

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this film project is to make a fiction film by using the codes and conventions of documentaries and television news and forums. In general, these codes and conventions are used to support the argument as truth independent from the reading. As a result, making a mock-documentary will be the subversion of the representation of the reality in a fiction.

Independent from the subject of the film, every mock documentary has the potential to lead a non-diegetic reading that shows the possibility of making a fiction film with the tools of documentary. If a fiction film can be made with the tools of documentary, it can not be claimed that documentaries represent the reality, they can also be fictive. Therefore, every mock-documentary, without its intentions, weakens the credibility and believability of documentaries and tv news and forums.

The subject in the “Forbidden Film” is focused on the representation in the media, especially in the television by telling a story about the relationship between a television programmer and tv channels around him. The approach of the media to the television program shifts when the expectations of the sector from the program are not satisfied. Also, the television programmer wants but can not do a criticizing and objective program about social issues that are harmful to the capitalist interrelations with the means of image production that belongs to the capitalists. So, a campaign against him is organized in the media by representing him as a terrorist without any real reference.

All in all, I will try to interrogate the representation of the reality in the media with the combination of style and the subject of the film. The hypothesis is that if a fiction film can be done with the tools of documentary and tv news, thus these tools are not credible if the audience perceive the fiction as real for a while.

I wrote a literature review that focuses on the fictitious elements of the documentary. There is a methodology section about shooting *Forbidden Film*. Also, there is a section where I tell about the methodology of conducted interviews.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review is shaped according to the contribution of the theoretical information to the film. The theory provided me some conceptual tools to analyze, to check and also to improve my project. My aim is not to comparatively analyze mock-documentaries and documentaries in the circumstances of any issue; I will only summarize the theories that are beneficial to my project.

Roscoe and Hight define mock-documentary as “a ‘fact-fictional’ form which has a close relationship to both drama and documentary. It not only uses documentary codes and conventions but constructs a particular relationship with the discourse of factuality.” (6) They also emphasize that mock-documentary is a fictional text which mimic documentary modes and to varying degrees “look” (and sound) like documentaries. (1)

What distinguishes mock-documentary from documentary? Roscoe and Hight answer the question while they are comparing the reflexive documentaries and mock-documentaries: “... reflexive documentaries are constructed from the images with a *direct relationship to the real*, while mock-documentaries’ content is purely fictional.” (33) Their answer is applicable to difference between all modes of documentaries and mock-documentaries (fiction).

They also underlines that faked non-fiction texts, for example hoax documentaries, are not included within the definition of mock-documentary. (3)

As a candidate to be a mock-documentary director, I have to have an idea on the codes and conventions that are frequently used in documentaries. Roscoe and Height list these codes and conventions (15-18) but I will tell about them in the methodology section with my usage of them in *Forbidden Film*.

I want to focus on the fictitious character of the documentary. I think this can provide the opportunity to explore the possibilities of imitating it. The fictive side of documentary is also including the most vulnerable points, which can easily be imitated. However, my research will not only include the stylistic

applications that I will use in my film but also support the idea behind deciding to make a mock-documentary that reveals the incredibility of documentaries.

John Corner mentions that the theories that criticize documentaries can be classified as two types: one is the “*the critique of documentary evidentiality*” and the other is the *critique of the institutional character of the documentaries*. The former focuses on the capacity of the documentary to reference the world and the latter on “its specific location within political, economical and social systems.” (16) I will restrict research to this evidentiality critique in order to be able to compare the documentary with the mock-documentary. Also, the latter can be a subject of the film but does not provide any applicable stylistic information.

According to Corner, the evidentiality critique can be analyzed at two stages. The first stage is involving technical accessibility and the conventions of shooting. The secondary stage includes the propositional/argumentational matters. (17-18)

The critiques that cover the first stage question the fidelity of the recorded images and sounds to their physical reality, or referential world. Corner points out “the degrees of directorial intervention and assumed levels of behaviour modification in the speech and action of filmed subjects” as examples. (18)

Brian Winston clarifies and adds some more examples while discussing Paul Rotha’s statement: “Documentary’s essence lies in the dramatization of actual material”. Winston mentions that “Given the need for a camera to be present; the deals that must be done with those who are to be filmed; the effect of the camera’s presence; the decision when to film and when not; how to light, what lens to use, and where to stand; where to position microphones-one can legitimately begin to query what is “actual” in Rotha’s “actual material.” (21)

These examples which question that the event happened in the historical world can not be shot appropriate to the real event. I think these can be categorized under four important challenges.

The first challenge is the caused by the inability of shooting apparatus to record the reality. The events can not be represented as they happen in the world. The referent and the signifier can not be the same thing. The referent is three dimensional but the camera can only capture two dimensional index of it.

The crew has to position the camera and microphones so only a piece of audiovisual material can be recorded. Also, the emphasis on the lenses mentions the modification during the shooting.

The second is about the subjective eye of the director or cameraman. The director might have an idea before the shooting about what to shoot or there can be a scenario. Thus, what will be shot can be predetermined. Also, during an ongoing event the cameraman can decide what and when to record. If something is shot during an event something may not be shot. The positioning also causes a partial representation of the world. The decision when to shoot and when not also underlines the selective manner of the director. The selection and editing of the materials begin during the shooting.

