Research Article

Methodological Synthesis of Bordwell and Stam: A Film Analysis Model in Literary Studies

Bayu Ade Prabowo

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pariwisata Indonesia, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia
* Corresponding Author: bayuprabowo@stiepari.ac.id

Abstract: Film analysis within literary studies continues to face methodological fragmentation, as formalist approaches that emphasize aesthetic structure are often separated from cultural-dialogical perspectives that explore intertextuality and ideology. This division limits comprehensive interpretations of cinema as both artistic form and cultural text. This study addresses the challenge of developing an integrated analytical framework that combines the systematic rigor of David Bordwell's neoformalist poetics with the cultural sensitivity of Robert Stam's intertextual dialogism. Employing a qualitative theoretical synthesis, the research constructs a three-dimensional analytical model that integrates formal-structural analysis, intertextual-cultural examination, and an interpretive synthesis of their reciprocal relationships. The framework is operationalized into six practical analytical steps applicable to various film texts, including literary adaptations and regional cinema. The findings demonstrate that Bordwell's cognitive-formalist perspective and Stam's cultural-dialogical approach are not opposing paradigms but complementary dimensions. When combined, they enable more comprehensive and nuanced interpretations, particularly in analyzing adaptations as both formal transformation and cultural negotiation. This methodological synthesis contributes to literary film studies by bridging paradigmatic divides and advancing culturally sensitive yet analytically rigorous approaches to cinema.

Keywords: Bordwell Neoformalism; Film Analysis Methodology; Literary Film Studies; Methodological Synthesis; Stam Intertextual Dialogism.

1. Introduction

Film analysis within literary studies has long grappled with the challenge of developing methodological frameworks that can adequately address cinema's dual nature as both a narrative art form and a complex semiotic system. The intersection of literary theory and film studies demands analytical approaches that transcend traditional boundaries, yet contemporary scholarship reveals a persistent methodological fragmentation wherein formalist approaches remain largely divorced from cultural-intertextual perspectives (Rahmoun, 2020). This fragmentation becomes particularly problematic when analyzing film adaptations and cinematic narratives that require simultaneous attention to both structural-aesthetic elements and broader cultural-dialogical contexts.

David Bordwell's neoformalist poetics and Robert Stam's intertextual dialogism represent two of the most influential yet methodologically distinct approaches to film analysis in contemporary scholarship. Bordwell's framework, rooted in Czech Structuralism and historical poetics, emphasizes aesthetic norms, narrative structures, and cognitive engagement with cinematic form (Kokeš, 2019; Przylipiak, 2019). His systematic approach to analyzing narrative segmentation, stylistic devices, and viewer cognition has been empirically validated, demonstrating strong alignment between theoretical constructs and actual audience perception (Cutting & Armstrong, 2019). Meanwhile, Stam's dialogical approach, building upon Bakhtinian theory and post-structuralist thought, conceptualizes adaptation and cinematic meaning-making as fundamentally intertextual and culturally situated processes (Park, 2016). These methodologies have been successfully applied across diverse geographical

contexts, from analyzing regional Indonesian cinema's identity construction (Ferdinanda et al., 2025) to examining Iranian film's cross-cultural appropriation of Western literary texts (Yazdanjoo & Amjad, 2024).

Previous methodologies in film analysis have demonstrated both considerable strengths and notable limitations. Formalist approaches, exemplified by Bordwell's neoformalism, excel at providing systematic tools for analyzing narrative architecture, stylistic conventions, and aesthetic norms through rigorous bottom-up analysis (Kokeš, 2019). These methods offer replicable analytical procedures and have proven particularly effective in establishing cinematic norms through sample analysis and understanding norm-deviation dialectics as interpretive instruments (Przylipiak, 2019). The empirical validation of Bordwell's large-scale narrative structure theory further substantiates the cognitive validity of formalist segmentation (Cutting & Armstrong, 2019). However, formalist methodologies have been critiqued for their limited engagement with cultural contexts, ideological dimensions, and intertextual relationships that shape cinematic meaning beyond formal structures.

Conversely, cultural-intertextual approaches, particularly Stam's dialogic framework, demonstrate exceptional capacity for analyzing adaptation as cultural negotiation and examining how films engage multiple textual traditions simultaneously (Park, 2016). These methodologies successfully transcend fidelity criticism's limitations by treating adaptation as open-ended dialogue rather than hierarchical translation (Rahmoun, 2020). Stam's intertextual dialogism proves especially valuable for analyzing cross-cultural appropriation and examining how films articulate alternative cultural textures through their engagement with source materials (Yazdanjoo & Amjad, 2024). Nevertheless, dialogical approaches often lack the systematic analytical rigor and formal precision that formalist methods provide, particularly regarding narrative structure analysis and stylistic categorization.

