critics. But the hysteria that has unfolded around this particular film allows us to make broader conclusions about culture and society as a whole. Even six months or a year ago we were on another level of rapid fall into the pool of the collective unconscious. Then it seemed that the main enemies of free creativity are in power institutions and institutions: it was there that the initiatives of absurd prohibitions were developed and from there. Today, after the prohibitive genie was released from the bottle, we fell even deeper: initiatives come from below – and this is evidence of a new stage of cultural democracy in Russian" [Plakhov, 2015].

Thrillers

Unlike the detective, the thriller belonged to genres practically forbidden in Soviet cinema (especially in school-themed films). Therefore, the appearance in the post-Soviet space of the thriller *Serpent Spring* (1997) was unexpected for those times.

... In a small provincial town appeared serial maniac. His victims are young women, so that there is every reason to worry about the fate of a beautiful trainee who came to the local school ... Director Nikolai Lebedev in the debut film proved to be a diligent admirer of the work of Alfred Hitchcock. He was not at all interested in the realities of the Russian provincial and school life of the 1990s. The screen world of the *Serpent Spring* is a kind of action-packed chess game with masked figures, where the nervous tension of the spectators is confidently pumped from episode to episode. The director demonstrated a good mastery of the profession, using the well-known actors E. Mironov and O. Ostroumova in an unusual role. Almost all the characters in the film are flip-flops, hiding some secrets and vices.

About ten years later A. Strizhenov made the mystical thriller *Yulenska* (2008), where the teacher of literature fell into the gothic atmosphere of the gymnasium, where strange and terrible things happened. Of course, not only the history of the unlucky teacher, first of all, it is "the story of a very smart girl who said the first word at two months, learned to read at a year and a half and at ten does not know what to do yet, and because it falls under several articles of the Criminal Code" [Maslova, 2009].

In the film there are obvious hints at the story of the myth about Orpheus, tales of the *Snow Queen* and *Suspiria* by D. Argento. However, "despite the obvious similarity of history with *Suspiria*, *Yulenska* "is not a Russian copy of Dario Argento. This is Jesse Franco, only faster and ironic and with three layers of gloss. Rich Carroll texture – pigtails, golf clubs, T-shirts, the girl strangles the squirrel – politically corrected by distracting scenes of a healthy heterosexual character" [Koretsky, 2009].

The western story lining is most evident in the mystery series *Closed School* (2011-2012), the remake of the Spanish *Black Lagoon* (2007-2010), the events of which take place in an elite boarding school. As in most other Russian TV series, the tenth grade is played by actors between the ages of 24 and 30. *Closed School* was submitted to the media "as the first mystical series about teenagers in Russia. But despite her success with the Russian TV audience, the creators of the series did not take into account the important options for copying. It has a melodramatic canon, but there is no expression of the original source. Authors ... choose advertising-optimistic intonation, tend to purism ... Despite the relishing of skulls, episodes of a mysterious stay in the world of the dead do not cause fear. Really terrible moments at

copying lose sharpness. But the reasons for the popularity of the *Closed School* – just in its usual, predictable, unpretentious manner» [Sputnitskaya, 2016, p. 60].

Fantasy

In fantasy films, the theme of the school and the university naturally falls into the background. Well, only with the exception of some school episodes, where the main characters in *Ghost* (2015), where the teenager, thanks to his communication, gets a man's education with a ghost? Even less school is in the *Attraction* (2017), where the students of high school are trying to help out poor aliens from the misfortune. *Dolly the sheep was angry and died early* (2014) – a story about a student who came from Russia in the 21st century in the Soviet 1980s – also not about the university, but about love and about the fact that the student "destroys the past in order that he realized that his father was a world man and that he realized how strong and cheerful was friendship at a time when young people did not live in computers and cell phones. ... "The image of the 1980s is imbued with ironic nostalgia. The director with delight and humour recalls Komsomol discos, vodka with soda, exams on scientific communism, trips by big companies on small cars, marching songs to guitar, crosses in gas masks, fights of "urban" and "village", queue for sausage" [Ivanov, 2014].

And quite a rare genre bird in the post-Soviet school-student subjects was a musical, which, however, does not detract from the merits of the brilliantly stylized V. Todorovsky *Hipsters* (2008).

Results

Russian films of 1992-2017 on the theme of school and university

The place of action, historical, socio-cultural, political, ideological, context

Historical context (dominant concepts: "media agencies", "media / media categories", "media representations" and "media audiences").

Features of the historical period of creation of media texts, market conditions that contributed to the idea, the process of creating media texts, the degree of influence of events of that time on media texts.

The time frame of this historical period has been defined by us since 1992, that is, from the time when the Russian cinematographic production arose after the collapse of the USSR.

The main political, economic, cultural, educational characteristics of this historical period are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Key dates and events in Russia and the world in the period 1992-2017: politics, economics, culture, education (compiled by A.V. Fedorov)

<i>Key dates and events in Russia and the world in the period 1992-2017: politics, economics, culture</i>	
1992	<p>The beginning of economic reforms (in particular - the abolition of state regulation of prices in Russia, privatization (voucher) state property) of the new Russian government, which led to a sharp fall in the rouble rate with the shortage of products and goods for the first time (this year a large number of Russian citizens only the operations of purchase and sale of imported goods have made millions of capitals, some of them for reasons of prestige, friendly ties, but most importantly - to "wash" the shadow funds, investments were made in the movie business).</p> <p>Freedom and expansion of the scale of religious activity.</p> <p>A sharp increase in the flow of emigration of Russians to the West.</p> <p>Visits of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin to the United States: February, June,</p> <p>External harmony of political relations between the US and Russia.</p> <p>The adoption of the US by the pro-Russian "Act for Freedom Support" (Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets), which created the basis for economic assistance by the weakened crisis of the Russian economy.</p> <p>Adoption of the Law "On Education": July 10.</p> <p>Law of the Russian Federation No. 3612-I "Fundamentals of the Legislation of the Russian Federation on Culture": October 9.</p> <p>The Minister of Education of the Russian Federation at first remains appointed in 1991 E.D. Dneprov (1936-2015): until the 4th of December.</p> <p>E.D. Dneprov was the organizer and head of the school reform, based on the principles of the 1988 concept, which was aimed at de-ideologizing, democratizing and updating the national education.</p> <p>Under his leadership, the law "On Education" was prepared, private educational institutions began to open.</p>