The third challenge is about the change in the behaviours of the subjects when the subjects know they are being filmed. Corner borrows two terms from Dai Vaughan's study called *Television Documentary Usage* (1976) to explain this effect. One is the putative event that is what things *would* have been like without the camera there and the other is the profilmic event that is what happened when the camera was there. Graham argues that with the emergence of the portable cameras cinema verite cameramen "can follow their subjects almost anywhere, and because of their unobtrusiveness (they need no artificial lighting) people soon forget the presence of the camera and attain surprising naturalness."ⁱ Recording naturalistic events may be persuasive in the sense that the camera does not have any influence on the subjects but in fact it is not other than disguising the fly on the wall.

The fourth is the intervention of the director. I learn from Winston that there are cinema verite directors who "don't ask anyone to *do* anything or to say anything."ⁱⁱ Also, there may be documentaries that directors do not intervene. Audience will not realize that there is directorial influence on the material if the director chooses not to reveal it.

Corner claims that in the secondary stage "the whole textual system of the film or programme, its expositional organization, forms of argument, modes

ⁱ Peter Graham, "Cinema-Verite In France", *Film Quarterly* (Summer 1964), 34. quoted in Brian Winston, "The Documentary Film as Scientific Inscription", in *Theorizing Documentary* (ed. Michael Renov). New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

ⁱⁱ Mark Shivas, "New Approavh", *Movie*, Vol. 8 (April 1963), 14. quoted in Brian Winston, "The Documentary Film as Scientific Inscription", in *Theorizing Documentary* (ed. Michael Renov). New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

of adducing visual and verbal evidence and the lines of causality indicated in the narrative scheme are all implicated”. (18)

It can be argued that the aim of many documentaries is not to exhibit what really happened but to persuade the viewer with the truth claims that reflects the interpretation of the director. Selection, elimination, coordination and the dramatization of the actual material are done in order to achieve this goal.

Brian Winston continues to criticize the Rotha as follows: “And then [after the shooting] the crucial work of molding the film into a culturally satisfying shape- the need to ignore the sequence of rushes, to crosscut, to build climaxes, to remove or add sound, to add commentary and music, titles-raises further questions as to how much of the “actual” can be left when the process of “dramatization” is complete.” (22)

Renov analyses the differences and similarities of documentaries with regarding the semiotics, performance and the narrativity. At the level of sign, he repeats the argument that referent is the determinant. He also questions the performance-for-the camera in the documentaries in a similar way that I have already argued. Under the narrativity, he argues that documentaries sometimes use the suspense-inducing structure and *the “crisis structure”* like fictions. He also give examples to “fictive elements” used in documentaries such as construction of character, narration, music, high or low camera angles etc. Thus, he underlines that documentaries “employ many of the methods and devices of its fictional counterpart”. (2-3) Then, he argues that documentaries are “if not fictional, at least fictive.” (7)

Nichol claims that documentaries do not differ from fictions in their constructedness as texts and he argues that “documentaries are fictions with plots, characters, situations, and events like any other. They offer introductory lacks, challenges, or dilemmas; they build heightened tensions and dramatically rising conflicts, and they terminate with resolution and closure. They do all this with reference to a “reality” that is a construct, the product of signifying systems...” (107)

In addition to these, Roscoe and Hight use some gathered data based on the reactions of the audience while they are interpreting the audience but they

confess that an audience research is needed to interpret the audience reactions better.

3. METHODOLOGY of SHOOTING “FORBIDDEN FILM”

One of my aims in shooting the *Forbidden Film* is to reveal the fictitious characteristics of the documentary. But my main aim is to increase the skepticism toward the “truth claims” of documentaries and television news which uses similar codes and conventions.

Forbidden Film begins with a title that claims that what is going to be watched is a documentary and all of the materials used in the film will be used appropriate to the codes and conventions of the documentary in order to make the film look like a documentary. However, the film does not have any real referent except the scene where fascists protests Ferhat. This real footage is used independent from its referential context, in other words, in reality the protest was not organized against Ferhat who is off-screen. However, the voice over adds these fake meanings to visual image. Therefore, it differentiates from the documentaries where all of the images have real referents, but I can not claim that in documentaries all of the images/signifiers coincide with their referents. Deficiency of the reason and partiality of the signifier may cause inconsistency between the signifier and the referent. The signifier is not an independent image, the image gain meaning with the whole argument of the film. Also, the voice over can add meaning to the image that does not have when considered independently. A similar approach takes place in the tv news where the meeting of Hygiene Association is edited. I will tell about it later.

One of the subjects of the film is about the fakery of news that blames the Hygeine Association and another subject is the making process of a documentary which tries to disprove the arguments of the news and also to reveal the economic relations of the television institution in the circumstances of these arguments. *Forbidden Film* will not screen the making process of the documentary; it is the documentary that is being made in the film.

Forbidden Film has a “hostile” manner towards classic documentary aesthetics. This manner can be interpreted in two levels. The first is the Özgür’s documentary and the second is the *Forbidden Film* as being a mock-documentary.

I want to discard the fictionality of the film as being mock-documentary for a while to focus on Özgür's documentary as if it is a real documentary. To some extent, I want the audience to assume that the film is a documentary and so it is Özgür's documentary that is prepared for television to inform the audience about what really happened in the previous weeks.

