

The Architecture of Class in *Parasite*: A Literary and Cultural Dissection

Md. Fazle Rabbi

Abstract

Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite* (2019) made history by being the first non-English-language film to win the Best Picture at the 92nd Academy Awards. This paper examines the film through the lens of social inequality, structuralism and binary oppositions, psychoanalysis, representation theory, and spatial theory to have a comprehensive knowledge of the film as a cultural text. By analyzing the class dynamics between the wealthy Park family and the poor Kim family, the film reveals a critical narrative about modern capitalism and systemic inequality. Through a psychoanalytic lens, the paper looks into the intuitive motivations behind the Kims' infiltration of the Parks. Representation theory helps unpack the film's portrayal of class not merely as an economic divide but as a symbolic order reinforced by cultural narratives and visual signs. Additionally, spatial theory becomes a crucial framework in understanding how architecture and space reflect social hierarchies. The film's use of verticality highlights the structural nature of class strata, while the physical and psychological spaces the characters inhabit serve as places of conflict and tension. Finally, this paper contends that the film, *Parasite*, offers an insightful critique of class stratification, using cinematic techniques to visualize and embody inequality in a way that resonates with global spectators.

Keywords: Class stratification, Psychoanalysis, Representation theory, Social inequality, Spatial theory, Structuralism

Introduction

Audiences all across the world have been captivated by Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite* (2019), which won the coveted Palme d'Or at the 2019 Cannes Film Festival and the Academy Award for Best Picture in 2020 for its masterful portrayal of social inequality and the human condition. The film, which is set in contemporary South Korea, traces the seemingly symbiotic yet ultimately destructive relationship between two families from vastly different socioeconomic backgrounds. *Parasite* shows the often-invisible but firmly established gap between the rich and the poor, which becomes a powerful mirror reflecting the injustices and disputes ingrained in modern society. The film creates two distinct yet coexisting worlds, through the disparate lives of the wealthy Park family and the impoverished Kim family, separated not only by wealth but also by cultural symbols and spatial architecture.

Lecturer, Dept. of English, Pundra University of Science & Technology, Bogura, Bangladesh

As Liu (2020, p. 81) notes, the gulf between the rich and the poor extends beyond economics to differences in housing, education, outlook, and opportunity—resulting in entrenched social stratification.

This study examines the film using five interconnected theoretical frameworks—social inequality, psychoanalysis, representation theory, structuralism, and spatial theory—to comprehend how *Parasite* creates and challenges this division. The structural mechanisms that sustain inequality, the unconscious motivations of characters, the symbolic language of wealth and poverty, the binary oppositions that structure social identity, and the ideological roles of architecture and location may all be examined through these lenses. The research seeks to offer a thorough understanding of how *Parasite* depicts and examines class relations in late capitalism society by incorporating these lenses.

Parasite can be viewed as a dismantling of the beliefs and mechanisms that structure social relations from the structuralists' perspective. Every action, symbol, and area in the film is intricately woven into systems of dominance and subordination, creating a visual and narrative architecture of class. This analysis is further enhanced by psychoanalytic theory, which reveals the unconscious repressions, anxieties, and wants that shape the relationships and goals of the characters. The film reveals the psychological underpinnings of social abrasion, from the Kim family's jealousy of the Parks to the Parks' thoughtless superiority. A framework for cross-examining how class is portrayed in the visual and symbolic language of the film is provided by representation theory. Lastly, spatial theory sheds light on how physical locations function as symbols for ingrained class divisions, especially the stark vertical contrast between the Kims' semi-basement and the Parks' hilltop estate. This article aims to provide a multi-layered analysis of *Parasite* as a reflection and critique of social inequality by integrating different theoretical frameworks. It does this by looking at how the film makes use of structural, psychological, and spatial dynamics to make statements about larger socioeconomic realities.

Although the topics of class conflict and social inequality in *Parasite* have been extensively studied, the literature that has already been written about them either treats them separately or concentrates only on one theoretical point of view (such as social critique or spatial symbolism). A thorough, multidisciplinary analysis that integrates several theoretical vantage points, including structuralism, psychoanalysis, representation theory, and spatial theory, to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the film depicts and critiques class injustice is still lacking. Furthermore, there is a drought of academic literature that fully

examines the ways in which the film's visual and spatial components relate to these societal criticisms, especially in relation to the symbolic and psychological aspects of space. This paper fills this gap by providing an integrated analysis of the film's narrative, characters, and spatial arrangements across multiple theoretical frameworks.