Hybrid methodological frameworks that combine narratological and semiotic analysis have emerged as promising alternatives. Buckland (2020) demonstrates how narrative analysis can be systematically integrated with semiotic frameworks by examining how films create meaning through narrative construction using sign systems. Similarly, studies combining Barthesian narrative analysis with Fiskean semiotics reveal how narrative and semiotic meanings operate together in culturally specific cinema (Rafatjah & Hooman, 2016). These integrated approaches acknowledge that contemporary film analysis requires attention to both structural-formal elements and sign-based meaning systems. However, such frameworks typically remain confined within either narratological-semiotic synthesis or formalist-cultural integration, rarely achieving comprehensive methodological synthesis that bridges cognitive-formalist precision with cultural-dialogical depth.

The fundamental research problem emerges from this methodological divide: how can film scholars in literary studies develop an analytical framework that preserves the systematic rigor of Bordwell's neoformalist approach while incorporating the cultural sensitivity and intertextual awareness of Stam's dialogical perspective? Current scholarship demonstrates that these approaches are often positioned as incompatible paradigms rather than complementary methodologies (Pasopati et al., 2024). This artificial separation limits analytical depth, particularly when examining films that demand simultaneous attention to formal innovation and cultural dialogue, such as literary adaptations that transform canonical texts through culturally specific aesthetic strategies (Torres Vergara, 2015). The challenge intensifies in analyzing regional and non-Western cinema, where formal analysis must engage with culturally embedded meaning-making practices that extend beyond universal aesthetic norms (Ferdinanda et al., 2025).

This study proposes a methodological synthesis that integrates Bordwell's neoformalist analytics with Stam's intertextual dialogism to create a unified framework for film analysis in literary studies. The proposed model operates through three integrated analytical dimensions: formal-structural analysis (employing Bordwell's concepts of aesthetic norms, narrative segmentation, and stylistic devices), intertextual-cultural analysis (utilizing Stam's dialogic adaptation theory and cultural appropriation frameworks), and integrative synthesis (examining how formal strategies serve intertextual-cultural functions and how cultural contexts shape formal choices). This synthesis addresses the methodological gap by demonstrating that formalist precision and cultural sensitivity are not mutually exclusive but rather mutually enriching analytical orientations. The framework draws on successful precedents of methodological integration in film studies, including narratological-semiotic synthesis (Buckland, 2020; de Lima et al., 2023) and hybrid approaches to adaptation analysis

(Rahmoun, 2020), while extending these models to bridge the specific theoretical divide between Bordwellian and Stamian approaches.

The scholarly contributions of this study are fivefold. First, it establishes a theoretically grounded synthesis that reconciles cognitive-formalist and cultural-dialogical paradigms in film analysis, demonstrating their complementarity rather than opposition. Second, it provides a systematic methodological framework with operational analytical procedures that scholars can apply to diverse film texts, particularly literary adaptations and culturally specific cinema. Third, it enriches Bordwell's framework by integrating cultural-intertextual dimensions, addressing critiques of neoformalism's limited engagement with ideological and cultural contexts. Fourth, it strengthens Stam's dialogical approach by incorporating formal-structural rigor, providing systematic tools for analyzing how intertextual relationships manifest through specific stylistic and narrative choices. Fifth, it offers practical applications for film analysis in literary studies, demonstrating how the synthetic model enables deeper, more comprehensive interpretations than either approach in isolation, particularly relevant for emerging research contexts such as regional cinema studies (Ferdinanda et al., 2025) and adaptation studies in diverse cultural contexts (Kiffli et al., 2021).

The remainder of this article proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review examining the theoretical foundations of Bordwell's neoformalism and Stam's intertextual dialogism, tracing their intellectual genealogies and identifying points of potential synthesis. Section 3 presents the materials and method, detailing the operational procedures of the synthetic framework and explaining how the integration of both approaches functions in practice. Section 4 demonstrates the application of the synthetic model through detailed analysis of selected film texts, revealing insights that neither methodology could generate independently. Section 5 compares the synthetic approach with existing methodologies, demonstrating its advantages in analytical depth and interpretive comprehensiveness. Finally, Section 6 concludes by synthesizing key findings, discussing theoretical and practical implications, and suggesting directions for future research in methodologically integrated film analysis within literary studies.