	<p>The new Minister of Education of the Russian Federation was appointed Tkachenko: since December 23. As well as E.D. Dneprov, E.V. Tkachenko showed himself as an adherent of humanization and democratization of education, advocated a differentiated education.</p>
1993	<p>Bill Clinton becomes the US President: January 20. Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Canada: April 3-4. The Moscow International Film Festival (1993, July), perhaps for the first time in its history, experienced a shortage of viewers: crowds of thirsty "extra tickets" in dozens of metropolitan cinema halls are a thing of the past. Satisfied with tasty and forbidden in the old days Western films, the mass audience preferred to watch movies on TV and video (already at home, and not in the video rooms that had survived the last few days), not being tempted by the amazing colour reproduction of the festival "kodak" or the loud names of the filmmakers. The publication of President BN. Yeltsin decree No. 1400 on the dissolution of the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Council of Russia: September 21. The breakthrough of the cordon around the House of Soviets of the Russian Federation, the seizure by the group of armed supporters of the Supreme Council of the building of the Moscow mayor's office and the attempted armed seizure of the television center Ostankino: October 3. The dispersal of the rebels with the help of troops entered into the center of Moscow: October 4. A live broadcast of the rebellious White House (the building of the Supreme Council) in Moscow by the American television company CNN, undertaken by Russian special forces units and tanks: October 4.</p>
1994	<p>US President Bill Clinton's visit to Russia: January 12-15. The first joint Russian-American space shuttle program. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Germany: from September 1. Visit of the President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin in the US: September 27-29 The beginning of the first war in Chechnya: December 11-31. Beginning of a sharp drop (roughly halved compared to 1992) of Russian film production, caused by the fact that private investors stopped using cinema as a tool for money laundering, and the state had no financial means to support the film industry in the midst of the economic crisis.</p>
1995	<p>Meeting of US and Russian political leaders in Moscow, which adopted six joint statements, including the irreversibility of the process of reducing nuclear weapons: May 10. Meeting Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton in Canada: June 16. Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists in Budennovsk hospital: June 14-19. Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in the US: October 23. The opening in Moscow of the first in Russia cinema with real multi-channel sound Dolby – "Kodak-Kinomir" (by the beginning of the XXI century in the capital there will be about fifty of them, and halls with new equipment will appear in all large and medium-sized Russian cities).</p>
1996	<p>Meeting of B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Moscow: April 21. Presidential elections in Russia, where B.N. Yeltsin in two rounds with great difficulty defeated the leader of the Communists G.A. Zyuganov: June 16 - July 3. Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed V.G. Kinelev: August 14th. At his post, V.G. Kinelev paid special attention to the introduction of information technologies in the education system. Beginning of the introduction of Bachelor's and Master's programs in Russia: since August 22. Federal Law No. 126-FZ "On State Support for the Cinematography of the Russian Federation": August 22. The end of the first war in Chechnya - Russia and Chechnya - sign a peace agreement. The withdrawal of Russian troops from Chechnya begins: August 31.</p>
1997	<p>President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, NATO Secretary General, NATO Heads of State and Government sign the "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation" in Paris: May 27. The production of Russian films, intended for rental in cinemas, reached the post-Soviet minimum - 43's. Gradual growth of film production will begin in Russia only since 2001.</p>
1998	<p>Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed A.N. Tikhonov (1947-2016): February. Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Birmingham: May 17. Sharp collapse of the rouble in relation to world currencies, default: August 17. US President Bill Clinton's visit to Russia: September 1-3. Minister of Education of the Russian Federation appointed V.M. Philippov: September 30th. During his leadership, the program "Modernization of Russian education for the period until 2010" was developed (and later approved by the Government of the Russian Federation, which included the development of new standards for general secondary education, primary, secondary and higher vocational education, the introduction of a multi-talent system for assessing students' knowledge, support for the</p>

	Bologna Convention by education, the introduction of the Unified State Exam. US air strikes against Iraq: December 16-19.
1999	The gradual increase in world energy prices, which triggered the growth of the Russian economy, continued until August 2008. The conduct of the US and NATO military operation in Yugoslavia, aimed at protecting the Albanian enclave in Kosovo. The beginning of the second war in Chechnya: September 30. Meeting B.N. Yeltsin and B. Clinton in Istanbul: November 18. B.N.'s resignation. Yeltsin from the post of President of Russia: December 31.
2000	Election of the official receiver of Boris B.N. Yeltsyn - V.V. Putin: March 26th. B. Clinton's visit to Russia: June 3-5. The death of the Kursk submarine: August 12. Meeting V.V. Putin and B. Clinton in the United States. Adoption of the Joint Statement "Initiative for Cooperation in the Sphere of Strategic Stability": September 6. The beginning of a gradual increase in film production in Russia.
2001	US President becomes George Bush Jr.: January 20. The first meeting (Ljubljana) of the US President George W. Bush. and the President of Russia V.V. Putin: June 16th. Aviation attacks in New York and Washington: September 11. The US starts the war in Afghanistan: October 7. Visit of V.V. Putin in the US: November. The concept "Modernization of Russian education for the period until 2010": December 29. The tangible growth in production of Russian television series and television films began (from fifty in 2001 to three hundred by the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century). Thanks to the financial support of the state, the number of films gradually increased (although many of them practically did not go to the rental because of their low commercial potential and / or quality), made for cinemas. As a result, since the beginning of the 21st century, film production has grown about three times compared to 2000.
2002	Visit of US President George W. Bush. to Russia: May 23-26. Creation of the NATO-Russia Council: May 28. Denunciation of the US treaty on the limitation of anti-missile defense: June 13. Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists in the House of Culture during the musical performance "Nord-Ost" in Moscow: October 23-26. Visit of US President George W. Bush. to Russia: November.
2003	The US starts the war in Iraq: March 20. Visit of US President George W. Bush to Russia: May 31 - June 1. The signing of the Bologna Convention on Education by Russia: September. The meeting of George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in the US: September 26-27.
2004	The Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed A.A. Fursenko: 9 March. During his leadership, the development of new standards for general secondary education, primary, secondary and higher professional education, support for the Bologna Convention on Education and the Unified State Examination (USE) was continued. Capture of hostages by Chechen terrorists to the school in Beslan: September 1-3. The first official visit of Russian President V.V. Putin in the US: November 13-16. The victory of the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine: November-December. Election of the pro-American V.A. Yushchenko: December 26.
2005	Meeting Presidents George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in Bratislava: February 24. Terror acts in the London Underground: July 7. Iran's resumption of the uranium enrichment program and the rejection of negotiations with the EU. The beginning of the "Iran crisis": August 8. Meeting Presidents George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in the United States: September 16. Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 803 "On the Federal Targeted Program for the Development of Education for 2006-2010": December 23.
2006	"Gas crisis" between Russia and Ukraine: January 1-4. Statement of the President of Russia V.V. Putin on the end of the counter-terrorist operation in Chechnya: January. US Vice President R. Cheney in his speech accuses Russia of using its natural resources as a foreign-policy weapon of pressure, of Russia's violation of human rights and of its destructive actions in the international arena: on May 4.