Özgür's documentary has an intrinsic critique to the representation of evidentiality in documentaries. As I discussed before, the performance of the subjects can be changed according to the presence of the camera. In the documentary, the crew follows Simitçi with a hand-held camera and when he realizes the camera he changes his attitudes. Özgür's film does not do anything to prevent this change. Also, Özgür's documentary does not hide the intervention of director when the Association members force the General Editor of the tv channel to reenact his dialogue with Ferhat. There two more examples where the actors acts towards camera. The first is Özgür's video where he forces a man to clean his spit and the second is Uğur's speech to members of association while they are in the meeting.

As narrator and director and also as a victim of the private television, Özgür mentions it is subjective approach to its subject. He is very tendentious while trying to prove that he is not guilty in front of the audience. In this respect his film looks like a plea. His selective manner about what and whom to shoot and what to screen is inevitable and he does not try to hide his subjectivity. He primarily gives place to the arguments of the members of the Hygiene Association, but not to the people they are against of. The television recordings are used for disproving them; not for creating a comparison between two sides of the argument. For example, two types of editorial approach to the meeting are given; the first (thesis) is the channel's way in which the meeting is edited by picking some words to create a sentence that was not spoken and presented the meeting as an organization of terrorist activities; and the second (antithesis) is Özgür's where he shows what happened in real by fast-forwarding the cassette. So, Özgür exhibits the selection and arrangement of the evidential material in tv news.

Özgür's documentary has reflexive instances that underline the constructedness of the documentary. By revealing the making process of the documentary, Özgür's film has the potential to remind the audience that the

documentary is a construct. Decision moment of making a documentary against the television news is screened in film. This scene obviously gives information about the reason of making the documentary and about that this is that documentary which is going to be prepared. Also, in a scene Özgür picks the camera after his speech to camera and goes to shoot the preparation meeting of occupation of television channels without stopping the record. In addition, the interviewees directs to the camera and so the audience (judge). These scenes underlines the existence of the camera and so the making process. Furthermore, the crew asks the Simitçi to act in the film. Thus, the preproduction of an enactment scene is screened.

All of the above about Özgür's documentary are designed to underline the evidentiality critiques. Playing with the codes and conventions and making them strange can affect audience' perception negatively that Özgür's film is a documentary. I prefer the audience to realize that Forbidden Film is not a documentary, but I do not want them to realize it because of the bad acting, the unrealistic décor or the exaggerated usage of codes and conventions.

For example, I want Simitçi to change his behaviours when he realizes the camera but I do not want audience to realize that he is acting. He has to be natural as one changes his behaviours when he encounters with camera in daily life. Thus, what is natural in the diegesis of the film is the presence of the camera, in other words, with a hand-held camera the crew goes to ask the Simitçi to play in the film. Özgür is not trying to capture the putative event. The same approach is also applicable to the enactment scene between General Editor and Ferhat where the director intervenes. The intervention of the director not only changes the behaviour of the subjects but it is the reason of their behaviours. I mean what really happened in the scene is the directorial intervention. So, these two scenes as I put against the evidentiality argument of shooting are not powerful to reveal that documentaries presents their footage as they would inevitably happen whether or not the camera exists and the director intervenes.

As I told before, I want to list the codes and conventions that are I used in the film to make the realistic to look like a documentary. These codes are commonly used in documentary films to support the argument. These are not documentary specific codes, in other word; they can also be used in feature

films. Whether they are documentary codes or not base on the context of the film. When these are presented as if they are signifying real referents, the film may look like a documentary. The codes are used in order to reinforce the idea that “what is presented here was happened in history”.

In the beginning of the film there is written information that tells that the film was shot fifteen years before but it is forbidden. Some captions will also give information about the time and place. This code will empower that the story was really happened in the past.

The news, Ferhat’s television program and the occupation of the channel will take place in the film as if they are recorded from the television. In this regard, in post-production I will add logos (I will cover the logo with black), crawling and still titles about the news and television programs to make the verisimilitude of television image.

I will prepare some fake newspaper pages in photoshop about association as he took place in newspapers.

These last two materials will be presented as they are gathered for evidences. Some of them have the informative priority but some are used for disproving the argument of the news as I told before.

I also try to mimic the usage of hand-held camera in documentaries to create a realist atmosphere. All of the hand-held camera footage except the one shoots the meeting and the ones in Ferhat’s programme are shot by Özgür for his documentary (they are not gathered). None of Özgür’s own shots disguise the fly on the wall.

The scene of police raid to “Hygiene Association” will be used from the recordings of surveillance cameras. But it is not a gathered material; Özgür shoots it while he is planning to record a possible fascist raid.

There are two reconstruction scenes that will be mentioned by the word “reconstruction” written on the screen. This is a technique that is used in documentaries. If the word “reconstruction” writes on the screen the other scenes without it will automatically becomes non-fictive. One of them is the argument between the Simitçi and Ferhat in the beginning of the film. The other is the dialogue between General Editor and Ferhat. Both of them are far from the classical usage. In the first, as I told before, the crew asks Simitçi to reenact. The second usage is assumed, by Özgür, to be the reconstruction of the

dialogue; however with his intervention it becomes evidence that gives the information that the editor is forced to reenact.

To support the argument Özgür uses eyewitnesses as they are used in documentaries. In his film he does not interview any expert. However, in the film, indirectly experts are interviewed in tv-news. The interviewee (Uğur) and the expert in the news are not telling the truth and I think this is important to underline the issue that they can be incredible.

