Critical Representation of Family in Turkish Cinema: An Analysis of Majority and Nobody's Home Films

Türk Sinemasında Ailenin Eleştirel Temsili: Çoğunluk ve Köksüz Filmlerinin Analizi

Emine AKÇELİK[1][2]

Alkan ÜSTÜN[3]

Abstract

This study examines the critical representation of family in contemporary Turkish cinema through an analysis of two films: *Majority* (2010) by Seren Yüce and *Nobody's Home* (2013) by Deniz Akçay. Traditionally, Turkish cinema has portrayed the family as a sacred institution with predominantly positive attributes, reflecting the sociocultural values of Turkish society. However, these selected films challenge conventional representations by highlighting the destructive aspects of family relationships, particularly regarding individual autonomy and identity formation. Utilizing content analysis methodology, the research explores how these films depict families as environments where emotional and psychological imprisonment occurs, contrasting sharply with idealized family portrayals in earlier Turkish cinema. The theoretical framework draws upon functionalist, feminist, and postmodernist perspectives on family, as well as concepts from critical theorists including Freud, the Frankfurt School, and Laing. The findings reveal how both films illustrate the phenomenon of "internalized imprisonment" where family members, though conscious of their constraints, cannot escape familial authority structures. This study contributes to understanding the evolving representation of family in Turkish cinema and how it reflects broader societal changes in family ideology and structures.

Keywords: Turkish Cinema, Family Representation, Critical Perspective, Identity Formation, Family Ideology.

Öz

Bu çalışma, Seren Yüce'nin *Çoğunluk* (2010) ve Deniz Akçay'ın *Köksüz* (2013) filmlerinin analizi üzerinden çağdaş Türk sinemasında ailenin eleştirel temsilini incelemektedir. Geleneksel olarak Türk sineması, Türk toplumunun sosyokültürel değerlerini yansıtan, ağırlıklı olarak olumlu niteliklere sahip kutsal bir kurum olarak aileyi tasvir etmiştir. Öte yandan bu çalışma kapsamında ele alınan bu filmler özellikle bireysel özerklik ve kimlik oluşumu bakımından aile ilişkilerinin yıkıcı yönlerini vurgulayarak geleneksel temsillere meydan okumaktadır. İçerik analizi tekniğini kullanan araştırma, seçilen bu iki filmin aileleri duygusal ve psikolojik mahkûmiyetin gerçekleştiği ortamlar olarak, erken dönem Türk sinemasındaki idealleştirilmiş aile tasvirlerinden nasıl keskin bir şekilde farklılaştıklarını çözümlemektedir. Çalışmanın teorik çerçevesi, işlevselci, feminist ve postmodernist aile perspektiflerinin yanı sıra Freud, Frankfurt Okulu ve Laing gibi eleştirel teorisyenlerin kavramlarından yararlanmaktadır. Bulgular, her iki filmin de aile bireylerinin kısıtlanmalarının bilincinde olmalarına rağmen ailesel otorite yapılarından kaçamadıklarını ve "içselleştirilmiş mahkûmiyet" olgusunu nasıl gösterdiklerini serimlemektedir. Bu çalışma, Türk sinemasında ailenin değişen temsilini ve bunun aile ideolojisi ile aile yapılarındaki daha geniş toplumsal değişimleri nasıl yansıttığını anlamaya katkı sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk Sineması, Aile Temsili, Eleştirel Perspektif, Kimlik Oluşumu, Aile İdeolojisi.

---

[1] Arş. Gör. Dr., Bartın Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Bölümü, emineakcelik@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-3003-9195

[2] Sorumlu Yazar (Corresponding Author)

[3] Doç. Dr., Bartın Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Bölümü, alkanustun@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-3616-8193

Introduction

This research undertakes an analysis of the critical approach to the family institution in Turkish cinema through an examination of two films: *Majority* (2010), directed by Seren Yüce, and *Nobody's Home* (2013), directed by Deniz Akçay. The study is structured in several sections: the first and second parts examine the position of the family institution in society and its treatment in sociological literature, followed by an exploration of family ideology and theoretical frameworks within functionalist, feminist, postmodernist paradigms, and other conceptual approaches. The third section investigates family representation in Turkish cinema, while the fourth section details the methodological approach employed in this research. The fifth section offers a detailed analysis of the aforementioned films through the concept of internalized imprisonment. The research concludes with a synthesis that articulates key findings and their broader implications.

Family represents the fundamental institution where individuals begin their socialization process, where they acquire social norms, customs, and traditions, and where they internalize societal expectations and roles. In sociological discourse, the family institution has typically been examined through an affirmative perspective, emphasizing its role as the primary agent of socialization alongside its biological, sexual, psychological, economic, educational, religious, and related functions, with critical perspectives often marginalized. From a critical standpoint, family analysis has largely been confined to gender dynamics, focusing particularly on women's unequal position within family structures and issues of domestic violence.

The family, as an enduring and often sanctified social institution, continues to be portrayed in cinema -particularly Turkish cinema- predominantly in accordance with conventional sociological understandings. According to Abisel (2005, p. 77) family in Turkish cinema is generally portrayed in a "positive" manner, rarely incorporating objective or negative examples. Cinematic representations of family typically manifest through idealized constructs. Oktan suggests that, particularly after 1960 with the advent of the social realist perspective, films began to be produced that adopted a more critical approach in terms of family representation compared to the early period of Turkish cinema (Oktan, 2018).

While existing literature has largely analyzed this subject as "the transformation of family in cinema," this research focuses specifically on critical perspectives in contemporary films rather than chronicling the evolutionary trajectory of family representation. Indeed, films that preserve the sanctity of family and emphasize solely its positive functions remain prevalent in contemporary cinema. This study deliberately selects films that adopt a critical stance toward the family institution, rather than those highlighting its positive aspects.

In the existing literature, including articles and theses, subjects are generally examined through films under thematic categories such as family, marriage, divorce, domestic violence, or women's familial positioning, either through theoretical frameworks or specific methodological approaches. This article structures its analysis through sequential examinations of family conceptualization, family-related theories, family representation in Turkish cinema, critical perspectives on the family institution, and detailed analyses of *Majority* and *Nobody's Home*.

Representations of family in cinema have increasingly become a focal point in cultural sociology, particularly regarding how cinematic texts reproduce or resist dominant ideologies

(Stacey, 1994; Williams, 2011). According to Dyer (1997), cinematic images function as cultural codes that stabilize or unsettle normative discourses. In the Turkish context, these discourses often valorize the family as a moral nucleus, which renders critical portrayals particularly subversive (Arslan, 2020). Accordingly, this study positions *Majority* and *Nobody's Home* within a critical tradition that seeks to expose the emotional, ideological, and psychological mechanisms embedded in family life.