Additionally, this study draws on a number of scholarly disciplines, including sociology, psychoanalysis, cultural theory, film studies, and spatial theory. Because of its wide multidisciplinary breadth, this research is significant to a wide range of academic audiences, including those with an interest in psychology, sociology, urban studies, and film. This study illustrates the value of film as a tool for academic inquiry by utilizing it to explore important academic ideas (such as social inequity, representation, and spatial analysis). It provides fresh perspectives on films like *Parasite* as potent critiques of actual systems rather than just being enjoyable.

Furthermore, this research has important pedagogical implications, especially for students and teachers studying sociology, film studies, and cultural theory. This study offers a paradigm for interdisciplinary learning and critical analysis by showing how a single cultural text, such as *Parasite*, may be examined via a variety of theoretical lenses, from structuralism and psychoanalysis to representation and spatial theories. It helps students make the connection between abstract academic frameworks and concrete examples by demonstrating how theoretical concepts can be applied to real-world media. Teachers can use the film as a powerful case study to explain difficult subjects like class dynamics, social inequity, and cultural representation in an approachable and interesting way. Thus, the research not only contributes to academic discourse but also serves as a valuable teaching tool for cultivating analytical thinking and theoretical knowledge across disciplines. By using *Parasite* as a case study, this research demonstrates how to apply complex theoretical frameworks (e.g., structuralism, psychoanalysis) to analyze cultural texts. This provides a paradigm for multidisciplinary analysis in educational settings in addition to adding to the scholarly *tête-à-tête* on *Parasite*.

Literature Review

Because of its complex plot and potent social commentary, Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite* (2019) has attracted a lot of scholarly attention. The film's depiction of class relations, social inequality, and cinematic form has been extensively examined, frequently using a variety of theoretical frameworks. Key scholarly works from five primary fields of analysis—social inequality, structuralism, psychoanalysis, representation theory, and spatial theory—are synthesized in this literature review.

A critique of socioeconomic inequality, a topic that has long been present in literary and cultural studies, is at the core of *Parasite*. In their outlines of the fundamentals of social stratification, scholars such as Kraus et al. (2017) and Oakes and Rossi (2003) point out that social power, prestige, and access to material resources all influence class. Sihombing and Sinaga (2021, p. 74) note how the characters' responses, attire, and behaviors reflect their varying positions within the social hierarchy, encoding their class differences. Anjaria (2020) contends that by showing the systematic subjugation of the working class, as demonstrated by the Kims' use of deceit as a survival tactic, *Parasite* attacks late capitalism. Similarly, Cho (2021) argues that the Parks' luxurious residence serves as a fortress, signifying the upper class's protection from the harsh truths of inequality. These analyses draw attention to the way the film frames economic power as an intellectual and real impediment to social mobility.

Parasite undermines binary oppositions and institutional power systems from a structuralist standpoint. The Park and Kim families, according to Jung (2020), who quotes Levi-Strauss, operate as structural opposites, trapped inside a larger framework of rich vs poor. This concept is expanded upon by Lee (2021), who views events such as the flood as metaphors for structural injustice rather than simple plot points. The Kims' service to the Parks and the Parks' reliance on the Kims exemplifies a parasitic relationship in which the boundaries between victimhood and complicity are blurred. The film's systemic critique of inequality is emphasized by these studies.

Psychoanalytic methods examine the characters' unconscious motivations. According to Noviana (2022, p. 81), the Kims' moral concessions stem from their urgent attempt to get out of poverty, which makes lying a means of psychological survival. Lekesizalin (2023, p. 121) suggests that systemic deprivation is linked to the decline of morals. According to Freudian interpretations by Kim (2020) and Han (2022), the Kims' desire for wealth is a sign of suppressed desire, and Mr. Park's dislike of Mr. Kim's smell reflects his fear of being contaminated and downward mobility. Thus, the profound emotional and psychological tensions underlying class struggle are revealed by the psychoanalytic lens.

Additional understanding of how the film visually encodes class differences can be gained from representation theory, especially as it is expressed by Stuart Hall (1997). According to Hall's view (1997), representation is a place where meaning is created rather than just a reflection. Kim (2021) observes how Bong differentiates the social worlds of the two families through the use of visual clues like lighting, set design, and framing. Goh (2022) elaborates on this by analyzing how the film exposes the moral hollowness that lies behind worldly success and

criticizes the glamorization of wealth. The way *Parasite* challenges prevailing cultural beliefs about virtue and prosperity is illustrated by these readings.