An off-screen voice over as narrator will be used throughout the film. At the beginning of the film the voice over has descriptive and summarizing function that can be called “objective”. But, I think the objectivity is a very problematic issue when there are chosen descriptions and summaries. While the film approaches to the end, the voice-over will be more and more subjective and in the side of “Hygiene Association” with an exaggerated manner. This altering usage is an antidote to the assumption that objectivity of voice-over can be possible in documentaries and in tv-news. Furthermore, when it is realized that this is a mock-documentary, it will be obvious that what the voice-over said, both the objective and subjective ones, were only consist of lies.

Does *Forbidden Film* reveal itself as mock-documentary and how can audience realize the mock?

Forbidden Film is designed to position the audience to start watching it by assuming that it is a documentary but to produce suspicion about the documentary by encountering with an over-exaggerated subject throughout the film. This suspicion can also lead the audience to realize that it is not a documentary but a fiction. However, instead of an obvious revelation of fictionality, I preferred the audience to suspect about the reality of the film, so I changed the chronological order and put the most realistic scenes in the beginning. These are tv-news where the décor is designed appropriate to 1992 and Alp Buğdaycı acted as the reporter. He was news reporter at 1992. Also, in order to prevent a hoax, I put a hint to the film which reveals that it is a fiction. The hint is that Özgür’s documentary is broadcasted in 12th July although the “reconstruction” between Editor and Ferhat, and the occupation is happened almost at the same moment. I kept this hint to the end of the film, but left a reason for audience to investigate by not answering the question that what happened after the occupation.

However, how the film will work on audience highly depends on the audience's knowledge about the film and the period. Also, the reception process can change for every audience; but since it is a mock-documentary, film maker (me) has to take how the codes and conventions can work on audience into consideration as possible as he can.

What happens when the film is taken into account as a mock-documentary? All of the codes and conventions, the truth claims and arguments, and the structure of the film will be realized as fiction. If it is possible to make a fiction with these tools then documentary is not a credible style (or genre) for representing the truth.

4. METHODOLOGY of AUDIENCE RESEARCH

4.1 Participants

I defined my sample as people who are between the ages of 33-37 because the film pasts in the year 1992, so the participants will be between 18-22, that is the age where people mostly structure their political opinions about the world. Also, they can remember the television programs and what happened in 1992.

The most important issue defining the sample was that I did not prefer the people who know that I made the film and who has the potential to know the actors and actresses. Therefore I could not offer the people I know to be a participant.

One of the interviewees was 40 years old, but I neglected the age difference and used the data. The other three interviewees are 33 and two are 34 years old. Five of them are graduated from university and one is from high school. Also, they have different professions.

4.2 Apparatus

I decided to conduct interviews with the participants who watched *Forbidden Film*. At first, I was indifferent between interview and focus group. To gather people in one place at the same time were difficult to make a focus group. Also, the participants could influence each other during the discussion. Furthermore, I assumed that the participants could tell it to someone and this can provide me a chance to ask whether they talked about during or after watching the film with someone or not. I asked whether they did so or not in 7th and 9th questions, so I could learn whether they realized the fiction or not by asking it indirectly. If they did not tell the film to someone, I prepared the 10th question to learn what they would tell. I thought probably they would tell about the fiction if they realized it.

It was difficult and could be misleading to learn whether the audience suspects *Forbidden Film* is a film or documentary when directly asked. The

questions between 7 and 12 are put in interview to find out whether the participants realized the fiction or not indirectly. If these questions would not work, the 13th question directly asks the participant whether the events are experienced or not, in other words, whether they are perceived real. At first it was my first question but the pilot study with 2 graduated and one PhD student lead me not to ask it directly as a first question because they found it misinterpretable and misleading. So I decided to ask questions indirectly before 13th question. One of them offered me to ask 8th question and my advisor offered me to ask 11th question. The 12th question designed to provide controlling data. The answer can be Özgür or someone other than Özgür. If the answer is someone other than Özgür then it can be said that the participant realized that *Forbidden Film* a fiction. But the answer that the “director is Özgür” does not mean reverse. The participant can assume that Özgür made a fiction film.

All of the six questions before the 13th one claim that the film is documentary, so it was possible for the participant to react against this argument.

14th question is designed to find out from which materials the participants understand the fiction. I predetermined the possible answers as I discussed in the methodology of shooting the film. In the pilot study it is offered that I can wait the participants to answer as much as they can, then I can remind them the other possible answers.

The aim of the 15th question is to measure whether the participants could watch the film as a documentary to some extent or not and also to determine the moment when they realized the fiction.

16th question is tried to find out what the participants think about the believability of common sense. 17th question is asked about their opinions about the media but I did not use the data. 18th and 19th questions will be asked if the interviewee watched the film as real.

4.3 Procedures

I made dvd and vcd copies of *Forbidden Film* and gave them to my friends to give them to people who are appropriate to my criteria. When I

learned that they watched the film I wait for a while in order to give them time to tell the film to someone. I did not tell them to make anything but I thought they can talk about the film with people. This was also asked them in the interview. One of the interview is made face to face but the second one was done by phone because of the preference of the participant who complained about his business. During the interview he asked me whether I was in the film or not, so I thought maybe they can ask more questions when they do not see me. So I continued to make interviews via phones. I took notes and read the notes to them while writing, so they had chance to check it.