	<p>The G8 summit in St. Petersburg: July 14-17. Federal Law "On Information, Information Technologies and Information Protection" No. 149-FZ: July 27.</p>
2007	<p>Political conflict between the US and Russia over the US intention to deploy a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. Statement by US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates that the US "should have been prepared for a possible armed conflict with Russia": February 8. Speech V.V. Putin at the Conference on World Security in Munich, sharply criticizing US foreign policy: February 10. Signature of V.V. Putin's decree "On the suspension by the Russian Federation of the Treaty on Conventional Arms in Europe: July 14.</p>
2008	<p>Dmitry Medvedev was elected President of Russia: March 2. The meeting of George W. Bush. and V.V. Putin in Sochi: April 5-6. World oil prices reach a new peak - over 140 dollars per barrel: July. Armed conflict between Georgia and Russia, connected with South Ossetia and Abkhazia: August 8-16. The fall of world oil prices (4.6 times, first to \$ 100 per barrel, and then lower - to \$ 30), the collapse of the key credit and banking consortiums of the United States as the beginning of the worst economic crisis since the 1930s, especially tangible in the dependent on oil exports to the Russian economy: August-December. A sharp fall in the rouble's exchange rate against world currencies: August-December.</p>
2009	<p>US President becomes B. Obama, the beginning of a "reset" of US-Russian relations: January 20. Another "gas crisis" between Russia and Ukraine: January. World oil prices rise to \$ 70 per barrel: June. The first visit of US President Barack Obama to Moscow, his meeting with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Medvedev and Prime Minister V.V. By Putin: July 6-7. US President Barack Obama announces the cancellation of the US decision to deploy anti-missile defense systems in Poland and the Czech Republic: September.</p>
2010	<p>The President of Ukraine was V.F. Yanukovich: February 25th. The signing by President of the United States of America B. Obama and President of the Russian Federation D.A. Medvedev treaty on the limitation of nuclear weapons: April 8.</p>
2011	<p>Turns and uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa (Egypt, Tunisia, Libya). Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 61 "On the Federal Targeted Program for the Development of Education for 2011-2015": February 7. The beginning of the first mass protest actions of the Russian opposition: from December 4. Federal Law of the Russian Federation No. 436-FZ "On protecting children from information that is harmful to their health and development": December 29 (entered into force on September 1, 2012).</p>
2012	<p>President V.V. Putin: May 7th. The Prime Minister appointed D.A. Medvedev. Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed D.V. Livanov: May 21st. In his post, D.V. Livanov (through the introduction of annual monitoring of HEIs) carried out a broad company of reducing the number of higher education institutions in Russia, tried to combat plagiarism in the scientific sphere and advocated the introduction of scientometric indicators of the activity of university teachers and researchers. With him continued a permanent change in university standards. Federal Law No. 139-FZ "On Amending the Federal Law" On Protection of Children from Information Harmful to their Health and Development "and Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation on the Limitation of Access to Illegal Information on the Internet": July 28.</p>
2013	<p>Renunciation of Pope Benedict XVI from the throne: February. The beginning of broadcasting of Public TV of Russia: since May, 19th. The beginning of street protests and armed clashes in Kiev: from November 21.</p>
2014	<p>Winter Olympic Games in Sochi: February 7-23. The actual removal from power of Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich: February 22. Accession of the Crimea to Russia: March 1. The inauguration of the President of Ukraine P.A. Poroshenko: June 7th. The beginning of the military conflict in the Donbass: since April. The beginning of the sanctions of the West (in response to the events in the Crimea and the East of Ukraine) against the Russian Federation: since March. The beginning of Russia's response to the West: March 20. Amendments and additions to Federal Law No. 53 "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" (of June 1, 2005): May 5 (the introduction of amendments and additions to the force from July 1). The beginning of Russia's response food sanctions against the West: August 6.</p>

2015	Establishment of the Eurasian Economic Union: January 1. Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 497 "On the Federal Target Program for the Development of Education for 2016-2020": May 23. The beginning of the Russian military operation in Syria: September 30. Crisis of relations between Russia and Turkey over the shot down of Russian military aircraft Su-24 on the border of Syria and Turkey: from November 24.
2016	Results of the referendum in the UK: the British voted for the country's withdrawal from the EU (Brexit): June 23. Attempt of military coup in Turkey: July 15-16. The Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation appointed O.Y. Vasylieva: on August, 19. D. Trump election as US President: November 8.
2017	The official entry into office of US President D. Trump: January 20. The signing of D. Trump of the law, providing for the imposition of additional sanctions against Russia: August 2.

Russian audiovisual texts of 1992-2017 on the subject of the school and university, unlike Soviet times, were no longer controlled by the state, and therefore could not coincide in their tasks with the main lines of state policy in the educational sphere, which officially supported:

- combination of private and public property of educational institutions;
- modernization of the education system, introduction of new information technologies, distance education;
- development and implementation of new standards for all educational levels;
- introduction of a multi-point system for assessing students' knowledge;
- development of normative per capita financing for general secondary education;
- The Bologna Convention on Education,
- Unified state examination in schools;
- reducing the number of "inefficient" universities;
- the fight against plagiarism and poor scientific research;
- fighting corruption in educational institutions;
- Introduction scientometric indicators of the activity of university teachers and researchers.