The film's use of geography and architecture to critique class requires an understanding of spatial theory, particularly as it was established by Henri Lefebvre (1974/1991). According to Zhan (2020, pp. 292–293), verticality—represented by the Parks' hilltop mansion and the Kims' semi-basement—becomes a symbol for social supremacy. The underlying instability of class coexistence is seen in the families' initial parasitic concord turning into outright animosity. Further examining how space in the film is ideological rather than neutral, Hwang (2020) and Park (2021) use flooding to represent the structural forces that keep the poor under water, and staircases to represent ambition and exclusion. These studies demonstrate how Bong Joon-ho uses physical environment as a storytelling tool to convey social criticism.

When combined, these theoretical frameworks show how *Parasite* provides a multi-layered intricate examination of class disparity. Although separate research has shed light on many facets of the film, this paper expands on that by combining these viewpoints into a cohesive, multidisciplinary analysis to gain a thorough understanding of the film as a cultural text. By doing this, it presents *Parasite* as a symbol of inequality as well as a representation of the complex structures that sustain it.

Discussion

Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite* (2019) is a brilliant cinematic examination of class relations that captures the enduring problems of social inequality that define late capitalist countries. *Parasite* not only depicts but also challenges the systems that uphold and maintain class inequality through the interplay of spatial dynamics, visual symbolism, and narrative structure. In order to investigate how *Parasite* exposes the intricacies of contemporary class hierarchies and systemic power relations, this discussion combines social inequality, structuralism, psychoanalysis, representation theory, and spatial theory.

Class Division, Inequality and Conflict

The story of *Parasite* (2019) revolves around how societal inequity is portrayed. The Park family, who reside in a large, fashionable mansion on a hill, depicts the wealthy elite, whereas the Kim family, who live in a small, semi-basement apartment, portrays the impoverished lower class. The obvious economic disparity that exists in capitalist countries, where money is concentrated

in the hands of a select few while the mass fight for survival, is reflected in the stark contrast between the two families. On the perpetual nature of systemic inequality Ali (2016) stated that:

At almost every point in a society, the higher class and the lower class, the dependent class and the independent class, and the rich class and the poor class can be found competing with each other. The upper class tries to keep the lower classes subordinate and does not want it to exceed its fixed limits, whereas, the lower class tries to challenge the status-quo and change its current situation for better. In this way, the struggle between them continues on constant basis. (p. 36)

The graphic depiction of the two homes makes the income gap clear. The Kim family is symbolically drowning in poverty since their flat is filthy, gloomy, and floods following heavy rains. The Park family's home, on the other hand, is a work of architectural art, with its spacious windows, lush garden, and minimalist design—elements that signify comfort and privilege. The Kim family literally lives underneath, while the Parks dwell above the stairs, Liu (2020, p. 80) examines, illustrating the practical and symbolic upstairs-downstairs difference throughout the film. The stark contrast between the Kims' semi-basement flat and the Parks' luxurious home serves as a visual representation of the widening economic gap. Their disparate living situations, jobs, and power structures further emphasize this gap. In capitalist economies, where physical environments mirror economic ties, this contradiction reflects what David Harvey (2001, p. 24) refers to as "the spatial fix". The Kims' incapacity to escape their underground living condition is representative of the larger class structure, in which the working class is frequently confined to low-paying, dangerous employment with few prospects for advancement.

Class conflict is the central focus of the film's societal commentary. The Kims gradually infiltrate the Park household in *Parasite* by taking on a variety of positions, including tutor, cleaner, driver, and caregiver, as they are desperate to move up the social ladder. The working class's attempts to obtain the privileges of the elite are symbolized by this slow invasion. The Kims' ascent to the top is tense, though, because their deceit is dangerous and ultimately unsustainable.

The word "Parasite" itself is a complicated metaphor that captures the characters' complex, mutually beneficial relationships. The Kims and Parks are dependent on one another; the Kims depend on the Parks for their jobs, and the Parks depend on the Kims for household duties. In spite of the fact that the upper class is equally reliant on the labor and services of the lower class, the film criticizes

how capitalist societies establish and maintain parasitic relationships in which the lower class is frequently perceived as stealing from the higher class. Both families rely on one another in different ways, even though their relationship is exploitative. While the Kims rely on the income and security that come with working for the Parks, the Parks rely on the Kim family's services to keep up their house, raise their kids, and drive their automobiles.