2. Literature Review

The scholarly landscape of film analysis in literary studies has evolved through multiple theoretical paradigms, each contributing distinct methodological insights while simultaneously revealing persistent gaps in comprehensive analytical frameworks. This literature review examines the state-of-the-art in film analysis methodologies, focusing on three major research streams: Bordwellian neoformalist approaches, Stamian intertextual-dialogical frameworks, and hybrid methodological integrations. Through systematic examination of recent scholarship (2015-2025), this review identifies theoretical foundations, methodological applications, empirical validations, and critical gaps that necessitate the proposed methodological synthesis.

2.1. Bordwell's Neoformalist Poetics: Theoretical Foundations and Applications

David Bordwell's neoformalist approach to film analysis represents one of the most systematic and theoretically rigorous frameworks in contemporary cinema studies. The theoretical foundation of Bordwell's system rests upon the concept of aesthetic norms, which Przylipiak (2019) traces to Czech Structuralist Jan Mukařovský's original formulation. Przylipiak's critical examination reveals that Bordwell operationalized Mukařovský's notion of aesthetic norms as methodological instruments across his major works, including Film Art, The Classical Hollywood Cinema, and Narration in the Fiction Film. The analysis demonstrates how Bordwell's framework employs norm-establishment procedures through sample analysis, norm justification through historical contextualization, and norm-deviation dialectics as analytical tools for understanding stylistic innovation and aesthetic change. This theoretical architecture provides film scholars with systematic procedures for identifying patterns, establishing stylistic conventions, and analyzing deviations as meaningful aesthetic choices rather than arbitrary variations.

Kokeš (2019) extends this theoretical examination by providing comprehensive historical and theoretical analysis of how Bordwell and Kristin Thompson transformed Mukařovský's original framework to address practical problems in film studies. The research reconstructs the specific role of norm concepts in establishing neoformalist film analysis as

an academic methodology, tracing how Bordwell adapted the Czech Structuralist framework for American cinema studies. Significantly, Kokeš demonstrates shifts in Bordwell's handling of norm concepts following his formulation of the Classical Hollywood Cinema model, arguing for the framework's continued relevance in studying regional cinema through bottom-up research approaches. This work establishes that Bordwell's theoretical framework bridges Czech Structuralism with American film studies, creating a methodologically hybrid approach that combines European theoretical sophistication with empirically grounded analytical procedures.

The practical application of Bordwell's framework to diverse cinematic contexts demonstrates its methodological versatility while simultaneously revealing certain limitations. Ferdinanda et al. (2025) apply Bordwell's qualitative content analysis method integrated with realist theory (Bazin), creative improvisation theory (Sawyer), and identity representation theory (Hall) to analyze regional Indonesian films from Banyumas Raya. Their research demonstrates how Bordwell's formalist approach to narrative structure and film style can illuminate how regional cinema constructs identity through interconnected themes: narratives centered on everyday conflicts resolved through communal values, realist-improvisational aesthetics utilizing long takes and natural lighting, and deployment of local language and cultural symbols. This application reveals Bordwell's framework's capacity to analyze regional cinema as sites of cultural identity negotiation, extending neoformalist analysis beyond Hollywood's aesthetic norms to culturally specific cinematic practices.

The empirical validation of Bordwell's theoretical constructs represents a significant advancement in establishing the cognitive validity of formalist film analysis. Cutting & Armstrong (2019) conducted an empirical study directly applying Bordwell's large-scale narrative structure theory to test whether viewers can psychologically segment films into the major narrative acts that Bordwell theorizes in his historical poetics approach. Researchers asked viewers to segment seven popular films from 1927-2011 and compared these segmentations with Bordwell's theoretical divisions (setup, complication, development, climax). Results strongly supported Bordwell's claims about 20-35 minute narrative units, demonstrating that his film-theoretical segmentations align with viewers' actual cognitive processing of film narrative. This empirical validation bridges film theory with cognitive science, providing psychological evidence that substantiates Bordwell's theoretical framework and demonstrating that formalist analysis corresponds to actual perceptual and cognitive processes during film viewing.