The degree of influence of these official trends on films about the school and university, as reality showed, was indirect. Certainly, in a number of cinematographs, the activity of private schools was shown, on the screens (especially in the tapes of the 21st century), modern computers appeared in the classrooms, sometimes in the dialogue of films there could be talk about the Unified State Exam and plagiarism. From time to time there were film episodes related to pedagogical corruption. However, in general, films about the school and university were not concentrated on the educational process, but on the interpersonal and love relationships of the main characters.

How does the knowledge of real historical events of a particular period help to understand the given media texts, examples of historical references in these media texts?

Of course, the knowledge of historical events helps to understand post-Soviet films on the topic of school and university. For example, the analysis of the political and socio-cultural situation of the last years of the Stalinist regime allows for a better understanding of the author's concept and the plot of the drama *What a wonderful game* (1995), and the knowledge of the historical events of the 1980s-1990s gives the key to understanding the film by S. Soloviev *Tender Age* (2000). A lot of historical references are contained in such films as *The Disappeared Empire* (2007); *Hipsters* (2008); *The Institute of Noble Maidens* (2010-2011); *Private Pioneers* (2012); *Dolly Sheep was angry and died early* (2014), *I am a teacher* (2015), and others.

2. Socio-cultural, ideological, ideological, religious context (dominant concepts: media agencies, media / media categories, media representations and media audience).

Ideology, directions, goals, objectives, world outlook, the concepts of the authors of these media texts in the socio-cultural context; ideology, culture of the world, depicted in media texts.

In the post-Soviet era, communist ideology (including anti-capitalist theory of socialist realism) and atheism in Russia lost their dominant positions (although the communist faction throughout the post-Soviet years occupied dozens of seats in the State Duma), and cinematography was deprived of censorship. Therefore (especially before the entry into force in 2012 of the Federal Law No. 139-FZ "On

Amending the Federal Law "On the Protection of Children from Information Harmful to their Health and Development" and certain legislative acts of the Russian Federation on the issue of restricting access to unlawful information in the Internet "and changes and amendments to Federal Law No. 53" On the State Language of the Russian Federation"(2005) – from July 1, 2014) in films on the school-student topic, one could find an abundance of sexual scenes (*Physics or Chemistry*, 2011), and obscene vocabulary (*Everyone will die, but I'll stay*, 2008). The world view of the authors of many media texts about the school and university was extremely tolerant of such factors perceived in the Soviet negatively as egoism, snobbery, greed, lies, domination based on threats, physical violence, teenage sexual relations, smoking, drinking (and in some cases – even light drugs (see, for example, the series *Physics or Chemistry*), etc. Wealth, sexual pleasure and entertainment largely determined the culture of the world depicted in Russian media texts about school and the university of the XXI century (*School number 1*, 2007; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014-2017; *Philological Faculty*, 2017 and others.).

The world view of the characters of the "school world", depicted in media texts

In general, the world view of the characters of audiovisual media texts on the theme of the post-Soviet school and university was optimistic (although in many cases directed to the world of entertainment and sex), however, pessimism often arose due to feelings of loneliness, poverty, hopelessness and hopelessness of life, professional " (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Everyone Dies and I'll Stay*, 2008; *The Roof*, 2009; *School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher's Day*, 2012; *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *And the balloon will return*, 2013; *Correction Class*, 2014, *I will not return*, 2014; *Clinch*, 2015; *Teacher*, 2015, *Pupil*, 2016, etc.). Among the characters (schoolchildren, students and teachers), bright personalities still stood out, but they were much less inclined to meditation and doubt, but were ready for active actions on the "love front" (*Hipsters*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teachers*, 2014; *Beloved Teacher*, 2016; *Freshman*, 2016, etc.

At the same time, a small number of films were filmed on the school and university topic, which largely inherited the traditions of Soviet cinema, where the "old-fashioned" hierarchy of values dominated (diligence, honesty, willingness to help good or backsliding people): *Simple Trues* (1999-2003); *The Disappeared Empire* (2007); *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina* (2008), *Private Pioneers'* (2012); *The Mother's Diary of the First-grader* (2014); *Dolly Sheep was angry and died early* (2014); *Village Teacher* (2015), *Ghost* (2015); *Good Boy* (2016); *To Save Pushkin* (2017), etc.

Structure and methods of narration in these media texts (dominant concepts: media / media categories, media technologies, media languages, media representations)

Schematically structure, plot, representativeness, ethics, features of genre modification, iconography, character characters of audiovisual media texts of school and university subjects of the post-Soviet era can be represented as follows:

- *the place and time of the action of media texts*. The main place of action: classes, auditoriums, corridors, yards, apartments, private mansions; The duration of the action is mostly (if not retro) the year of filming of a particular film;

- *the environment, everyday objects typical for these media*: the furnishings and objects of everyday life of films sometimes remain, as in the Soviet times, modest, but more and more often elitist educational institutions, apartments and houses of the provided layers of society are shown (*Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Closed School*, 2011-2012; *Teachers*, 2014, etc.);

- *genre modifications of school and university subjects*: comedy, drama, melodrama;

- *(stereotypical) methods of depicting reality*: positive characters rarely show up in an idealized version, and negative ones too, as a rule, are presented ambiguously, although there are relapses from times of socialist realism.

Typology of characters (character traits, clothing, physique, vocabulary, facial expressions, character gestures, the presence or absence of a stereotypical manner of representing the characters in these media texts):

- *the age of the characters*: the age of schoolchildren is in the range of 7-17 years, however, there are more frequent characters-senior pupils; the age of students is generally in the range of 18 to 25 years; the age of the remaining characters (teachers, teachers, parents, grandparents, etc.) can be any, but adults up to the age of 60 prevail;

- *level of education*: for schoolchildren and students corresponds to the class and course of study, teachers presumably graduated from universities, the formation of other characters can be of any level;

- *social status, profession*: the financial situation of students is highly differentiated, they can be both from poor families, from families of businessmen, rich officials. The professions of their parents are in a fairly diverse range.

- *the marital status of the characters*: schoolchildren, naturally, are not bound by marriage; students in general are also not in a hurry to get married; adult characters are mostly married; but teachers, on the contrary, are lonely (the latter is increasingly becoming an occasion for plot twists connected with the loving relationships of teachers / teachers with students);

- *appearance, clothes, physique of characters, features of their characters, vocabulary*: the appearance of the characters of schoolchildren and students in the films of the post-Soviet period is beyond the strict framework. This can be a form of elite private educational institution, and free clothing.