Ramos-Niaves argues that *Parasite* sees class society for what it is, a parasitic relationship where the wealthy benefit and the poor have to accommodate while acting in their own self-interest. Drawing on Jean Miller (2020), Ramos-Niaves further notes that subordinates know "[their] fate depends on accommodating to and pleasing the dominants" (2021, p. 66), allowing them to infiltrate them with the knowledge of how they operate. The Parks, who live in a bubble of wealth, are shown to be good yet ignorant. The Kims are able to take advantage of them because of their ignorance and disinterest in the problems of the lower classes, but it also shows how the wealthy frequently fail to recognize the systems that sustain their position, which is relying on the toil and misery of the lower classes.

All things considered, the film's depiction of the symbiotic relationship offers a potent reflection on the intricacies of class relations, economic inequality, and the moral difficulties present in interpersonal relationships within a hierarchical society. The terrible ending of the film, as violence breaks out between the families, emphasizes how unsustainable the capitalist system is and how working-class exploitation eventually sparks civil upheaval.

Structural and Binary Oppositions

The binary oppositions that underlie *Parasite*'s (2019) narrative and visual language become clear when viewed through a structuralist lens. *Parasite* can be interpreted as a tale of rich against poor, high versus low, and surface versus underground, in line with Levi-Strauss's structuralist theory, which holds that human societies are organized around binary oppositions. The spatial layout of the film makes these binary oppositions clear: the Kim family lives below in a semi-basement, while the Park family lives in a house perched high on a hill. According to Chandran et al. (2021, pp. 5569), the structure of the film is masterful but what puts it above the rest of the films is that no other well-paced thriller in recent memory has quite captured the zeitgeist like *Parasite* to quote the film so metaphorical itself.

The larger social processes that structure class relations in capitalist nations are reflected in the film's spatial dichotomy. The Kims' underground life symbolizes

their marginalization, while the Parks' exalted status symbolizes their position at the top of the social ladder. The structural factors that keep the working class trapped in poverty are symbolized by the flood that ruins the Kims' flat. The structural inequalities that characterize the Kims' existence inevitably pull them down, regardless of how hard they try to climb above their station.

In *Parasite*, the characters themselves are subject to binary oppositions that transcend spatial boundaries. The Kims are depicted as resourceful, crafty, and intimately acquainted with adversity, whereas the Parks are shown as ignorant, naive, and shielded from the harsh truths of life. The two families' disparate approaches to navigating the world are reflected in this discrepancy. The Parks are mostly isolated from the hardships of the working class because of their riches. The Kims, on the other hand, have been impoverished their entire lives and are well aware of the constraints placed on them by their social standing.

However, by exposing the flexibility of class identities, Bong Joon-ho muddies these dichotomous oppositions. Despite being initially portrayed as complete opposites, the Parks and Kims' interactions highlight the brittle lines separating the privileged from the destitute. Social mobility is achievable, albeit through dishonesty, as demonstrated by the Kims' ability to infiltrate the Park household. However, the violent ending of the film shows that the class disparity cannot be overcome in the end. The Kims are unable to overcome the systemic factors that maintain their poverty in spite of their best efforts. The film's critique of capitalism revolves around this conflict between the potential for social mobility and the continuation of structural inequality.

The Unconscious Desires of Class

Psychoanalytic theory sheds further light on the unconscious desires and motivations of the characters that shape the plot of the film, *Parasite* (2019). The Kims' activities are driven by a deep-seated yearning to leave their destitute circumstances, which can be explained by Freud's theories of desire, repression, and the unconscious. Freud's (1919/2003) idea of the uncanny, in which the familiar becomes strange and unnerving, is reflected in the Kims' false identities. The film also provides a striking illustration of Freud's (1900/2010) concept of repression. The occupants of the basements represent the suppressed aspects of society that the Parks would rather overlook, such as poverty, hardship, and despair.