The film analysis encompasses examinations of characters both in terms of their individual psychological structures and within the context of interpersonal dynamics among family members and their broader social environment. Various factors such as the socioeconomic and sociocultural characteristics of the depicted families, the reciprocal influences among family members, and their adaptive mechanisms for navigating life's complexities are subjected to analytical scrutiny.

1. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

1.1. Functionalist Theory

According to sociologists working within the functionalist theoretical framework, nuclear families serve as "units that fulfill certain specialized roles in modern societies" (Giddens & Sutton, 2017, p. 432). Talcott Parsons stands as the foremost representative of this theoretical perspective. Bilton et al. (2009) observe that Parsons' argument maintains that the nuclear family system optimally adapts to the requirements of industrial society. Parsons contends that the varying income levels generated by economic differentiation in industrial society, and the consequent diversity in lifestyles, are incompatible with the extended family system. Parsons identifies two fundamental family functions. The first involves "the socialization of children", while the second concerns "ensuring the personality balance of adults". Within this familial structure, the mother's role centers on addressing the emotional needs of family members, whereas the father's function involves securing resources for the family's sustenance. Consequently, the woman's role within the family is characterized as emotional, while the man's role is described as instrumental. The first function, child socialization, encompasses a process whereby children learn and internalize the social and cultural norms of their birth society. The second function, maintaining adult personality equilibrium, entails emotional support for adult family members (Parsons & Bales, 1955).

Parsons' theoretical framework has faced criticism both for its prescriptive approach to family structure based on modernist perspectives and for presenting an idealized family form. Bilton et al. (2009) emphasize that families cannot invariably conform to a single specific model. They further argue that this theory disregards prevalent family problems including violence against women and children, harassment, childhood acknowledge the increasing dissolution of marriages and the rise of single-parent families. Additionally, Giddens and Sutton note that this perspective has been extensively criticized for naturalizing the domestic division of labor between women and men (Bilton et al., 2009, pp. 230–231; Giddens & Sutton, 2017, p. 433).

1.2. Feminist Theory

According to Gittins, theories asserting that the family represents a universal institution comprising mother, father, and children, functioning in mutual harmony, have been subjected to substantial feminist critique. Feminist perspectives characterize the family as an institution

where women and children in particular experience oppression within the context of patriarchal society (Gittins, 2011, p. 14).

Bilton et al. (2009) note that radical feminists position the nuclear family as the primary site for women's exploitation. They contest the normative frameworks established by gender patterns in discourses that operate on the premises of the family's natural foundation. From this perspective, assumptions predicated on a specific family form, regardless of benevolent intent, function as effective mechanisms for consigning women to subordinate positions (Bilton et al., 2009, p. 249).

Judith Butler's contributions to feminist theory further illuminate the power dynamics embedded within the family. According to Butler (2004), gender roles are not biologically determined but are continuously reproduced through performative acts within social institutions such as the family. This performativity reinforces heteronormative and patriarchal expectations, particularly through maternal and paternal role assignments. In the context of *Nobody's Home*, the mother's behavior exemplifies this process, as she assumes a traditional caregiving role while simultaneously exercising symbolic dominance over her children - particularly her eldest daughter Feride- thus reinforcing gendered hierarchies and emotional dependence within the family structure (Butler, 2004, pp. 1–30).

1.3. Postmodernist Theory

Bilton et al. (2009) identify the contemporary discourse on family as a central point of contention between modernist and postmodernist perspectives. Modernists advocate for the establishment of normative standards regarding what ought to be, what constitutes right and wrong in aspects of family organization such as interpersonal dynamics, household structure, and child-rearing practices. Postmodernists criticize this modernist stance, asserting that questions concerning optimal human living arrangements can never yield singular, universally applicable answers. They contend that no individual should exercise influence over another regarding the conduct of family life. The postmodernist perspective rejects frameworks that impose limitations and rules that merely present other individuals' perspectives as *objective realities*. According to this view, individuals should be liberated from such constraints. Postmodernists argue that modernism's quest for instruments of human happiness is fundamentally misguided. They emphasize the necessity of abandoning the notion that a singular objective reality can satisfy human needs or ensure happiness, instead advocating for the recognition of human diversity and the invalidity of universal truths. Difference and diversity are considered the most essential characteristics of human existence. Individuals should enjoy the freedom to live according to their preferences and select their lifestyle without external constraint, provided they do not harm or inconvenience others. Consequently, postmodern family life encompasses contradictions and opposing elements. No familial configuration or practice -whether related to sexuality, partnership, marriage, or procreation- can be evaluated as inherently superior to alternatives (Bilton et al., 2009, pp. 251–257).

In addition to general critiques of universal family models, Baudrillard's (2013) concept of simulacra and simulation offers a compelling lens through which to view the constructed nature of family ideology. According to Baudrillard, postmodern societies increasingly substitute real social relations with symbolic representations that mask underlying voids and contradictions. From this perspective, the traditional family ideal becomes a simulation - a

model with no basis in lived experience but presented as universally desirable. The selected films reflect this idea by portraying families not as cohesive, nurturing units, but as emotionally fragmented spaces where individuals struggle to reconcile imposed roles with personal desires. Such representations reveal the family as a hollow structure propped up by cultural and ideological scripts rather than genuine relational stability (Baudrillard, 2013).

1.4. Other Perspectives on Family

Marx and Engels posit that the family institution is grounded in private gain and capital accumulation. They characterize family as an institution facilitating the reproduction of the capitalist system. According to Engels, marriage and family institutions emerged in response to the necessities of private property and legitimate inheritance. He contends that in historical periods without private property, marriage was unnecessary, and projects that in a future without private property, the institution of marriage will similarly decline (Gittins, 2011; Poster, 1989, p. 97).

Max Horkheimer, a prominent representative of the Frankfurt School, argues that the family concept aligns with Marx's social theory. He maintains that understanding human behavior requires family analysis because the family constitutes the essential connection between individual and society. Family functions as the principal instrument in shaping the human character that society requires and desires. The Frankfurt School and Horkheimer critique the dominance element within family structures, suggesting that women and children experience unhappiness under the father's economic hegemony, experiencing both material and psychological exploitation. According to Horkheimer, paternal authority over children represents a mechanism that undermines the individual's inherent natural freedom. Consequently, he emphasizes the significance of individual autonomy (Horkheimer, 1936).