I gave 32 copies to the potential participants. At first, all of them promised to watch the film and participate in the interview but only 6 of them replied my invitation. The interview with the Interviewee 1 is interrupted because of his job.

4.4 Findings and Discussion

Five of the interviewees directly told or provide sufficient information that they realized *Forbidden Film* is a fiction film before I ask the 13th question. But they began watching the film as a documentary. The first moment they realize the fiction differs but it is in the beginning of or in the first half of the film.

The realization moment of the interviewees is as follows from earlier to later: the murder scene which is between fourteenth second and first minute, the Ferhat's first program which is between first and third minutes, after the channel is closed and Hygiene Association is began to be pronounced which is between third and fourth minutes, the first Simitçi scene which is between eleventh and twelfth minutes, and after the news when the association is founded which is between twelfth and eighteenth minutes. The last one is confusing because the there are other events between the news and the foundation of the association. Also, one of them asked me whether the film was real after the interview although he argued he did not believe the reality of the film.

Which factors were efficient in interviewees' realization of the fiction? To answer this question I will use the responses given to 14th question. I think

the most efficient factors would be the ones that were declared without my interference. When I consider those responses, it is obvious that the most powerful factor is the absurdity and exaggeration in the film. Four of five interviewees (the ones who realized fiction) talked about absurdity and exaggeration before I reminded them the choices. They used some phrases to mention the absurdity and exaggeration. These words and phrases are: “too much exaggerated”, “not possible”, “not seem serious to me”, “a product of imaginary power”, “absurd as well as can not be real”, “contradict with my logic”, “nobody does ... in real life” and “does not evoke the reality”.

These phrases points out that four interviewees compares the events that they encountered in *Forbidden Film* with the “events can be happen in real life”, or in other words, with their daily life experiences. If the events in the film can not easily be happen (there is a very low possibility) in the daily life, then they can be perceived exaggerated or absurd. This comparison is meaningful when we compare the fiction and the documentary. The former is a product of imagination and the latter is the product of real life. The one who talked about absurdity after I reminded the choice give the foundation of Hygiene Association as an example and then he continued: “I had obsessive friends around me those years. If there were an association, I should have heard about it.” In this example, what is absurd is determined according to the personal memory. The previous ones are decided according to possibility but this one has certainty. Also, it can be argued that the interviewee who believed that the events in the film are happened get that decision according to his experiences when his answers to other questions considered. He thought he perceived the film as real because he is opponent and he said “we experienced things like that in past and most of them were camouflaged”.

As I told above, only one of the interviewees claimed that he realized fiction because of his knowledge about the past without any interference of the interviewer. In contrast, when I asked the interviewee, who believed that the film was real, what he would say if it is a fiction, he said that he remembers the reporter so he believes that events are really happened. Two of the interviewees accepted that their past knowledge can have effect on their decision, one was indifferent and one denied with a reason that he was not watching television

those days. Only one of these four gave emphasis to this choice, the others gave short answers.

Only one of the five interviewees said that the acting was not good. One of them said acting is successful because they act in order to reveal the fiction. But I did not want the actors to act to reveal it except the Editor. Another one pointed out a specific actor that was Simitçi but he found the others successful. The other two found all the actors insufficient.

Three of the five interviewees mentioned that the décor is realistic. They said they “look like real” or “they reminded me those years”. Interviewee 1 argued that the news studio look likes modern and so it can be said that, for him, it is not realistic. However, he claimed that he watched the film as a documentary until the first Simitçi scene, therefore this data is contradictory. Interviewee 5 told that the street shootings were isolated so they do not look like real. He gave the simitçi scene and Özgür’s video as examples. However, the Simitçi scene has to be isolated because Özgür and Ferhat were illegal at that moment so they had to prefer to shoot the scene when the street is empty.

I think the realistic décor of the news studio and the existence of a known reporter was the most efficient factor in the believability of the interviewees. As I told before, who believed that *Forbidden Film* is real argued that the news were real. Also, Interviewee 3 declared that she asked herself whether they are happened when she encountered with the news.

None of the interviewees found out the logical mistake of the film that they can not broadcast a video that has also the images that had just been shot. Interviewee 5 said it was not logical but he referred to the absurdity when he said “events can not be happen”.

According to the four of five interviewees people can believe that the events are happened. Two of them claimed that low educated people can perceive it real. Interviewee 1 argued that the foreigners who are against to Turkey can believe it. Maybe the political engagements have a role in the perception because Interviewee 6 admits that he is an opponent. But my study can not have enough information to conclude this argument.

I want to focus on the scenes where the interviewees emphasized that the scenes made them to realize the fiction. I gathered data from their responses to 14th question where they gave examples to exaggeration and bad acting and

also from their first revelation moments of the fiction. The simitçi scene is declared four times; the fight scene because of the spit declared three times; and the murder scene, the foundation of association and the scene where Uğur uttered during the meeting declared twice as examples by the interviewees. Simitçi scene, Uğur's scene and the fight scene has a common property that in those scenes the camera and the director's intervention were not disguised; because of my preference that Özgür's documentary could be an hostile one as I told in Methodology of Shooting *Forbidden Film*. I do not have enough data to conclude that this phenomenon has influenced the interviewees but I think it may have. Also, I have to add that the measure of this effect is very difficult because the other factors have to be isolated.