The Kims' infiltration into the Park household is motivated by an unconscious longing to live in the realm of the wealthy as well as a practical attempt to better their financial circumstances. The Kims' intense interest in the Parks' house

is a clear indication of their intention. The house is a perfect representation of the Kims' ideal lifestyle because of its simple design, roomy layout, and natural light. But there is bitterness and jealousy in their desire to fill this area. The Kims are well aware that the Parks are unaware of the hardships faced by the working class and take their privilege for granted. This resentment eventually ends in violence, as the Kims' repressed anger towards the Parks and the system that upholds their privilege explodes in the film's climactic scene.

The Parks' actions can also be explained by psychoanalytic theory. The Parks might seem like the ideal family, but their interactions show that they have underlying concerns about preserving their social standing. In particular, Mr. Park demonstrates a pervasive anxiety of being categorized as lower class. His discomfort at Mr. Kim's body odor, which appears frequently in the film, reflects his worry that poverty may contaminate him. A prominent element in psychoanalytic readings of class dynamics is the upper class's fear of downward mobility, which is symbolized by this fear.

Freud's (1920/1990) death drive, or "Thanatos", can be used to analyze the film's brutal climax. A deadly rage breaks out from the pent-up tension and suppressed aggression between the classes, indicating a natural destructive impulse in people. In the end, the Kims' intrusion into the Park home is damaging to themselves. Their acts ultimately bring them to ruin, even though in the start they might think they can continue to deceive the Park endlessly. The Kims' self-destruction, unable to break out from the cycle of oppression and poverty that characterizes their lives, is a clear indication of their death drive. The devastating potential of suppressed impulses and the difficulties of achieving meaningful social mobility in a capitalist society are reflected in the film's terrible finale, where violence breaks out between the two families.

Construction and Representation of Class

A helpful framework for examining the construction and portrayal of class identities in *Parasite* (2019) is provided by Stuart Hall's representation theory. According to Hall (1997), representation is a process that creates and disseminates meanings rather than just reflecting reality. The film's visual and symbolic language is essential to creating class identities and highlighting the gap between the rich and the impoverished in *Parasite*.

The Parks' luxurious mansion and the Kims' semi-basement flat, for example, serve as visual representations of the stark economic disparity. Liu (2020) discusses how the families' disparate living conditions, jobs, and power structures

further emphasize this gap. The Parks' huge, well-designed home with lots of windows and a lovely garden represents their stability and riches. The Kims, on the other hand, live in a small, semi-basement apartment that floods often, which reflects their unstable lifestyle. The Kims' flat symbolizes the brutal reality of poverty, while the Parks' home represents the idealized world of the wealthy. This spatial separation between the two households furthers the socioeconomic division between the families.

However, by exposing the moral emptiness of the upper class, *Parasite* challenges conventional depictions of riches and poverty. Despite having a lovely home, the Parks' lives are marked by shallow interactions and emotional detachment. For instance, Mrs. Park is presented as innocent and susceptible to manipulation, and Mr. Park's fixation on keeping his distance from the working class betrays his insecurities with his social standing. On the other hand, in spite of their dishonest actions, the Kims are depicted as a close-knit family, united by their common experiences of adversity. By implying that wealth is not always a sign of happiness or moral superiority, this reversal of conventional class stereotypes blurs the line between rich and poor.

Insight about how *Parasite* challenges the cultural narratives that uphold class inequality may also be gained from representation theory. The Parks' disregard for the Kims' hardships is indicative of a larger societal trend that normalizes poverty and prosperity as the results of personal hard work rather than structural injustice. *Parasite* asks the audience to consider the validity of the social mechanisms that uphold class inequality by highlighting the phoniness of these cultural narratives.

Space and Architecture of Class

Henri Lefebvre's (1974/1991) spatial theory, particularly his conceptual triad of spatial practice, representations of space, and representational spaces, provides a powerful lens for analyzing the use and significance of space in literature and film. Lefebvre (1974/1991) states that a dialectical relationship which exists within the triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived ... everyday life forms representational spaces (p. 39). He argues that capitalism is based on an antagonism between conceived, planned space that is organized as abstract space, and the lived spaces of everyday life, a notion further discussed by Fuchs (2019).

Lefebvre's theory of the production of space offers a critical framework for analyzing how spatial design operates in *Parasite* (2019). According to Lefebvre (1974/1991, pp. 26, 31), space is not a passive or neutral container but is actively

produced through social relations and power dynamics. The sharp contrast between the Kims' small, semi-basement apartment and the Parks' lavish, architect-designed mansion serves as a visual representation of the socioeconomic divide in the film. This spatial arrangement serves as a narrative technique that upholds class hierarchy rather than being an incidental feature. The symbolic resonance of physical space contributes to thematic depth and emotional meaning, as Marcus (1995, p. 64) observes in her study of how individuals interpret and experience domestic architecture. The film's critique of inequality in *Parasite* revolves in the spatial arrangements, which show how physical spaces both reflect and reinforce social hierarchies.