Laing (1969) identifies the nuclear family's fundamental deficiency as the excessive interpersonal intrusion facilitated by its structure. He observes that within nuclear families, parents presume superior knowledge of their children's desires and thoughts. Children struggle to establish individual autonomy, resulting in their psychological identities remaining embedded within parental identities. Children's distinct identities, lives, and individualities develop along trajectories determined by their parents. Through adolescence, children endeavor to differentiate their identities from the family. This struggle is particularly pronounced among girls because patriarchal structures afford them less autonomy compared to boys (Laing, 1969).

Sigmund Freud contends that the individual cannot be separated from social reality. He asserts that "the psychology of the individual is, at the same time, the psychology of society." Accordingly, Freud acknowledges the social dimension of psychoanalytic work and its relationship to family dynamics. Freud maintains that individual psychology cannot be analyzed in isolation from society or family because the most private and personal characteristics become meaningful only through analysis of the family structure as an integrated entity. Therefore, "the family is the secret of the individual" (Freud, 1949). The fundamental principle of Freudian psychology holds that mental structure develops during childhood. The mind is not innate but evolves through processes experienced within the family context (Poster, 1989, p. 37).

1.5. Family in Turkish Cinema

Cinema, as an artistic medium, incorporates both surrealistic elements characteristic of artistic expression and reflections of social reality. Generally, cinema mirrors the society it emerges from, capturing social structures and transformations on screen.

Adıgüzel notes that within social realism, a significant cinematic movement, film is understood as "having a structure that selects methodologies to convey reality to its audience while redefining and reproducing that reality". Cinema creates works that more closely approximate reality because, relative to other artistic forms, it has a stronger foundation in observation and the transmission of these observations through recording to viewers (Adıgüzel, n.d., pp. 26–27).

Yeşildal observes that particularly between 1960-1965, social realist cinematic approaches dominated Turkish filmmaking. This perspective "aims to transfer social reality and social problems to cinema through the ordinary life of the individual". According to his analysis, this period witnessed significant innovations and transformations in cinema (Yeşildal, 2010, p. 215).

Films represent, to a certain extent, products of the culture that their creators -directors, producers, screenwriters, and actors- have internalized either consciously or unconsciously. Consequently, it can be argued that Turkish cinema reflects the structural dynamics of Turkish society.

In research examining whether social structure is reflected in cinema through the transformations in Turkish film between 1969-1990, Demiray concludes that Turkish cinema, functioning as both mass communication medium and art form, reflects social structures and changes, sometimes paralleling social change and sometimes lagging behind it (Demiray, 1993, p. 215).

According to Abisel (2005), the family institution occupies a highly significant position in Turkish society. Consequently, Turkish films portray family as an institution requiring protection and exaltation. The prevailing understanding in these films emphasizes the paramount importance of family order, which should remain undisturbed. This order refers to unity and togetherness within the family unit. Family members are expected to demonstrate self-sacrifice to maintain this order. The effort and struggle to preserve family cohesion persist consistently. Even when losses occur, unity is ultimately achieved. Abisel notes that characters who express negative views toward marriage or the family institution are typically characterized negatively. Films are produced in alignment with traditional perspectives, emphasizing traditional and religious values. Therefore, she observes that one rarely encounters Turkish films that present either the concept or functioning of family in an objective or negative manner. According to Abisel, occasionally negative family portrayals appear that contradict the "good family" ideal. These families are generally disparaged for having abandoned human values. They gravitate toward problematic behaviors such as excessive materialism, alcohol consumption, gambling, mutual deception, and interest-based relationships. The negative characterization of these families is attributed either to westernization tendencies or wealth. Abisel notes that bourgeois families in particular are depicted negatively as having dissolved traditional bonds, fractured authority structures, and disconnected luxurious lifestyles (Abisel, 2005, pp. 77–78).

Şendur Atabek et al. (2015) report that Turkish cinema during 1960-1980 exalted middle-class family values in Yeşilçam films. An understanding aligned with the patriarchal structure

dominating Turkish society during that period is similarly evident in cinema. Mothers and fathers are depicted in accordance with traditional gender roles. Divorce is viewed negatively. During the "women's films" period emerging after 1980, divorce became more acceptable, though divorced women faced various social challenges. In the "new cinema" period films after 1990, while divorce is not centrally positioned, it has become more normalized within society, and the sacred family discourse has begun to lose prominence. Before this period - that is, before 1980- the sacred family discourse was reproduced in films as an ideological reflection of the era. The common theme across all films is the preservation of family values (Atabek et al., 2015, pp. 307–308).

According to Oktan (2018), representations constructed through ideological and traditional value patterns -such as family sanctification, the presumption that every individual must necessarily experience marriage, and the expectation that family members must devotedly serve their families without question- manifest as a metalanguage present in narrative structures, character development, and cinematic language (Oktan, 2018, pp. 13–14).

Yılmaz (2008) emphasizes that the traditional sacred family understanding in Turkish cinema has begun to evolve in contemporary films. Rather than patterns such as the exalted family institution, family cohesion, and idealized family representations, recent films address issues including communication deficiencies within families, estrangement among family members and from society, and family dissolution. As the sanctity attributed to the family institution in Turkish cinema diminishes, film characters increasingly appear as individuals experiencing loneliness, urban life challenges, unhappiness, or various problems (Yılmaz, 2008, p. 214).

Relevant studies have documented a marked transformation in the representation of family in Turkish cinema. Yağbasan and Ateş (2018) analyze the shift from idealized and inviolable family imagery in Yeşilçam-era films to depictions of dysfunction, trauma, and generational conflict in post-2000 cinema (Yağbasan & Ateş, 2018, p. 28). Similarly, Çakırlar & Güçlü (2013) reveal how contemporary auteurs such as Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Reha Erdem, and Ümit Ünal portray the home as a center of tension -marked by emotional turmoil, violence, and alienation- rather than as a haven of refuge (Çakırlar & Güçlü, 2013, pp. 167–183).

Recent academic inquiries into *Majority* have explored the film's socio-ideological dimensions within the context of upper-middle class representation and sociological critique. Uysal's study (2025) interprets the film as a work of Turkish social realism that dissects the internal dynamics of conservative upper-class families and their interactions with lower-class individuals. Additionally, Akmeşe and Deniz (2015) investigate the film from the perspective of social inequality, while Yüksel (2013) examine *Majority* through lenses such as father–son relations and masculinity crises. These contributions both affirm the film's relevance in critical sociocultural discourse and help position our analysis as advancing beyond these thematic inquiries by focusing on the interplay of ideological reproduction and identity formation within family structures.

Though less abundant in academic literature than *Majority*, *Nobody's Home* has gained critical attention for its exploration of family disintegration and psychological alienation. A Venice Days review (Scarpa, 2013) emphasizes the film's vivid portrayal of identity loss and the breakdown of familial cohesion following the father's death. Critical discourse (Güler, 2014; Tüzen, 2016) also highlights its haunting examination of maternal neurosis, generational tension, and the burdens cast upon female protagonists within socially conservative contexts.