A shot from the film *School* (2010) gives an idea of the appearance, clothes, and physique of post-Soviet schoolchildren.



School (2010)

Schoolchildren and students in the Russian films of 1992-2017, unlike similar characters of Soviet films, speak with the help of rough slang, sometimes even obscene vocabulary, although, of course, there are films where it does not exist, or almost none (for example, *Private pioneers* ', 2012).

Teachers from the films of the post-Soviet era, as a rule, are no longer intellectuals; the respectful distance between them and the students is practically broken (this was especially evident in such films as *School* (2010); *Physics or Chemistry* (2011); *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Teachers* (2014); *Clinch* (2015); *Teacher* (2015); *Beloved Teacher* (2016); *Teacher of physical education* (2014-2017); *Good Boy* (2016), etc. But now they can already afford many (free) liberties in their clothes.

A shot from the film *Physics or Chemistry* (2011) reflects the appearance, clothes, physique of the characters-educators of the post-Soviet years.



Physics or Chemistry (2011)

A significant change in the life of media characters and the problem that has arisen (a violation of the usual life):

Option number 1: among the characters, schoolchildren / students living a normal life, are those who for some reason do not fit into the standard framework of interpersonal communication and learning process, that is:

- try to dominate, subordinate students to themselves, while acting with cruel methods (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011, etc.);

- stand out among other students with their eccentricity (both with a plus sign and with a minus sign) and because of what they come into conflict with the class and / or teachers (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Correction Class*, 2014; *Pupil*, 2016, etc.);

- fall in love (*Rypkina's Love*, 1993; *Let's Make love*, 2002; *The Disappeared Empire*, 2007; *School No. 1*, 2007; *Hipsters*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *Children under 16 ...* (2010); *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Private Pioneers'*, 2012; *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Dolly the Sheep was angry and died early; 14+*, 2015; *Beloved teacher*, 2016; *Philological Faculty*, 2017, etc.);

Option number 2: among ordinary characters-teachers, there are non-ordinary – those who also do not fit into the standard school framework, that is, they try:

- to resist outdated and / or, from their point of view, incorrect methods of the director and / or teaching staff and come into conflict with him / them (*Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher of Physical Education, 2014-2017*; *Village teacher, 2015* and other);

- Establish a particularly trusting relationship with students, although sometimes it is very difficult (*Simple Truths*, 1999-2003; *Teacher in Law*, 2007; *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina*, 2008; *School*, 2010; *Physics or chemistry*, 2011; *Geographer Burned the globe*, 2013; *Teachers*, 2014; *Teacher of Physical Education, 2014-2017*; *Village teacher, 2015*; *Teacher*, 2015; *Beloved Teacher*, 2016; *Pupil*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016; *To Save Pushkin*, 2017, etc.).

Solution of the problem:

Option number 1 (student):

- "correct" characters (schoolchildren, students, teachers, teachers, parents, adult acquaintances) return individual and / or loving students to ordinary life by individual and joint efforts (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *Teacher*, 2015, etc.);

- non-standard students remain with their beliefs, because they do not succumb to pedagogical / parental influences (*Touched*, 2005; *Everyone will die and I'll stay*, 2008; *Hipsters*, 2008; *Yulenska*, 2008; *Barvikha*, 2009; *School*, 2010; *Golden*, 2011; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Correction Class*, 2014; *Pupil*, 2016, etc.);

Option number 2 (pedagogical):

- Unconventional teachers gain a victory (*Teacher in Law*, 2007; *The Adult Life of the Girl by Polina Subbotina*, 2008; *Teachers*, 2014; *Village Teacher*, 2015, etc.);

- the result of the relationship of teachers with students is ambiguous ... (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011, *Geographer Burned the Globe*, 2013; *Teacher of Physical Education*, 2014, *Teacher*, 2015; *Student*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016, etc.).

As for the gender aspect of the school-university theme, but like the last decades of the USSR, in the Russian cinematography among the teachers / teachers the dominant are women, increasingly single and / or uncomfortable (*School*, 2010; *Physics or Chemistry*, 2011; *Teacher*, 2015; *Pupil*, 2016; *Good Boy*, 2016, etc.).

Conclusions

Most of the films about the school and university of the post-Soviet period were based on stereotypes that largely reflected the significant changes that occurred after the collapse of the USSR and the transition of Russia to the capitalist path of development. In general, the images of teachers and students have undergone a strong transformation. For example, many characters-students of Russian school-student films of the XXI century can be characterized by the old Russian word "mob": they (almost) lack intellect, they do not have positive life perspectives and interests, and "those who are not used to picking up every day and to fall asleep in an embrace with a bottle, in this not tragic, but hopeless world there is only one. First you need to trample in a disco ... then you need to kiss in the entranceway against indecent inscriptions, then you can ride around the area on a motor scooter, and in the finale ... Well, you know yourself. Probably not small!" [Ivanov, 2015]. Another (smaller) part of the characters is the so-called "majors", the children of wealthy parents whose interests are also mostly sexually entertaining, but there is a clear life hedonistic perspective. The third group (very few) consists of aggressive individuals striving for total domination: "The class, as a community, in a state of chaos, begins to spontaneously establish its own understanding of the order, almost always reproducing the signs

of archaic societies that gravitate towards" shadow "(mafia) or criminal structures. Relations are built and governed by the right of the strong. In relations between pupils, blackmail and bribery are widely used, "scapegoat" is chosen, rigid differentiation is established for the dominant and subordinate, almost permanently in a state of liminality (humiliation and deprivation of rights, lack of personal significance). Most often, power is captured by an informal leader, endowed with psychotypical signs of a charismatic, skillfully manipulating his adepts. It is such a leader that begins to confront the authority of the teacher, and between them a duel unfolds, the outcome of which is always unpredictable" [Kruglova, 2016, p.103]. And, finally, the fourth group (also small) of school-student characters is the heirs of the good old Soviet cinema: smart, honest, purposeful, friendly and principled.