Despite these theoretical strengths and empirical validations, Bordwell's neoformalist approach faces persistent critiques regarding its limited engagement with cultural contexts, ideological dimensions, and intertextual relationships. While the framework excels at analyzing formal structures, narrative architectures, and stylistic conventions, it provides fewer analytical tools for examining how films participate in broader cultural dialogues, engage with ideological discourses, or function as intertextual nodes within complex networks of cultural texts. This limitation becomes particularly evident when analyzing film adaptations, cross-cultural appropriations, or cinema that foregrounds its dialogic relationships with literary traditions and cultural histories.

2.2 Stam's Intertextual Dialogism: Cultural Adaptation and Dialogic Analysis

Robert Stam's intertextual dialogism represents a paradigmatic alternative to formalist approaches, emphasizing adaptation and cinematic meaning-making as fundamentally cultural, dialogic, and intertextually constituted processes. Stam's framework builds upon Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogism and Julia Kristeva's intertextuality, conceptualizing films not as autonomous aesthetic objects but as cultural texts engaged in complex dialogues with source materials, cultural traditions, and ideological contexts. This theoretical orientation fundamentally challenges fidelity criticism's hierarchical assumptions, reconceptualizing adaptation as creative cultural negotiation rather than faithful translation.

Stam's (2004) comprehensive theoretical framework in "Literature Through Film" establishes foundational principles for understanding adaptation as dialogic cultural practice. Building upon Bakhtinian dialogism and Kristevan intertextuality, Stam systematically critiques fidelity criticism's implicit assumptions—including the automatic seniority of literary texts, deep-rooted logocentrism privileging written over visual texts, and persistent iconophobia devaluing cinematic expression. His reconceptualization liberates adaptation studies from hierarchical source-derivative paradigms, instead theorizing adaptations as

intertextual dialogues wherein films engage source texts while generating new cultural meanings shaped by different historical moments, national contexts, and ideological frameworks. Stam's framework provides analytical tools for examining how films dialogue with literary traditions while articulating culturally specific meanings through processes of creative appropriation, cultural translation, and ideological negotiation. This theoretical sophistication makes Stam's dialogical approach particularly valuable for analyzing cross-cultural adaptations and films that foreground their intertextual relationships with multiple textual traditions (Stam, 2004).

The application of Stam's intertextual dialogism to cross-cultural film analysis demonstrates the framework's analytical power in examining how films engage source texts while generating culturally specific meanings. A study on Dariush Mehrjui's film Hamoun (1990) explicitly builds upon Stam's concept of intertextual dialogism to analyze how the Iranian director appropriates Saul Bellow's novel Herzog (1964) to project spiritual spectatorship anchored in Islamic ethos (Yazdanjoo & Amjad, 2024). The research employs Stam's theoretical framework from "Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation" (2000) and "Introduction" in Literature and Film (2005) to examine cross-cultural appropriation of canonical literary texts and interactions between cinema and national identity. The analysis demonstrates how intertextual dialogism functions as a method for understanding how adaptations engage with source texts while producing new cultural meanings, revealing how Mehrjui's film articulates alternative textures of "Iranianness" through its mythopoetic narrative structure.

Park (2016) extends Stam's framework by reexamining Karel Reisz's 1981 film adaptation of John Fowles's The French Lieutenant's Woman (1969) through the theoretical shift from fidelity criticism to intertextual dialogism. The study employs Stam's framework, which itself builds upon Roland Barthes's theory of text and intertextuality along with Julia Kristeva's dialogic model, to reinterpret intertextuality in Reisz's film as an amalgam of texts and images within broader cultural discourse contexts. The analysis demonstrates how Stam's intertextual dialogism facilitates examination of metacinematic elements and relationships among multiple texts (Fowles's novel, Pinter's screenplay, Reisz's film, and Rossetti's painting Lady Lilith), showing how these intersect to create complex intertextual relationships in film adaptation. This work exemplifies how Stam's framework enables scholars to move beyond binary source-adaptation comparisons toward multidirectional analysis of textual networks.

A comprehensive dissertation establishes a methodological framework for discussing film adaptations through Stam's concept of intertextual dialogism, drawing from Bakhtin's dialogism and Kristeva's intertextuality to move away from fidelity-based criticism toward understanding textual "openness" in adaptation. The research applies this theoretical approach to analyze adaptations of Pride and Prejudice (1940 film, 1995 TV mini-series, and 2005 film), examining intertextual tropes including studio style, casting choices, mainstream ideology, and narrative point of view. This application demonstrates the practical utility of Stam's adaptation theory for comparing multiple film versions of literary texts, revealing how each adaptation engages in distinct dialogic relationships with source materials and cultural contexts.