These perspectives underscore the critical importance of examining emotional surveillance and domestic power structures in Turkish cinema, aligning with our study's focus on ideological and psychological family representations.

Accordingly, it can be claimed that Turkish cinema is progressively departing from traditional understandings and family sanctification, moving toward the production of social realist films that reflect evolving societal perspectives.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design and Approach

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically utilizing ethnographic content analysis to examine the critical representation of family in contemporary Turkish cinema. The qualitative approach was selected due to its suitability for exploring complex social phenomena and cultural texts, allowing for in-depth examination of implicit meanings, symbolic representations, and thematic patterns within cinematic narratives (Krippendorff, 2018). As Denzin and Lincoln (2018) assert, qualitative methodology enables researchers to investigate how social experiences are created and given meaning, making it particularly appropriate for analyzing the multifaceted portrayal of family dynamics in film. In this regard, based on the theoretical grounding and the focus on critical representation, this study was guided by the following research questions:

- How are family dynamics portrayed in the films Majority and Nobody's Home?
- In what ways do these portrayals reflect, reproduce, or challenge dominant ideological structures such as patriarchy, emotional labor, and authority?
- How do cinematic techniques (such as framing, and character interaction) contribute to the construction of familial roles and identities?

These questions shaped both the analytical coding process and the interpretative framework of the study, ensuring consistency between the research aim, theoretical approach, and empirical findings.

A qualitative methodology was chosen due to its capacity to investigate nuanced symbolic meanings, complex social relationships, and cultural ideologies (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018) as expressed through cinematic language. Through this lens, the study aims not just to describe, but to interpret the embedded ideological and emotional structures within family portrayals.

The study employed ethnographic content analysis (ECA) as introduced by Altheide (1996), which emphasizes both systematic coding and flexible interpretation of cultural texts. The process began with a preliminary viewing of both films, followed by the development of initial codes based on recurring social, emotional, and ideological themes. These included concepts such as patriarchal authority, emotional labor, generational conflict, and socio-economic reproduction.

In the next phase, scenes were segmented into analytical units, with each unit corresponding to a distinct narrative episode or interaction. These segments were coded iteratively, allowing for thematic refinement and emergence of sub-categories. For instance, codes related to maternal surveillance, and domestic alienation were later grouped under broader themes of gendered familial roles and emotional burden.

To enhance reliability, the coding process was conducted independently by two researchers and followed by a comparison of interpretive notes. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion and theoretical alignment, ensuring inter-coder consistency (Schreier, 2012). Additionally, triangulation was achieved by juxtaposing the coded data with theoretical perspectives discussed in the conceptual framework, reinforcing analytic rigor.

The research adopts a sociological perspective informed by critical theory, which seeks to uncover power dynamics and ideological structures embedded within cultural texts. This theoretical orientation facilitates the examination of how family relationships in the selected films both reflect and challenge dominant social ideologies about family in Turkish society (Fiske, 2010). By employing this critical lens, the study aims to move beyond descriptive analysis toward an interpretive understanding of how cinematic representations can contest established social institutions and normative structures.

2.2. Sample Selection and Criteria

The research sample consists of two contemporary Turkish films: *Majority* (2010) directed by Seren Yüce and *Nobody's Home* (2013) directed by Deniz Akçay. These films were selected through purposive sampling based on several criteria: (1) their production within the contemporary era of Turkish cinema (post-2000), (2) their critical approach toward family structures and relationships, (3) their thematic focus on family as a central narrative element, and (4) their reception as significant contributions to Turkish cinema, evidenced by critical acclaim and festival recognition.

The selection of these two specific films was further justified by their contrasting yet complementary approaches to family critique. While *Majority* primarily examines patriarchal authority through father-son dynamics in an upper-middle-class setting, *Nobody's Home* explores maternal dominance and family dysfunction following paternal absence in a lower socioeconomic context. This deliberate selection allows for comparative analysis across different gender dynamics and socioeconomic backgrounds, providing a more comprehensive understanding of critical family representation in contemporary Turkish cinema.

2.3. Data Collection and Analytical Procedure

The primary data for this study consisted of the complete visual, audio, and narrative content of both films, which were viewed multiple times to ensure thorough analytical engagement. Each film was systematically examined through multiple screenings: initial viewing for overall narrative comprehension, subsequent viewings for detailed scene-by-scene analysis, and final targeted viewings focusing on specific themes, character interactions, and cinematographic techniques.

The analytical procedure followed Altheide and Schneider's (2013) ethnographic content analysis framework, which emphasizes reflexive interpretation while maintaining systematic rigor. The films were watched on three stages:

Initial Viewing: Overall narrative structure and thematic impression.

Thematic Coding: Scenes were coded based on pre-identified conceptual categories from theoretical literature (e.g., paternal authority, autonomy suppression, gendered division of roles, symbolic violence, emotional labor).

Focused Re-Watching: Specific scenes (e.g., Gül's return scene, sauna scene, Feride's phone conversation on the stairs) were analyzed in relation to specific theoretical concepts (e.g., Horkheimer's authority, Freud's superego, Laing's intrusion).

Coding sheets were manually developed to track recurring motifs, character interactions, and symbolic elements. These sheets included categories such as:

Power Dynamics (paternal control, maternal pressure, intergenerational transmission),

Identity and Autonomy (emotional suppression, forced conformity),

Resistance and Escape (silent rebellion, marriage as an exit strategy).

The coding process was iterative: as new themes emerged, previous scenes were revisited and re-coded where necessary. This flexible approach allowed for deeper theoretical integration as the analysis progressed.

2.4. Theoretical Framework and Analytical Concepts

The analytical framework for this study integrates multiple theoretical perspectives to examine family representation in the selected films. The primary theoretical lenses include:

1. Critical theory: Drawing particularly on Frankfurt School perspectives on family as a site of ideological reproduction and psychological domination (Horkheimer, Adorno).

2. Psychoanalytic theory: Utilizing Freudian concepts regarding identity formation within family contexts and the unconscious internalization of parental behaviors.

3. Family systems theory: Examining how family members' behaviors, emotions, and psychologies are interconnected within the family unit (Laing, Bateson).

4. Feminist critique: Analyzing gender dynamics and patriarchal structures within family relationships (Gittins, Butler).

5. Functionalist and postmodernist perspectives: Contrasting traditional views of family function (Parsons) with postmodern critiques of universalized family models.