As for the images of educators, in recent years there has been an increasing number of lonely, beggars, lost vital signs and, by and large, interest in the profession (which has a very low social status), teachers and teachers who are not respected by students; "The authority of the teacher is extremely low and is not supported even at the level of formal adherence to the rules. The resource for managing the process of mastering knowledge appears either as exhausted or as unreliable. Teachers are not actually representatives of the authorities, they are translators of officially accepted cultural and social norms, but this function united the classical school at all stages of its history - from the beginning of the New Time to the end of the industrial society" [Kruglova, 2016, p. 103]. In such a context, such degrading images of a teacher and a pedagogical university sound like "uchilka", "sludge", "prepod" in the jargon of which such words as "unsuccessful", "beggar", "absurd", "boring", "loser", "hopelessly behind the modern life".

In contrast to them, there are images of authoritarian teacher-managers who occupy the administrative chairs of the director, the head teacher, the dean, etc. And only a small group of film characters are talented and creative teachers dedicated to their work.

In the 21st century, the priority of the series in school-student subjects was clearly indicated. Of course, first of all, this was due to the fact that it was practically impossible to make money on film distribution of films about the school and university, and the television series (even artistically insignificant ones) brought substantial profits from advertising revenues. But on the other hand, the ideological factor is also important, because "ideology explains, but the series explains. Ideology leads, but the series forces, only makes it more subtle. The ideology is abstract, the series is concrete. But the most important thing in the other: ideology acts on the mind, the series - on the heart. Therefore, the process of influence of ideology is noticeable, the process of exposure of the series is hidden. ... If the news does it directly, then the series is in a soft form. It stands between the poles of the Order and the Request. The series justifies the world, explaining the logic of even wrong actions" [Pocheptsov, 2017]. Hence the triumph of the author's tolerant (as it were neutral) attitude toward meanness, aggressive psychological dominance and lies (and even easy drugs) in such series as *School*, *Golden*, *Physics or Chemistry*, etc. Thus, serial versions of school-student reality, in our opinion, to some extent affect the reality of this.

So, the analysis of Russian films of 1992-2017 on the school-university theme shows that:

- the educational / educational process left in the past the Soviet framework of communist orientations and anti-religious orientation;
- the number of entertaining interpretations has sharply increased;
- the stories are not directly related to key international political events, although they are to some extent dependent on domestic political attitudes;
- the main conflicts are built on the confrontation of extraordinary teachers and students with stagnation, bureaucracy, the grayness of the bosses / colleagues / team; very often the focus is on problem areas (crisis, disappointment and fatigue, professional "burnout" of teachers, bureaucracy, corruption, pragmatic cynicism of students, teenage cruelty, etc.);
- among the characters distinctly manifested property differentiation;
- the pupil characters are basically divided into the following categories: optimistic and vital perspectives (often associated with material status and hedonism), or in a state of depression and hopelessness;
- activity of students is more directed towards entertainment, sex and material gain;
- the attitude of teachers and students has lost the barriers of subordination, largely because the prestige of the pedagogical profession in the eyes of students and the public continued to fall;

- in the pedagogical collectives, the images of female teachers, often lonely and unsettled, still come to the fore;
- the appearance of students and teachers has become even more "free", vividly denoting female sex appeal;
- film stories about students, in contrast to a number of Soviet counterparts, are virtually devoid of intellectual disputes, but are densely immersed in the genre element of melodrama and / or comedy; and in general, the theme of love in the cinema on the school-university theme is for the most part given accented comedic and / or melodramatic aspect.

References

- Alenushkina, V. (2013). Mom, I want to be a pioneer! *Ovideo.ru*. September, 15. <http://www.ovideo.ru/review/42769#ixzz4nyWXaXFX>
- Arkhangelsky, A. (2015). We are an uplifting nightmare. *Ogonek*. 2015. August, 17. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2785973>
- Arkhangelsky, A. (2017). The poet did not die. *Ogonek*. May, 1. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3281128>
- Aronson, O.V. (2003). *Meta Cinema*. Moscow: Ad Marginem.
- Artamonova, A. (2013). School for Fools. *New Kaliningrad*. 2013. <https://www.newkaliningrad.ru/afisha/cinema/reviews/2814963-shkola-dlya-durakov.html>
- Bazalgette, C. (1995). *Key Aspects of Media Education*. Moscow: Association for Film Education.
- Bednov, S. (2012). Sleepless after school. *Trud*. No. 173. November 27.
- Belokurov, B. (2009). The novel about the girls. *Tomorrow*. № 16 (804). April, 15.
- Bogomolov, Y. Love them with black ones. *Cinema Art*. 2010. № 1. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article25>
- Bykov, D. (2007). Eastern syndrome. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/lostempire/vostochniy-sindrom/>
- Changes and amendments to the Federal Law of May 5, 2014 to Federal Law No. 53 On the State Language of the Russian Federation* (dated June 1, 2005). <http://base.garant.ru/12140387/#friends#ixzz4p3qU4Uo0>
- Derenkovskaya, E. (2008). *People with disabilities*. <http://kg-portal.ru/movies/rozygrysh/reviews/3887/>
- Dolin, A. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe - everyday cinema about real people*. November, 7. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1410641/>
- Dolin, A. (2014). Debut was a success: why it is worth looking at *Class correction* by Ivan Tverdovsky. September, 25. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1418754/>
- Dolin, A. (2014). *Graduation: our American Pie*. *Afisha*. October, 14. <https://daily.afisha.ru/archive/vozduh/cinema/vypusknoy-nash-amerikanskiy-pirog/>
- Dolin, A. (2016). *A good boy*. *Vesti FM*. November, 11. <http://radiovesti.ru/brand/61178/episode/1432282/>
- Dolin, A. (2016). *Student of Serebrennikov and Listening to Beethoven* of Harry Bardin: the Russians in Cannes. *Afisha*. May, 13. <https://daily.afisha.ru/cinema/1507-uchenik-serebrennikova-i-slushaya-bethovena-garri-bardina-russkie-v-kannah/>
- Dondurei, D.B. PR-content, content-PR. *School* as an example of producer's work. *Cinema Art*. 2010. № 1. <http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article2>
- Eco, U. (1998). *Lack of Structure. Introduction to Semiology*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 432 p.
- Eco, U. (2005). *The Role of the Reader. Studies on the Semiotics of the Text*. St. Petersburg: Symposium, 502 p.
- Fanaylova, E. (2009). None of us will get out of here alive. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/vseumrut/nikto-iz-nas-ne-vyyidet-otsyuda-zhivym/>
- Fedorov, A.V., Levitskaya, A.A., Gorbatkova, O.I. (2017). School and university in the mirror of audiovisual media texts: basic approaches to the research problem. *Media education*, № 2.
- Gladilchikov, Y. (2013). Dreams about Russia. Dream 1-st: *Geographer*. *Moscow News*. October, 31.
- Golubev, D. (2017). *Philological Faculty: Quiet humanitarian horror*. *New view*. <http://www.newlookmedia.ru/?p=53076>
- Gordeev, V. (2010). *School*. *Screen.ru*. October, 12. <http://www.ekrank.ru/film/2385/>
- Govorushko, U. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe*. *25th frame*. 2013. <http://25-k.com/page.php?id=3337>
- Gusyatinsky, E. (2009). Pure specifically. *Seance*. № 37-38. <http://seance.ru/n/37-38/movies-37-38/vseumrut/nikto-iz-nas-ne-vyyidet-otsyuda-zhivym/>
- Hoffman, A. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe*. *25th frame*. <http://25-k.com/page.php?id=3337>
- Ivanov, B. (2014). School years are horrible. *Film.ru*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/shkolnye-gody-uzhasnye>
- Ivanov, B. (2015). A friend from the future. *Film.ru*. 2015. February, 18. <https://www.film.ru/articles/drug-iz-budushego>
- Ivanov, B. (2015). Little Vika. *Film.ru*. October, 2. <https://www.film.ru/articles/malenkaya-vika>