5. CONCLUSION

The possibility of making a mock-documentary that is a fiction decreases the credibility of documentaries because a fiction film can be made by documentary codes and conventions that can lead the audience to perceive it as real. These codes might have influence on the audience to convince them that what they see is real but they do not guarantee that documentaries have direct relations with real because these codes can be used in a fiction.

When results of the audience research are taken into account, it can be said that interviewees can watch *Forbidden Film* as a real documentary to some extent. It was not exactly perceived as real but the aim of *Forbidden Film* was not to deceive the audience. If so, it will be the reproduction of the news and documentaries that produce hoaxes to some extent. *Forbidden Film* was made to warn the audience that hoaxes can exist in documentaries so it should not have produced a new hoax. But the hesitation in the beginning was planned and according to interview results it is managed.

The audience research can be furthered by conducting interviews on low educated people and foreigners. Also, the sample can be more specific according to the time that audience spends with television or according to their political engagements to measure their different responses. Furthermore, the factors that reveal the fakeness can be analyzed by using controlling groups and different versions of film to isolate the factors from each other.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Corner, John. *The Art of Record*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Nichols, Bill. *Representing Reality*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Renov, Michael. "Introduction: The Truth About Non-Fiction" in *Theorizing Documentary* (ed. Michael Renov). New York and London: Routledge, 1993.

Roscoe, Jane and Crag Height. *Faking It*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Winston, Brian. "Documentary: I think We are in Trouble" in *New Challenges for Documentary* (ed. Alan Rosenthal). Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1988.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 - Interview Questions

1) What is your birth year?

2) What is your education?

3) What is your job?

4) How much money do you gain in a month?

5) Were you watching television in 1992?

Never Rarely Occasionally Often Too
Often

6) Are you watching television now?

Never Rarely Occasionally Often Too
Often

7) In which conditions did you watch the documentary? Were there anybody and did you talk about the documentary during the spectacle? If so, what did you talk?

8) Did you watch the documentary once? Did you watch some scenes again during or after the spectacle? Which scenes?

9) Have you ever talked about the documentary with someone? What did you tell?

10) What would you tell to a friend about the documentary? What are the interesting things and your approach?

11) Have you ever watched a documentary like that? Can you compare it with the documentaries you have watched?

12) For you, who is the director of the documentary and for what purpose he made it?

13) Do you think the events are happened? Are the events and the images real?

14) Why do you think these events are not happened and the events and images are not real?

(At first the participant will be waited for the answer and will be asked if there are more reasons. Then, the choices will be reminded.)

a) There are absurd and over-exaggerated issues. What are they?

- b) I could not remember the events. If they were really happened I should remember it because the events have the potential to be popular.
 - c) Some actors could not act realistic. Who?
 - d) Décor and the atmosphere are not realistic. Which?
 - e) There are actors and places that I know. Who and what?
 - f) There is a logical mistake in the film. What is that mistake?
- 15) Have you ever hesitate or decide about any image that can be real? What were these images? Then why did you change your mind?
- 16) Can you call the film documentary? Why? Do you think can anybody watch the film as documentary?
- 17) Do you think media behave as in the film in real life?
- 18) *Will be asked if the interviewee believed that the film is real.*
Have you ever hesitate or decide about any image that can be real? What were these images?
- 19) What will you say if I tell you that the film was fiction?

APPENDIX 2 - Interview Answers

Interviewee1

- 1) 1974
- 2) high school
- 3) driver in a private company
- 4) 1000-1500 ytl
- 5) rarely
- 6) too often
- 7) I watched the film on laptop in my workplace. It was a quiet place. Someone looked to film occasionally while I was watching but we did not talk.
- 8) I watched the film once, but while watching I read the titles twice because I could not read all of them at first. After watching the film I wanted to re-watch first scenes but then when I think on them I understood what happened and decided not to watch.
- 9) No.
- 10) I would tell that: "The film is about the tricks of the media. They make tricks because they have to be in harmony with the regime in order to gain money. Also, the film is about the environmental problems but the media does not care and make short news about those problems. So they (*the association members*) criticize the media." The most crucial thing for me is the montage of an event that is screened different on tv-news. Also, the immediate climb and fall of the programmer. This happens too often.
- 11) It looks like other documentaries because it argues something.
- 12) The film is not made by an association or institution or Sinan Çetin. They can be one or two people with friends. The idea can belong to one but the others should help. They want to tell something to people. They want to prove that they do not have a role in terror event. Also to emphasize the environmental problems. Also to criticize the media.
- 13) No, except the murder the media can do other things. For example, the montage event that I mentioned. There is a possibility to be real but I do not believe that the events really happened.

14) *The interviewee told without any interference:*

a) The murder planned by media, their closure to the home and their hiding on upstairs of the association, the police surely would find them. These are too much exaggerated. Also, the occupation of the channels and broadcasting a tape at the same time is not possible.

The interviewee told when reminded:

b) I was not watching television those days too often, so I did not think anything like that.

c) Simitçi acts badly. He does not look like a simitçi, even if he is someone working on the setting.

d) The news studio was not look like the ones in that period. They are too modern. In those days there were panels.

e) I know one of the extras.

f) I did not encounter with a logical error.

15) I thought it can be really happened before I see the Simitçi scene. But then I realized and did not say it may really happened again.

16) It is closer to documentary. There can be some people who can watch it as real because our people believe everything. Also, the foreigners who are against Turkey can believe that the film is real.