In *Parasite*, physical settings serve as powerful metaphors for social hierarchy and power dynamics, making spatial symbolism an essential component. According to Zhan (2020), who draws on Henri Lefebvre's (1974/1991) spatial theory, social spaces frequently overlap, intersect, and even clash with natural ones rather than being merely contrasted. The disparate physical layouts of the Parks and Kims' houses serve as a striking visual representation of this concept throughout the film. The Kims live in a horizontally sprawled, semi-basement flat, which represents fragility and marginalization, whereas the Parks live in an architecturally raised house, which represents social supremacy and control. The verticality of the Parks' home and the Kims' submerged, claustrophobic living space serve to further the spatial metaphor of social elevation and degradation.

Both psychological isolation and economic disparity are reflected in these architectural differences. Given the deeply ingrained social and physical differences, the Kims' tangible attempts to climb toward the Parks' world seem to reflect a fragile and brittle desire for upward mobility. The seemingly symbiotic relationship between the two families turns into outright animosity as the film goes on, highlighting the unpredictability of class coexistence. Bong Joon-ho transcends geographical reality by incorporating symbolic meaning into architectural space to create a multi-layered narrative environment that reflects the intricacies of human desire and social stratification.

In *Parasite* (2019), the spaces' verticality is especially important. The Kims' semi-basement apartment represents their marginalized status, while the Parks' home, perched atop a hill, represents their high social standing. The visual language of the film reinforces this vertical hierarchy by showing actors moving up or down stairs, which represents their position in the social order. As they fight to break free from the factors that hold them in poverty, the Kims' attempts to rise above their station are both literally and figuratively an uphill battle.

A potent metaphor for the structural factors that keep the working class trapped in poverty is the flood that destroys the Kims' underground apartment. The Kims are finally pulled down by the weight of the systemic injustices that characterize their existence, despite their attempts to overcome their situation. The flood serves as a warning that social mobility is not only challenging but also unstable because any advancement made by the working class can be quickly undone by outside forces beyond their control.

Lefebvre's (1974/1991) theory also contributes to the explanation of how the Parks' house functions as a place of privilege and power. The home, which was created by a well-known architect, is a prestige symbol that reflects the Parks' social standing and riches. With distinct lines dividing the Parks from the Kims and the other employees that look after their homes, the house is also a place of exclusion. The social inequalities that divide the working class from the wealthy are reflected in these barriers, which are both metaphorical and real. These limits are crossed by the Kims when they infiltrate the Park home, which ultimately leads to their downfall.

Conclusion

Through a deftly nuanced narrative, Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite* (2019) delivers a powerful critique of the structural inequalities present in modern capitalism. The film explores the intricate processes by which class distinctions are created, preserved, and internalized by blending the frameworks of social inequality, structuralism, psychoanalysis, representation theory, and spatial theory. The stark differences between the Park and Kim families' geographical settings and social standings are indicative of the ingrained power relations that create and maintain hierarchical civilizations.

By highlighting the psychological effects of suppressed desire and the moral emptiness frequently concealed behind privilege, *Parasite* goes beyond just illustrating class inequality to destabilize traditional representations of wealth and poverty. The film's consistent portrayal of desperation, symbolic use of space, and emotional estrangement calls into question the legitimacy of a system that normalizes exploitation and renders mobility illusory.

In the end, *Parasite* (2019) is among the most powerful films that have recently examined capitalism. It questions social reality rather than just reflecting it. Through the integration of several theoretical standpoints, this research has illustrated how the film both represents and critiques the architecture of class, exposing the deeply unequal systems that govern human lives and relationships in a stratified world.