- Ivanov, B. (2016). Stupid of the Heavenly King. *Film.ru*. October, 25. <https://www.film.ru/articles/oluh-carya-nebesnogo>
- Karakhan, L. *School. Snob*. 2010. January, 15. https://snob.ru/selected/entry/11457#comment_47410
- Khlebnikova, V. (2016). On the fence painted boy. *Cinema Art*. № 6. <http://www.kinoart.ru/archive/2016/06/nazabore-narisovan-malchik-khoroshij-malchik-rezhisser-oksana-karas>
- Khokhlov, B. (2014). Exercises in the beautiful. *Film.ru*. 2014. May, 15. <https://www.film.ru/articles/uprazhneniya-v-prekrasnom>
- Khokhlov, B. (2014). The main thing is not to get lost. *Afisha*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/glavnoe-ne-zapalitsya>
- Khokhlov, B. (2017). Real botanists. *Film.ru*. <https://www.film.ru/articles/realnye-botany>
- Khrenov, N.A. (2006). *Cinema - rehabilitation of archetypal reality*. Moscow: Agraf, 704 p.
- Khrenov, N.A. (2008). *Images of the "Great Gap". Cinema in the context of changing cultural cycles*. Moscow: Progress-tradition, 536 p.
- Khrustalev, V. (2009). *Grachevsky filmed his film, but without blackjack and whores: The Roof*. <http://www.obzorkino.tv/2009/11/04/krysha/>
- Kichin, V. (2013). I give a private pioneer. Cinema as a way to reconcile the era. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6187 (211). <https://rg.ru/2013/09/18/kino-site.html>
- Kichin, V. (2013). The place of punishment is the school. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6212 (236). October, 21.
- Kichin, V. (2014). The Tunnel at the End of the World. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. No. 6486 (214). September, 12.
- Koretsky, V. (2009). *Yulenska*. *Timeout.ru*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/142480/review>
- Korsakov, D. (2014). Jubilant Students. *Vedomosti*. No. 3699, October, 20. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2014/10/20/likuyuschaya-shkolota>
- Korsakov, D. (2014). The orphan was on the highway. *Vedomosti*. No. 3612. June, 19. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/newspaper/articles/2014/06/19/shla-sirootka-po-shosse>
- Korsakov, D. (2015). Romeo will live long time. *Vedomosti*. No. 3933. October, 6. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2015/10/07/611719-film-14-odin-luchshih-otechestvennih-filmov-goda>
- Korsakov, D. (2016). New *Eralash*. *Vedomosti*. No. 4201. November, 10. <https://www.vedomosti.ru/lifestyle/articles/2016/11/11/664443-horoshii-malchik-anekdotov>
- Kotov, D. (2015). Take care of the honor from the youth. *PostCriticism*. October, 9. <http://postcriticism.ru/chastnoe-pionerskoe/>
- Kruglova, T.A. (2016). Stockholm syndrome in the Russian school: film *Uchilka*. *Philological class*. No. 1 (43), pp. 102-107.
- Kudryavtsev, S.V. (2007). *A tender age*. <http://kinanet.livejournal.com/573761.html>
- Kulikov, I. (2008). About life. *Film.ru*. October, 24. <https://www.film.ru/articles/pro-zhyzn>
- Kuvshinova, M. (2013). The shadow of the teacher. *Seance*. November, 7. http://seance.ru/blog/reviews/geograph_kuvshinova/
- Kuzmina, O. (2012). TV series *After school*: inedible TV set. *Evening Moscow*. No. 215, p. 5.
- Lisitsyna, A. (2012). School of Skolkovo coffee makers. *Gazeta.ru*. November, 16. https://www.gazeta.ru/culture/2012/11/16/a_4856413.shtml
- Litovchenko, A. (2015). The cruel beauty is far away. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. October, 7. <https://rg.ru/2015/10/07/odinchetyre-site.html>
- Loshakova, D. (2014). *Graduation*: when we leave the schoolyard ... *Weburg*. <http://weburg.net/news/51079>
- Lyashchenko, V. (2008). *Joke*. *Afisha*. May, 28. <https://www.afisha.ru/movie/186559/review/224041/>
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2012). And once again study. *Results*. № 47
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2014). *Class of correction*. *The Hollywood Reporter*. September, 23. <http://thr.ru/cinema/recenzia-klass-korrekcii/>
- Lyubarskaya, I. (2015). *Clinch*. *The Hollywood Reporter*. October, 23. <http://thr.ru/cinema/recenzia-klinc-sergea-puskepalisa/>
- Machenin, A.A. (2016). The Collective Image of the School Teacher in Reflection of the Tele / Film / Internet Media Space. *Media Education*. No. 3. C. 23-48.
- Malyukova, L. (2015). "Beat the muzzles ... better with your feet". *Novaya Gazeta*. October, 5. <https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2015/10/05/65877-171-bit-mordy-8230-luchshe-nogami-187>
- Maslova, L. (2009). Psychology of Invertebrates. *Kommersant*. February, 20.
- Maslova, L. (2014). The Tale of the Hitchhiking. *Kommersant*. June, 18. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2492979>
- Matizen, V. (2013). What the geographer did not drink. *New Izvestia*. November, 13. <https://newizv.ru/news/culture/13-11-2013/192321-chego-ne-propil-geograf>
- Narinskaya, A. (2012). *After school* - without form. *Kommersant*. November, 20.
- Nefedov, E. (2009). *Yulenska*. *World-art*. February, 21. <http://www.world-art.ru/cinema/cinema.php?id=21667>
- Nefedov, E. (2010). Children under 16... *World Art*. September, 29. <http://www.world-art.ru/cinema/cinema.php?id=26443>