These theoretical perspectives informed the development of specific analytical concepts employed in the film analysis, including "internalized imprisonment" (the state where individuals are conscious of family constraints yet unable to escape them), "identity suppression" (the process by which family dynamics impede autonomous identity formation), and "familial hegemony" (the exercise of dominance through family roles and relationships).

2.5. Methodological Limitations

While the selected methodological approach offers analytical advantages, also limitations must be acknowledged. The sample size of two films, though allowing for in-depth analysis, limits the generalizability of findings to broader patterns in Turkish cinema. Additionally, as Sontag (2001) notes, interpretive film analysis inevitably involves a degree of subjective judgment that must be recognized within qualitative research paradigms. Finally, the cultural and contextual specificity of Turkish cinema requires careful consideration when applying theoretical frameworks developed primarily in Western academic contexts.

To address these limitations, the analysis is presented with appropriate interpretive caution, contextual sensitivity, and recognition of the films as individual artistic expressions rather than

comprehensive representations of Turkish cinema or society. The findings are positioned as contributory rather than definitive, opening avenues for further research on family representation in contemporary Turkish cinema.

3. Findings: Internalized Imprisonment (Analysis of Majority and Nobody's Home Films from a Critical Family Perspective)

This section presents the findings derived from the ethnographic content analysis of the two selected films. To enhance analytical clarity and address the thematic depth of family representation, the analysis was structured around a set of predefined and emergent coding categories, including patriarchal authority, emotional overload, identity suppression, and internalized imprisonment. This study employs ethnographic content analysis (Altheide & Schneider, 2013), which combines systematic thematic coding with interpretive engagement, allowing for in-depth exploration of social meanings embedded in cinematic narratives. The thematic framework was developed through iterative engagement with both films is summarized in Table 1 below. This approach follows the ethnographic content analysis model, which integrates systematic coding with reflexive interpretation (Altheide & Schneider, 2013).

The following analysis articulates how each film exemplifies these thematic concerns through character behavior, narrative progression, and cinematic language. To strengthen the analytical transparency of the study and address the systematic nature of the coding process, Table 1 provides a thematic coding summary derived from the ethnographic content analysis of the two films. Each thematic category was constructed based on theoretical frameworks and illustrates how critical family representations were operationalized during analysis (Altheide & Schneider, 2013; Krippendorff, 2018).

Table 1. Thematic Coding Summary of Family Representation in Two Films

Film	Thematic Category	Description	Example Scene or Dialogue
Majority	Patriarchal Authority	The father's dominance restricts individual autonomy and imposes economic control.	Father to Mertkan: "Why are you lying like that?"; Sauna and mosque visits.
Majority	Identity Suppression	Mertkan lacks autonomy and mimics paternal behavior despite inner resentment.	Gül: "What is your biggest dream?" Mertkan: "You tell me first."
Nobody's Home	Emotional Overload	The mother places excessive domestic and emotional burden on her eldest daughter Feride.	Mother calls out "Feride!" as Feride sighs: "As if there's time."
Nobody's Home	Maternal Dominance	The mother controls the financial and personal decisions of her daughter.	Feride is prevented from attending a work-related dinner; her salary is managed by mother.
Both Films	Internalized Imprisonment	Characters do not explicitly rebel but express resistance through passive behaviors.	Mertkan and Feride silently comply with family expectations and seek escape via marriage.
Both Films	Lack of Communication	Family members fail to engage in genuine dialogue; isolation is emphasized.	Balcony scene in *Majority*; Feride's final monologue in *Nobody's Home*.

This study examines two films that present a critical perspective on family: the 2010 film *Majority*, directed by Seren Yüce, and the 2013 film *Nobody's Home*, directed by Deniz Akçay. Family criticism constitutes the principal theme in both films. Diverging from traditional family

portrayals in Turkish cinema, these films avoid depicting harmonious family units. Instead, they highlight problematic dynamics including the family's destructive influences, member unhappiness originating from familial relationships, existential struggles, freedom limitations, and identity formation challenges.

Both narratives concentrate on single family units rather than multiple families. While *Majority* addresses negative discrimination and othering through majority-minority dynamics (reflected also in the film's title), family remains the central thematic focus. In both films, characters within problematic family structures express rebellion not through verbal articulation but through behaviors and demeanors. The narrative in *Majority* develops primarily through father-son dynamics, while *Nobody's Home* progresses through mother-daughter relationships. Family criticism is articulated by highlighting these central character relationships. The mother character remains peripheral in *Majority*, while the father character is deceased in *Nobody's Home*.

Majority portrays a nuclear family comprising mother, father, and two children (one married, one single). This upper-middle-class bourgeois family features a father figure representing capital ownership and wealth, while the mother figure embodies a non-working role focused on domestic responsibilities and childcare. Socioculturally, the family exhibits a nationalist-conservative and traditional structure.

In *Nobody's Home*, the family is a nuclear unit consisting of a mother, two daughters, and a son. The family occupies a lower socioeconomic position. Following the father's death, the eldest daughter, Feride, assumes responsibility for the family's financial support. The narrative includes a grandmother figure who provides occasional refuge for the children and demonstrates concern for the family.

Nobody's Home explores the ways in which family members cope with the father's absence. The responsibilities imposed following his death burden each member differently. Nurcan, the mother character, struggles to deal with her husband's death and maintain her life, as evidenced by obsessive behaviors such as constant cleaning despite back problems, excessive television watching, inability to leave home, and imposing heavy responsibilities on her children. Because the loss of her spouse and household responsibilities overwhelm her, she redirects this burden primarily onto her eldest daughter Feride, as well as her other children. Feride, in her thirties and university-educated, constitutes the family's sole income source through her company employment. She simultaneously manages household duties, sibling care, and her mother's health issues. İlker, the son, copes through perpetual conflict with his mother and drug use, while Özge, the youngest daughter, adopts a quiet, obedient demeanor. Özge's tendency to hide from her mother and sister when injured (as when she accidentally cuts her hand) and her quiet compliance with maternal demands exemplify this coping mechanism.

In *Nobody's Home*, the disintegration of the family unit is subtly illustrated through the characters' psychological withdrawal and silences. Freud's theory of repression and the return of the repressed is particularly relevant in the depiction of Feride, the mother, whose emotional numbness and obsessive behaviors reflect unresolved grief and internalized trauma. Her compulsive cleaning routines can be interpreted as sublimation, a defense mechanism where socially unacceptable impulses are redirected into acceptable activities (Freud, 1949). The family's inability to verbalize pain mirrors Freud's notion of familial

neurosis, where unspoken tensions manifest through bodily or behavioral symptoms rather than open conflict.