17) Absolutely. In magazine there is one hundred percent montage or they are exaggerated. News also does these things but in written media there are more. I know it because I watch news.

Interviewee 2

1)1974

1) University

2) Manager

3) 2-3

4) too often

5) occasionally

6) I watched it at home alone in the computer.

7) I watched once but I returned to some scenes to look at the dates.

8) I talked with someone. When it is called documentary, I assumed that a lot of things will be issued. But the film focuses only on one subject.

9) There is not any interesting thing. They made a film about cut, montage and paste. It is a good film in order to exhibit these but it is not a documentary.

10) It looks like a plea rather than a documentary. There is not a chronology. It is one sided and they try to prove that they are not guilty. It is made for acquittal. If it was a documentary it should exhibit all of the perspectives. It does not look like a documentary. I usually watch documentaries about nature but if it is a political one, it must not be one sided.

11) Man with the beard. To acquit himself.

12) They are not happened. None of them are real. They are imaginary. I do not remember these events, but media does things like that. Some of them could happen, but I do not think that they exactly happened as in the film. Are you acting in the film?

Me: No.

13) *The interviewee told without any reminder:*

b) The subject is very interesting; if they were happened I should remember them. They must be remembered.

The interviewee told when reminded:

a) The foundation of hygiene association and the scene where a passenger spits and the others run to him. I have obsessive friends and if there was an association I should have heard about it.

c) They do not act badly.

d) They reminded me those years.

e) I remember the news reporter. News was like real. I asked whether they are happened. Also, the fascist scene is a real scene.

f) No.

15) As I mentioned, I thought that the news are real and the protests against Serhat, was his name Serhat?, must be real footage. I do not remember his name exactly.

Me: Ferhat.

Interviewee: I understood that they are not real after the news when the association is founded.

16) We can not call this film is a documentary. It must not be one sided in order to be a documentary. Nobody can call it documentary around me.

Me: In the world?

The film is shot bad, it is amateur and artificial. If it was shot professional and realistic, they might believe the events are real but it is absurd so they can say it is a joke.

Me. which scenes are artificial?

The man who spits out, Simitçi scene and the man who enters the room and tells that they are making communism propaganda.

17) As I told before, yes.

Interviewee: May I ask you a question?

Me: Yes, please.

Interviewee: Was it a documentary? Were they really happened?

Me: No.

Interviewee 3

- 1) 1967
- 2) university
- 3) nurse
- 4) 1300-1400
- 5) often
- 6) occasionally
- 7) I watched it at home alone from DVD player.
- 8) I watched it once and did not return to any scene.
- 9) No.
- 10) I will tell them that it is a fiction. Did it made as a comedy?

Me: I can not answer this question now. Can you continue?

Interviewee: In 1992 those events did not happen. It is not a comedy but a black comedy.

11) I have not watched this kind of thing. I usually watch documentaries about nature. I am not sure whether they can be compared. I think they can not be compared.

12) Are you asking within the film or in real? The aim of the film is to emphasize the power and perversion of the media. If the film did not have hygiene things, it could really make the audience to think about terror. The people whose education is not enough can think that these things are real; they can say these things are happened. If the Hygiene Association words did not take place in the film it could be realized as a real serious organization. For example, the manifesto they read can be understood as belonging to a serious organization.

13) No, it is a fiction. Maybe they are experienced, but not the same things, things or other subjects like that can be experienced. But the filmmakers wanted to make a fiction in a different way by changing the subjects what are really happened. After 15 years, they wanted to remind the audience the events happened in 1992 that are similar to these things.

14) *The interviewee told without any interference:*

a) It did not seem serious to me. They are a product of imaginary power. They are absurd as well as they can not be real. For example, Simitçi. Their fight because Simitçi licks his finger. Then his change and have a water cup. When Uğur threatens the others. They force the channel manager to repeat what he did with snow masks.

The interviewee told when reminded:

b) I did not remember the events. This must have an effect on me.

c) The actors/actresses were realistic. They acted in order to reveal that this is a fiction. It was the aim of them so they were successful.

d) They were good.

e) The reporter. I remember him but I am not sure where from. Was he really a news reporter?

f) I could not find anything. Although there were flashbacks I could not.

15) From the first titles emerge to the Ferhat's speech to a person from phone, his leave of the channel and the closure of the channel, this is also included, I assumed that they are real. But when the Hygiene Association is begun to be talked, I understood it was not real.

16) We can call it documentary. Is not it needed to be about reality in order to be a documentary? But some people believe some lies and fakes in magazine programs, especially the elder women, I witness their conversations, and they

speak as if they believe. Some groups can believe the film as if it is really happened.

Me: Foreigners?

Interviewee: Foreigners can assume that they are happened because they can believe what does not or can not be happened in their countries can be happened in other countries.

17) Yes. Absolutely. They can perverse. They can montage the words. They can change the place of the sentences and can exhibit the things happened in fact they are not happened. I do not give permission to my child to watch magazine programs. They secretly exhibit some unethical things as if they are normal. They can make people believe that unfair is in fact right... *She gives an example from Tuğba Özay.*

Interviewee 4

- 1) 1973
- 2) University
- 3) Software developer and project manager
- 4) Higher than 3000 YTL
- 5) Rarely
- 6) Occasionally
- 7) At home from DVD player. My wife entered and leaved the room few times. I told her my hesitation whether it is real or not.
- 8) Once. I watched the beginning where a man was shot because I could not heard the conversation between them.
- 9) I spoke about the film with people in my workplace. I told them it is a sketch.
- 10) The film is about hygiene obsession. It is a psychological illness. Their attitude is not right.
- 11) Do you classify it as a documentary?