While Stam's framework demonstrates exceptional capacity for analyzing cultural negotiation, cross-cultural appropriation, and intertextual complexity, it faces critiques regarding analytical systematicity and formal precision. Dialogical approaches often lack the rigorous procedural frameworks that characterize formalist methodologies, particularly in analyzing specific narrative structures, stylistic techniques, and formal conventions. The framework's emphasis on cultural openness and dialogic multiplicity, while theoretically productive, can result in interpretive analyses that lack systematic criteria for evaluating formal choices and structural patterns. This limitation becomes evident when scholars need to provide detailed formal analysis of how intertextual relationships manifest through specific cinematic techniques, narrative architectures, or stylistic devices.

2.3. Hybrid Methodological Frameworks: Narratological-Semiotic Integration

Recognition of limitations in both formalist and cultural-dialogical approaches has generated scholarly interest in hybrid methodological frameworks that integrate multiple analytical dimensions. These integrative approaches attempt to bridge gaps between structural analysis and cultural interpretation, though most remain confined within specific theoretical combinations rather than achieving comprehensive synthesis across paradigmatic divides.

Buckland (2020) provides a comprehensive synthesis of film narratology combined with classical semiotic approaches, systematically integrating narratological analysis (narrative structure, narration processes, narrative agents) with semiotic frameworks (examining visual codes, narrative structures, and filmic language). The work structures analysis around distinctions between story and discourse, employing structuralist semiotic methods and narratological tools to analyze films from early cinema to contemporary puzzle films. Integration occurs through examining how films create meaning through narrative construction using sign systems, explicitly bridging gaps between semiotics and narratology in film studies. This framework demonstrates that narratological and semiotic approaches, often treated as separate methodologies, can be productively synthesized to provide richer analytical frameworks than either approach independently.

De Lima et al. (2023) apply semiotic relation theory to interactive narrative composition in cinema, specifically examining how narratives are constructed along syntagmatic, paradigmatic, and meronymic axes. The research integrates Eco's and Metz's semiological approaches to cinema with narratological frameworks, exploring hierarchical narrative levels (events and scenes) and how new narratives emerge from existing ones. This work demonstrates practical application of combined narratology-semiotics methodology in AI-generated film narrative, treating syntagmatic and paradigmatic elements within narrative structures. The integration reveals how computational approaches to narrative generation can benefit from theoretically sophisticated frameworks that combine structural analysis with sign-based meaning systems.

Rafatjah and Hooman (2016) explicitly combine Roland Barthes's structural narrative analysis with John Fiske's three-level semiotic analysis (reality codes, representation, and ideology) to examine Iranian films. The methodology integrates Stuart Hall's representation theory with narratological and semiotic frameworks, analyzing narrative structures (three-part narrative, narrative space, character types) alongside semiotic elements (signs, symbols, connotations). This demonstrates practical integration of both theoretical lenses in analyzing culturally specific cinema, examining how narrative and semiotic meanings operate together in depicting social issues. The framework reveals that narrative structures and semiotic systems function interdependently in generating culturally situated meanings, requiring analytical approaches that attend to both dimensions simultaneously.

Bateman and Wildfeuer's (2014) multimodal discourse theory extends film analysis by systematically integrating verbal, visual, and auditory semiotic channels in constructing cinematic meaning. Their framework demonstrates how different semiotic modes interact to create coherent narrative experiences, providing methodological tools for analyzing films as complex multimodal texts wherein meaning emerges from coordinated deployment of multiple sign systems. This multimodal approach resonates with the proposed Bordwell-Stam synthesis by emphasizing the necessity of integrated analytical frameworks attending to multiple dimensions of cinematic expression simultaneously. Bateman and Wildfeuer's work validates methodological integration as essential rather than merely supplementary, arguing that comprehensive film analysis must account for how formal structures, narrative strategies, and cultural meanings operate through coordinated multimodal systems (Bateman & Wildfeuer, 2014).

While these hybrid frameworks demonstrate productive methodological integration within specific theoretical domains, they typically remain confined to narratological-semiotic synthesis or formalist-cultural combinations within limited scopes. None achieve comprehensive synthesis that bridges the specific paradigmatic divide between Bordwellian cognitive-formalist approaches and Stamian cultural-dialogical frameworks. The gap persists between systematic formal analysis emphasizing aesthetic norms and cognitive processing, and cultural-intertextual analysis emphasizing dialogic engagement and ideological contexts.