In *Majority*, the narrative explores how the protagonist Mertkan's family relationships shape his personality development. The Mertkan character is portrayed as an irresponsible twenty-something with minimal life expectations, unable to identify his desires, and disinclined toward reflection. As an open education student, his academic disengagement is presented as an indicator of scholarly underachievement. In upper-middle-class families, paternal capital ownership, while advantageous, often negatively impacts children. Having the alternative of continuing his father's profession, Mertkan emphasizes academic achievement. Simultaneously, he lacks the necessary motivation, effort, and work ethic for university education leading to professional qualification. This dynamic is observable throughout the film. His family similarly devalues education, with the father prioritizing business continuity over his son's vocational training. Mertkan's academic indifference is evident in dialogues with his girlfriend Gül: when she examines his bookshelf looking for architecture texts (given that Mertkan works with his contractor father) and comments on their absence, he responds, "there's no need for books". In another scene, when Gül gives him an architecture book, he replies, "I've never read a book in my life, how can I read this", revealing his academic disinterest and lifelong reading avoidance.

In *Majority*, the father figure serves as an ideological anchor, embodying Althusser's concept of the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA), where the family functions to reproduce dominant ideology (Althusser, 1971). Mertkan's internal struggle emerges from the contradiction between the repressive expectations of his father and his own moral compass. His eventual submission to patriarchal demands and his passive complicity in violence against his girlfriend reflect the successful interpellation of the subject—he recognizes himself as a subject through the ideological discourse of masculinity, obedience, and honor reinforced by the familial and social structures around him.

The phenomenon Laing (1969) describes, wherein family members excessively intrude into each other's lives, is evident in both films' family structures. In both narratives, family members have virtually no independent existence outside the family unit. In *Majority*, Mertkan's life is so thoroughly scrutinized that his parents question every behavior both inside and outside the home. In one scene, even as Mertkan lies down, his father asks, "why are you lying like that?" This question saliently indicates how family members "occupy each other's lives".

Foucault's theory of disciplinary power offers a useful framework to understand how control is exerted not through overt violence but through subtle, everyday practices (Foucault, 1995). In both films, but especially in Majority, we observe this microphysics of power in domestic routines, the father's persistent surveillance, and the spatial confinement of youth within the family home. These mechanisms resonate with Foucault's panopticism, where visibility ensures compliance. The kitchen table, for instance, becomes a disciplinary site where silence, hierarchy, and tension regulate behavior.

In *Nobody's Home*, the unhappy, obsessive mother particularly dominates her eldest daughter Feride's life, consistently preventing her from pursuing personal interests. In one scene, as Feride prepares to meet work colleagues, potentially advancing a romantic interest, her

The Frankfurt School and Horkheimer critique how families destroy natural individual freedom and impede independence. Horkheimer's criticism that fathers impose economic hegemony on wives and children, transforming dominance into psychological and material exploitation (Horkheimer, 1936), is observable in the film *Majority*. Throughout the film, the father subjects his son to psychological violence-treating him rudely, swearing, criticizing every behavior, humiliating him, and expressing anger. Mertkan must comply with unwanted activities at his father's insistence. Scenes such as accompanying his father to the sauna, being unnecessarily sent to another city (İzmit) for work, and attending mosque with his father illustrate paternal economic hegemony. The father consciously seeks to enforce his authority through his son's compliance. The character of the father in *Majority* embodies the archetype of patriarchal and economic control as described by Horkheimer (1936).

The film's opening scene emphasizes this dynamic: in a childhood flashback, the father runs through forest with Mertkan trailing behind, appearing tired and disengaged. The elder brother character similarly could not escape paternal economic hegemony, working harmoniously with his father. The father's friend also puts pressure on Mertkan, repeatedly urging him to complete his military service. Psychological violence extends to the mother, albeit less prominently. The mother character presents an unhappy image, lamenting both father and son's emotional detachment. She expresses this to Mertkan: "I'm not angry at you, I'm angry at myself; how did I raise you to be so emotionless. I fell among emotionless men".

Freud (1923) emphasizes that mind structure isn't innate but develops through childhood family experiences. Accordingly, though Mertkan resents his father, he increasingly mirrors paternal behaviors toward others-reflecting Freud's emphasis.

In *Majority*, the character Mertkan exhibits a progressive loss of individuality and the internalization of paternal authority, which aligns closely with Freud's (1923) assertion that the superego forms during childhood through familial repression. Despite his resentment toward his father, Mertkan unconsciously mirrors his behavior—particularly in his interactions with Gül and his emotional detachment. This repetition of paternal patterns exemplifies Freud's concept of psychological identification as a form of repression. One particularly telling scene involves Mertkan's nonchalant reaction to the death of a former domestic worker, immediately echoed by his father in the same tone, illustrating how affective responses are inherited unconsciously within the family unit.

As portrayed in the film, Mertkan lacks life goals, purpose, dreams, or desires. This absence clearly stems from family attitudes devaluing education while demonstrating oppressive, overprotective behaviors. Having lived comfortably and irresponsibly since youth, Mertkan has likely never experienced dreaming, desiring, or striving. Perhaps his only desire was continuing his relationship with Gül, but his father, exercising authority, demanded its termination. Though initially resisting, Mertkan ultimately complies. His situation emerges in dialogues with his mother and also with Gül:

Mertkan: My father doesn't want me to be with Gül.

Mother: Well, do you want to?

Mertkan: I don't know, I guess I do.

Mother: You don't even know what you want yet, son. I've never seen you really want anything ever. If your father doesn't want it, he must know something...

When Gül asks, "what is your biggest dream", Mertkan pauses as if never having dreamed or wished for anything, appearing surprised by the question. His response -"you tell me first"- reinforces this impression. Additionally, Mertkan's character is revealed when returning home by car: before entering the parking lot, the camera shows him emptying the ashtray onto the ground from behind. As the vehicle enters, the camera shifts right, framing a trash can directly opposite where Mertkan discarded trash. This implies his insensitivity by showing he littered despite proximity to proper disposal.

Another family critique in *Majority* emerges through Gül's family's attitude. Gül flees her family because they oppose her university attendance and want her to return to Van. Unlike Mertkan, Gül challenges familial authority rather than complying, though ultimately forced to return. Further criticism appears through a young girl staying at Gül's residence-living with strangers, far from family, contributing through begging because her problematic father prevents her from living at home. The film also addresses ethnic discrimination, reflected in its title. Gül, presumed Kurdish because her family lives in Van, faces discrimination from Mertkan's father and friend, both pressuring relationship termination. Though initially presenting alternative reasons, the father later explicitly states, "these people are intent on dividing the homeland, they will harm us all".