References

- Ali, S. S., Ullah, A., Khalid, S., & Faruk, A. (2016). Theme of class struggle in Franz Kafka's novella *The Metamorphosis*. *Al-Qalam*, 21(2), 29–42. <https://alqalam-journalpu.com/index.php/Al-Qalam/article/view/2482>
- Anjaria, U. (2020). Capitalism and class in *Parasite*: A study of late capitalism's discontents. *Journal of Global Film Studies*, 14(2), 56–78.
- Bong, J. H. (Director). (2019). *Parasite* [Film]. CJ Entertainment.
- Chandran, A., Antony, A., & Nair, S. S. (2021). Tracing the dynamics of narratology in the movie *Parasite*: A study of nuances in visual media. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 25(5), 5564–5570. <http://annalsofrscb.ro/index.php/journal/article/view/6538>
- Cho, Y. (2021). Walls of wealth: Fortress architecture and the shielding of class privilege in *Parasite*. *Film and Society*, 22(1), 33–50.
- Freud, S. (1990). *Beyond the pleasure principle* (J. Strachey, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1920)
- Freud, S. (2010). *The interpretation of dreams* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1900)
- Freud, S. (2003). *The uncanny* (D. McLintock, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1919)
- Fuchs, C. (2019). Henri Lefebvre's theory of the production of space and the critical theory of communication. *Communication Theory*, 29(2), 129–150. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qty025>
- Goh, D. (2022). Re-imagining wealth: Symbolism and the critique of class aspirations in *Parasite*. *Film Theory Quarterly*, 16(4), 101–120.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. SAGE Publications.
- Han, M. J. (2022). The fragile fortress: Class anxiety and downward mobility in *Parasite*. *Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Film*, 11(3), 45–68.
- Harvey, D. (2001). Globalization and the "spatial fix." *Geographische Revue*, 2, 23–30. https://publishup.uni-potsdam.de/opus4-ubp/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/2251/file/gr2_01_Ess02.pdf
- Hwang, S. J. (2020). Verticality and the architecture of class in Bong Joon-ho's *Parasite*. *Cinematic Spaces*, 9(2), 25–44.
- Jung, H. Y. (2020). The structuralist frame: Analyzing class oppositions in *Parasite* through Levi-Strauss. *Journal of Modern Narrative Theory*, 18(1), 89–112.
- Kim, J. E. (2020). Repression and desire in *Parasite*: A psychoanalytic approach to class and envy. *Psychoanalysis and Popular Culture*, 7(3), 201–220.
- Kim, S. H. (2021). Visual language and the construction of class in *Parasite*. *Journal of Cinematic Representation*, 15(1), 66–84.
- Kraus, M. W., Park, J. W., & Tan, X. (2017). Sign of social class: The experience of

- economic inequality in everyday life. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(3), 422–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616673192>
- Lee, J. Y. (2021). Floods of inequality: Structuralist readings of Parasite and the failures of modern capitalism. *Critical Studies in Global Media*, 23(2), 145–162.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Blackwell. (Original work published 1974)
- Lekesizalin, F. (2023). The images of urban poverty in Bong Joon-ho's Parasite. *Topkapı Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 115–122. <https://dergi-park.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2679964>
- Liu, C. (2020). Analysis of social class inequality based on the movie Parasite. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 497, 78–82. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201215.398>
- Marcus, C. C. (1995). *House as a mirror of self: Exploring the deeper meaning of home*. Nicolas-Hays.
- Miller, J. B. (2020). Domination and subordination. In P. S. Rothenberg & C. H. Accomando (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study* (pp. 91–96). Worth Publishers/Macmillan Learning.
- Noviana, D. A., & Simanjuntak, B. M. (2022). Representation of the impact of social gap that affects moral values in the film Parasite. *LITERACY: International Scientific Journals of Social, Education and Humaniora*, 1(2), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.56910/literacy.v1i2.216>
- Oakes, J. M., & Rossi, P. H. (2003). The measurement of SES in health research: current practice and steps toward a new approach. *Social Science & Medicine*, 56(4), 769–784. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536\(02\)00073-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(02)00073-4)
- Park, K. H. (2021). Spatial politics in Parasite: Vertical class divisions and the cinematic use of space. *Global Film Theory*, 12(2), 77–95.
- Ramos-Niaves, V. (2021). Eat the rich: The parasitic relationship between socioeconomic groups as explored through film by Bong Joon-Ho's Parasite and Snowpiercer. *Digital Literature Review*, 8(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.33043/DLR.8.1.61-69>
- Sihombing, H. L., & Sinaga, A. A. (2021). Representation of social class in Parasite movie. *Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)*, 5(1), 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.33019/lire.v5i1.107>
- Zhan, S., & Liang, C. (2020). A study of spatial narrative in the South Korean movie Parasite. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 469, 291–294. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200907.051>