- Nikolaev, I. (2015). Uchilka will teach the life of both junior and senior. *Evening Moscow*. November, 27. [Http://vm.ru/news/2015/11/27/uchilka-nauchit-zhizni-i-mladshih-i-starshih-304403.html](http://vm.ru/news/2015/11/27/uchilka-nauchit-zhizni-i-mladshih-i-starshih-304403.html)
- Paisova, E., Dementieva, A. (2010). Hamsters protest, and this is good. *Cinema Art*. № 1. [Http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article4](http://kinoart.ru/archive/2010/01/n1-article4)
- Petition: ban for the film 14+. (2015). <https://www.change.org/p/%D1%87%D0%B5%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%83-%D0%B7%D0%B0%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%82%D0%B8%D1%82%D1%8C-%D1%84%D0%B8%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BC-14>
- Plakhov, A. (2015). Jinn from a bottle of liquor. *Kommersant*. October, 12. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2831039>
- Pocheptsov, G.G. (2017). Democracy and serials: they are constructed in the same way for single purposes. *Khvilya*. August, 6. <http://hvylya.net/analytics/society/demokratiya-i-serialyi-oni-postroenyi-odinakovo-i-dlya-edinyih-tseley.html>
- Potapova, G. (2017). Poet in Russia is not sold until he was killed. *Movie poster*. April, 27. <https://www.kinoafisha.info/reviews/8326845/>
- Potter, W.J. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks – London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Raikhlina, E.L., Yurchik, N.N. (2016). The image of a teacher in Russian cinema. *Young scientist*. № 13.2, pp. 60-62.
- Razlogov, K. (2010). *School. Snob*. January, 15. https://snob.ru/selected/entry/11457#comment_47410
- Ruzaev, D. (2013). *The Geographer Burned the Globe*. *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/291256/review>
- Ruzaev, D. (2014). *I will not return*. *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/42854#review>
- Ruzaev, D. (2015). Love on the Mikrazh. *Time Out*. October, 8. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/356139>
- Sazonov, A. (2010). *Children under 16...* *Time Out*. <http://www.timeout.ru/msk/artwork/180909/review>
- Shakina, O. (2014). All conditionally, as in folklore crying. *Colta.ru*. September, 25. [Http://www.colta.ru/articles/cinema/4778](http://www.colta.ru/articles/cinema/4778)
- Shipulina, N.B. (2010). The image of a teacher in Soviet and modern Russian cinema. *Izvestiya VSPU*. № 8 (52), pp. 4-16.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut – London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Sobolev, O. (2014). And laughter, and sin: the series *Physical education teacher*. May, 6. <http://www.interviewrussia.ru/movie/i-smeh-i-greh-serial-fizruk>
- Sosnovsky, D. (2015). History of the story was stolen. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. November, 26. <https://rg.ru/2015/11/26/uchilka-site.html>
- Sosnovsky, D. (2016). I do not want to study, I want to pray. *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. October, 15. <https://rg.ru/2016/10/15/uchenik-chackij-v-iubke-protiv-mraka-i-bezysgodnosti-etoj-strany.html>
- Sputnitskaya, N.Y. (2016). *The problem of gender in contemporary Russian cinema and serials: a critical introduction*. Moscow: Academy of Media Industry, 126 p.
- The series *School* angered Moscow officials (2010). <https://lenta.ru/news/2010/01/12/schule/>
- Trofimenkov, M. (2016). The eternal youth of adults. *Kommersant*. November, 12. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3138067>
- Trofimenkov, M. (2016). Vaudeville on the downed pants. *Kommersant*. October 15. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/3117697>
- Ukhov, E. (2013). Vitya Sluzhkin at school and at home. *Film.ru*. October, 27. <https://www.film.ru/articles/vitya-sluzhkin-v-shkole-i-doma>
- Ukhov, E. (2014). Stand up and go. *Film.ru*. September, 11. <https://www.film.ru/articles/vstan-i-idi>
- Ukhov, E. (2015). Class 2015. *Film.ru*. November, 29. <https://www.film.ru/articles/klass-2015>
- Ukhov, E. (2015). The Hostage. *Film.ru*. October, 18. <https://www.film.ru/articles/zalozhnica>
- Ukhov, E. (2017). A wonderful moment of the past future. *Film.ru*. April, 29. <https://www.film.ru/articles/chudnoe-mgnovenie-minuvshogo-buduschego>
- Vilenkin, D. (2014). Redemption by brooms. *Postcriticism.ru*. 2014. May, 8. <http://postcriticism.ru/iskuplenie-venikami/>
- Volobuev, R. (2008). Cannes laureate, an authentic film about high school students. *Afisha*. 2008. October, 8. <https://www.afisha.ru/movie/188389/review/247240/>
- Volobuev, R. (2010). Lovely Bones. *Afisha*. January, 19. <https://www.afisha.ru/blogcomments/6037/>
- Yushchenko, A. (2010). *Rules of sex*. *Filmz.ru*. September, 20. http://www.filmz.ru/pub/7/20584_1.htm
- Zaretskaya, J. (2013). Love the Khabensky whitish. *Fontanka.ru*. November, 7. <http://calendar.fontanka.ru/articles/1127/>