In both films, children view marriage as an escape from familial problems including unhappiness, hopelessness, and emotional deprivation. In a balcony scene, Mertkan tells his elder brother about paternal resentment, with his brother noting he "got married and escaped". His brother advises, "you get married too, escape", suggesting marriage as the only escape route. Both brothers clearly view their family as something requiring escape. This scene employs a camera-distancing tension technique—characters speak without looking at each other, instead gazing outward from the balcony. Vineyard notes this technique emphasizes loneliness, isolation, and suppressed emotions (Vineyard, 2010, p. 75).

In *Nobody's Home*, after Feride's engagement, her mother remarks, "so you were dying for a husband", prompting Feride's silent, disappointed gaze as she placed plates on the floor. After discovering her brother's drug use, Feride's previously silent rebellion finds a voice: "I'm tired, I'm tired of you, I'm tired of this house. Is this how you're going to support me! Sister, I'm tired, which one of you should I think about... sister, save me sister, save me İlker"… The subsequent wedding sequence continues until the film's conclusion, symbolizing Feride's escape through loveless marriage. During this sequence, Feride and her mother communicate through looks and behaviors. The mother, seemingly recognizing her actions, appears to silently apologize while acknowledging her helplessness. After waiting, she returns home, takes numerous pills, then returns to the wedding. For Feride, escape manifests through marriage; for her mother, who perceives losing her final support through Feride's marriage, through death.

Conclusion

This study aimed to analyze the critical approaches to the family institution in Turkish cinema through two contemporary films: *Majority* (2010) directed by Seren Yüce and *Nobody's Home* (2013) directed by Deniz Akçay. The research specifically focused on how these films challenge the traditional representation of family in Turkish cinema by highlighting the destructive effects of family on individual autonomy, identity formation, and psychological well-being.

The findings reveal that both films present a profound critique of family relationships and structures through their narratives, characterizations, and cinematographic techniques. Unlike the conventional portrayal of family as a sacred institution in traditional Turkish cinema, these films illuminate the internal conflicts, power dynamics, and psychological pressures that exist within families. In *Majority*, the father-son relationship demonstrates the devastating effects of patriarchal authority and economic hegemony on identity formation, as exemplified by Mertkan's inability to develop individual autonomy and his gradual transformation into a replica of his father despite his internal resistance. Similarly, in *Nobody's Home*, the mother-daughter relationship portrays how excessive responsibilities, and emotional dependency can suffocate the individual's freedom and life choices, as shown through Feride's sacrifice of her personal desires and dreams to fulfill family obligations.

The analysis also revealed that both films depict individuals who have internalized their psychological imprisonment within family structures-what can be termed as "internalized imprisonment". The characters do not openly rebel against their family situations but demonstrate their resistance through subtle behaviors, silences, and eventually through seeking escape via marriage or other means. This portrayal aligns with Laing's (1969) theory that families often occupy too much space in individuals' lives, preventing them from developing their own identities and autonomous selves.

When comparing these findings with existing literature, our analysis supports Gittins' (2011) argument that family ideology often masks the realities of family life and creates an idealized version that is unattainable for many. Both films effectively dismantle this ideology by presenting realistic family portraits that challenge the notion of the family as an inherently positive institution. This critical approach parallels Frankfurt School's perspective, particularly Horkheimer's critique of paternal authority as a mechanism that destroys individual freedom (Horkheimer, 1936).

Furthermore, the films' portrayal of characters who are unable to form individual identities separate from their families confirms Freud's assertion that the mind structure is shaped within the family during childhood (Freud, 1923). Mertkan's unconscious adoption of his father's behaviors and attitudes, despite his conscious rejection, exemplifies this psychological dynamic. Similarly, Feride's resignation to her role as the family's support system demonstrates how deeply family patterns can be internalized.

The shift in representation observed in these films also corresponds with Yılmaz's (2008) observation that recent Turkish cinema has begun to move away from the traditional sacred family understanding toward more critical and realistic portrayals. Rather than depicting the idealized family unity that characterized earlier periods of Turkish cinema (Abisel, 2005; Atabek et al., 2015), these films focus on issues such as lack of communication, alienation among family members, and the breakdown of family relationships.

For future research, several directions seem particularly promising. First, a broader analysis encompassing a larger sample of contemporary Turkish films could help establish whether the critical perspective on family observed in *Majority* and *Nobody's Home* represents a consistent trend in Turkish cinema. Second, comparative studies between Turkish and global cinema could explore how cultural, social, and economic factors influence the critical representation of family across different societies. Third, research focusing on audience reception of these critical family narratives could provide insights into how Turkish society is responding to these

challenges to traditional family ideology. Additionally, future studies might benefit from examining the connection between sociopolitical changes in Turkey and the evolving representation of family in cinema. As Turkey continues to experience tension between traditional values and modernization, cinema serves as an important medium for reflecting and shaping these cultural negotiations.

In conclusion, *Majority* and *Nobody's Home* represent remarkable contributions to a growing body of Turkish cinema that critically examines family relationships and structures. By portraying the destructive potential of family dynamics on individual development and psychological well-being, these films challenge the sacred status traditionally attributed to the family institution in Turkish society and cinema. Both films invite viewers to question established family ideologies and to recognize the complexity and potential darkness of what is often uncritically regarded as society's the most fundamental institution.

Table 2. Appendix: Filmography of Analyzed Films

Film	Majority (2010)	Nobody's Home (2013)
Director	Seren Yüce	Deniz Akçay
Screenplay	Seren Yüce	Deniz Akçay
Producer	Önder Çakar Sevil Demirci	Deniz Akçay
Cast	Bartu Küçükçağlayan Settar Tanrıöğen Esme Madra Nihal Koldaş Erkan Can Feridun Koç Cem Zeynel Kılıç İlhan Hacıhafızoğlu	Ahu Türkpençe Sekvan Serinkaya Lale Başar Mihriban Er Savaş Alp Başar Melis Ebeler

Awards	47th Antalya Golden Orange Film Festival Best Film (Seren Yüce) Best Director (Seren Yüce) Best Actor (Bartu Küçükçağlayan) **23rd Angers European First Film Festival** Grand Jury Prize **12th Mumbai Film Festival** Best Film (Seren Yüce) Best Actor (Bartu Küçükçağlayan) **43rd Turkish Film Critics Association Awards** Best Actor Performance (Bartu Küçükçağlayan) Best Supporting Actress Performance (Nihal Koldaş) Best Supporting Actor Performance (Settar Tanrıöğen) Best Screenplay (Seren Yüce) **22nd Ankara International Film Festival** Best Supporting Actor Award (Settar Tanrıöğen) Promising New Actor Award (Bartu Küçükçağlayan)	**47th Turkish Film Critics Association Awards** Best Screenplay (Deniz Akçay) Best Supporting Actress Performance (Lale Başar)

Açıklamalar

* Etik Kurul Onayı: Bu araştırmada herhangi bir insan faktörü araştırma nesnesi olarak kullanılmadığı için etik kurul onayı gerektirmemektedir.