Me: How do you classify?

Interviewee: I think it is not real. I do not think that someone can not be shot because of that reason. If so, I think murderers must have mental illness. The reason is not about hygiene. They must be cured. I think they have virus phobia,

I know it from psychology. A precaution is necessary, they must be isolated. But I still think it is not real.

12) The makers are amateur; maybe they used 1 or 2 cameras. The aim is to make a comedy.

13) The events are not happened.

14) *The interviewee told without any interference:*

a) The events in the film contradict with my logic.

Me: What do you mean?

Interviewee: For example, they wanted the man to clean his spit, this can not happen. Nobody accepts to clean in real life. I would not for example.

Me: Do you mean was it exaggerated?

Interviewee: Yes.

The interviewee told when reminded:

b) Maybe I was not watching television too much but I should have read it from newspapers. People around me should have spoken about it because it is very comic.

c) The actors are not sufficient in acting and talent. Of course, I can not act better but when compared with professional films they are not enough. In general it was like this.

d) The places were isolated. The passengers had to go by. It distances the film from realism. For example, simitçi scene and when Özgür force the man to clean his spit.

e) No.

f) There was logic. There is no mistake. The scenes were consistent.

15) At first, I assumed that it is a very serious film. I thought it was really forbidden. Maybe, it could be about PKK or other terror organizations, even I assumed a film made by them. However, when Ferhat's program starts I realized that is not real.

16) No, I can not say it is a documentary because some moments can not be recorded. They are shot later as if they are enactments.

Me: What are those moments?

Interviewee: For example, the murder scene can not be recorded. They would not record it. It looks like a film that is aim is entertaining.

Some people can believe. People with low education levels can believe it, for example construction workers.

Me: Foreigners?

Interviewee: Foreigners who do not know anything about Turkey can believe it if the film was more realistic. People who do not read newspapers and news can believe it. Americans who do not their president is Bush can believe.

17) Media can be leading. There is an independency. They try to impose their opinions on people.

Interviewee 5

1) 1974

2) University

3) Captain in Ships

4) 1500 YTL

5) occasionally

6) often

7) Alone, at home, quite place. From computer.

8) By giving breaks. I watched the fight scene again.

Me: Which one?

Interviewee: When Simitçi beats Ferhat.

9) No.

10) Comic. They refer to other events. They say hygiene but they emphasize things like democracy.

11) No, I have not watched a film like this. I think the character Uğur refers to Uğur Dündar. He was making programs about hygiene. The arguments of the film have not been declared before. Maybe they are true to some extent. The film collapses some thesis. Maybe it has truth when it is told the contradiction between the small and large markets. And also, the conspiracies may have truth.

12) To support a terror organization that is accused of being guilty.

13) They are happened. I do not remember an event like this in early 90s. But the dates are changed and events are symbolic. They are not real. The death of people refers to 1 May events in Taksim.

14) *The interviewee told without any interference:*

x) The places of logos are covered but there are no logos under the cover.

Me: I mean how you realized the fake.

a and c) what the people do in the film does not evoke reality. Also, they acting.

Me: Who? For example?

Interviewee: Ferhat.

The interviewee told when reminded:

a) The fight because a simit and afterwards the Simitçi wears glows. Also, the fight because of the split. These are exaggerated.

b) I do not remember the events. But this may did not influence on my perception.

d) They look like real.

e) The news reporter. He was reporting those years, but this one is a mise an scene.

f) The film was complicated. It was not logical. The events can not happen.

15) When I read the titles I assumed that they are real but when I saw that a man is killed because he spits out to ground, I realized.

16) The film emphasizes and argues something like documentaries. But I can not say it is a documentary. But, in Turkey everything is possible, some people can watch it as real.

Me: Foreigners?

Interviewee: Possible.

17) In media, some news' are true but some news' are lie. They usually exaggerate the events.

Interviewee 6

1) 1973

2) University

3) Public officer

4) 1000 – 1500 YTL

5) Rarely

6) Rarely

7) In workplace from computer. Alone. It was a quiet place.

8) Once.

- 9) I did not talk with anybody. I liked it. The content was nice.
- 10) Nothing has changed. The system and the media are same. The people who seem patriot are in fact ungrateful and vice versa.
- 11) I did not watch too any documentary.
- 12) There are some minorities. They try to exhibit right things to the society but people can not get their idea. People do not support the ideas except the nationalistic ones. But I will not leave my utopia. Some people demonstrate meeting some tries to make films to give messages. The film makers tried people to question and to inquire some things.
- 13) They happened and have happened. I do not remember those days exactly but I will investigate the events. We experienced things like that in past and most of them were camouflaged. Events happened in the documentary are real.

Me: Are you sure?

Maybe I believed because I am an opponent. They are not product. You will not believe if they were happened in Europe, but we experienced things like that. It convinced me.

18) There is not nothing contradictory to real.

19) I know the reporter. I believe that the events are really happened.

Me: Are you sure?

They should be real. I think they happened in the past.