* Yayın Etiği: Bu çalışma, "Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi" kapsamında belirtilen kurallara uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır. Ayrıca, makale intihal tespit yazılımlarıyla (Turnitin / iThenticate) taranmış ve herhangi bir intihal tespit edilmemiştir.

* Yazar Katkı Oranı: Bu çalışmada yazarların katkı oranı eşittir. Her iki yazarın da çalışmaya katkı oranı %50'dir.

* Çıkar Çatışması: Çalışmanın yazar(lar)ının veya yazar(lar)ın bağlı olduğu kurumun veya finansal destekçisinin diğer kurumlarla veya bu diğer kurumların çalışanlarıyla araştırmayı etkileyebilecek düzeyde doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak herhangi bir finansal, ticari, hukuki veya profesyonel ilişkisi/çıkarı söz konusu değildir.

* Akademik Finansal Destek: Çalışma; herhangi bir akademik finansal destek kuruluşu (TÜBİTAK, BAP, Avrupa Birliği, Birleşmiş Milletler, vs.) tarafından desteklenmemiştir.

* Yazar Beyanı: Çalışma herhangi bir tezden üretilmemiş ve herhangi bir kongre/sempozyum/konferansta sunulmamıştır.

References

Abisel, N. (2005). *Türk Sineması Üzerine Yazılar*. Phoenix Yayınevi.

Adıgüzel, V. (n.d.). *Din-Siyaset İlişkisinin Sosyolojik Bir Analizi: Şerif Mardin Örneği*.

Akçay Katıksız, D. (Director). (2013). *Köksüz* [Film]. Bulut Film.

Akmeşe, Z., & Deniz, K. (2015). Sinemada Toplumsal Eşitsizliklerin Temsili: "Çoğunluk" Filmi Örneği. *Erciyes İletişim Dergisi*, *4*(1), 0. https://doi.org/10.17680/akademia.v4i1.5000015889

Altheide, D. L., & Schneider, C. J. (2013). *Qualitative Media Analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (B. Brewster, Trans.). In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–186). Monthly Review Press.

Arslan, S. (2020). *Cinema in Turkey: A New Critical History*. Oxford University Press.

Atabek, G. Ş., Sönmez, S., & Bilge, D. (2015). Değişen Sinema Anlayışları Çerçevesinde Türk Filmlerinde Evlilik ve Boşanma. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, *2015*(41), Article 41.

Baudrillard, J. (2013). *Simülakrlar ve Simülasyon*. Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Bilton, T., Bonnett, K., Jones, P., Lawson, T., Skinner, D., Stanworth, M., & Webster, A. (2009). *Sosyoloji* (K. İnaş, Y. Kartal, N. Özkale, K. Toraman, Y. Özkan, & A. R. Günden, Trans.). Siyasal.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. Routledge.

Çakırlar, C., & Güçlü, Ö. (2013). Gender, family and home(land) in contemporary Turkish cinema: A comparative analysis of films by Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Reha Erdem and Ümit Ünal. In S. Talajooy & K. Laachir (Eds.), *Resistance in Contemporary Middle Eastern Cultures: Literature, Cinema and Music* (pp. 167–183). Routledge.

Demiray, E. (1993). *Türk sinemasında 1960-1990 yılları arasında çekilmiş filmlerde kentsel aile* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Anadolu University.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed.). SAGE.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White: Essays on Race and Culture*. Routledge.

Fiske, J. (2010). *Introduction to Communication Studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203837382

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Freud, S. (1923). *The Ego and The Id* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Hogarth Press.

Freud, S. (1949). *Group Psychology and The Analysis of The Ego* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Hogarth Press.

Giddens, A., & Sutton, P. W. (2017). *Sosyoloji* (M. Şenol, Trans.). Kırmızı Yayınları.

Gittins, D. (2011). *Aile Sorgulanıyor* (T. Erdem, Trans.). Pencere Yayınları.

Güler, E. (2014, March 27). *Köksüz: When a family falls apart*. Hürriyet Daily News. https://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/koksuz-when-a-family-falls-apart-63654

Horkheimer, M. (1936). Authority and the family. In M. Horkheimer (Ed.), *Critical Theory: Selected Essays* (pp. 47–128). Herder and Herder.

Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. SAGE Publications.

Laing, R. D. (1969). *The Politics of the Family*. Tavistock Publication Limited.

Oktan, A. (2018). Korkuyorum Anne ve Vavien Örnekleminde Aile Mitinin Sinemasal Görünümleri. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *29*, Article 29. https://doi.org/10.31123/akil.407403

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). *Family: Socialization and interaction process*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Poster, M. (1989). *Eleştirel Aile Kuramı* (H. Tapınç, Trans.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Scarpa, V. (2013, August 30). *Nobody's Home: A family drifting apart*. Cineuropa - the Best of European Cinema. https://cineuropa.org/en/newsdetail/243316/

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.

Sontag, S. (2001). *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays*. Picador.

Stacey, J. (1994). *Star Gazing: Hollywood Cinema and Female Spectatorship*. Routledge.

Tüzen, S. (2016, May 22). *Like mother, like daughter in Turkish cinema*. https://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/like-mother-like-daughter-in-turkish-cinema-99491

Uysal, Y. (2025). The Reproduction of Upper Class: A Try of Class Critique to 'Çoğunluk' Film. *Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi*, *18*(50), 1042–1067. https://doi.org/10.12981/mahder.1570343

Vineyard, J. (2010). *Sinemada Çekim Teknikleri* (G. Rızaoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul Organizasyon.

Williams, L. (2011). *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Visible"*. University of California Press.

Yağbasan, M., & Ateş, U. (2018). 1980 Öncesi ve 2000 Sonrası Türk Sinemasında Ailenin Temsili. Akademik Bakış. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *67*, Article 67.

Yeşildal, H. (2010). Türkiye'de 1960'larda toplumsal gerçekçi sinemada aile ideolojisi: "Kocanın en kötüsü hiç olmayanından daha iyidir. *Folklor/Edebiyat*, *16*(61), Article 61.

Yılmaz, S. (2008). *Türk sinemasında aile kavramı ve baba oğul ilişkisi* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dokuz Eylül University.

Yüce, S. (Director). (2010). *Çoğunluk* [Film]. Motiva Film.

Yüksel, E. (2013). Babalar Ve Oğullar: 2000'ler Türkiye Sinemasında Erkeklik Krizi. *Sinecine: Sinema Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *4*(2), 41–67.