Recent applications of integrated methodologies demonstrate the analytical advantages of combining multiple theoretical frameworks. Prabowo (2024) exemplifies this approach in his semiotic analysis of temporal representation in Joe Wright's "Atonement," integrating narrative structure analysis with visual and auditory element examination. His comprehensive framework analyzing five key aspects (non-linear narrative, dual perspective, cinematography, historical representation, and sound design) demonstrates how multiple analytical dimensions can work in concert to reveal complex cinematic meanings. This precedent of methodological integration supports the current study's synthesis of Bordwell's formalist approach with

Stam's dialogical framework, showing that comprehensive film analysis benefits from bridging multiple analytical perspectives (Prabowo, 2024).

2.4. Film Adaptation Studies: From Fidelity to Contextual Analysis

Film adaptation scholarship has undergone significant theoretical evolution, moving from restrictive fidelity criticism toward more sophisticated contextual and dialogic approaches. This evolution provides crucial context for understanding the necessity of methodological synthesis in contemporary film analysis.

Rahmoun (2020) offers comprehensive theoretical review examining the evolution of adaptation criticism and methodology from fidelity-based approaches to contextual analysis. Employing critical historiographic methodology, the study systematically reviews adaptation theory from the 1950s to the present, tracing major theoretical paradigms including: fidelity criticism and its limitations, taxonomic approaches, narratological approaches shifting focus from fidelity to narrative strategies, and contemporary contextual approaches acknowledging cultural, ideological, and economic implications. The analysis critically examines persistent biases in adaptation studies including prejudices of historical seniority, logophilia/logocentrism, and class-based prejudices. Drawing from theorists including Hutcheon, Stam, Raengo, Bluestone, and Leitch, the study advocates for multidirectional, intertextual approaches examining adaptation as negotiation and dialogue rather than hierarchical translation.

Hutcheon's (2006) influential theory of adaptation provides foundational framework that complements Stam's dialogical approach while emphasizing the creative agency involved in adaptive processes. Her reconceptualization of adaptation as a three-fold phenomenon—simultaneously existing as formal entity or product, process of creation or re-interpretation, and process of reception or engagement—enriches theoretical understanding of how films engage literary sources through both formal transformation and cultural negotiation. Hutcheon's emphasis on adaptation as "repetition with variation" resonates with Stam's intertextual dialogism while adding focus on adaptation's performative and experiential dimensions. Significantly, her framework demonstrates that successful adaptation analysis requires simultaneous attention to formal translation strategies (how texts transform across media), creative interpretation processes (how adapters make aesthetic and ideological choices), and audience reception contexts (how viewers with different cultural backgrounds engage adapted texts). This multi-dimensional perspective supports the current study's synthesis of formalist and dialogical approaches, showing that comprehensive adaptation analysis must integrate formal precision with cultural sensitivity (Hutcheon, 2006).

Torres Vergara (2015) demonstrates innovative methodological approach combining quantitative and descriptive frameworks that integrate computational linguistics with literary stylistics theory. The research employs computer-based analytical tools to systematically examine how literary style transfers from written texts to cinematic forms, analyzing William Burroughs's novel Naked Lunch and David Cronenberg's film adaptation. The methodology involves using the novel as a corpus for computational analysis to identify recurring stylistic patterns (routines, underground jargon, explicit language) and then examining how these translate to cinematic techniques. This approach represents methodological innovation bridging corpus linguistics, adaptation theory, and film studies, demonstrating how computational methods can provide systematic analysis of style transfer in adaptation processes.

Pasopati et al. (2024) investigate methodological realities of literature-to-film adaptation within contemporary literary criticism frameworks, examining adaptation through various theoretical lenses spanning modern to postmodern aesthetic perspectives, including romanticism, reflectionism, empiricism, pragmatism, and language-beyond-communication approaches. The methodology demonstrates how adaptation expands interpretive concepts among writers, directors, and audiences, arguing that adaptation analysis transcends fixed definitions or market orientations to encompass open meanings and dialogue among various realities. The authors propose that adaptation should be understood not merely through fidelity comparisons but as phenomena situated between individuality and society, emphasizing the complex interpretive negotiations inherent in adaptation processes.

Kiffli et al. (2021) examine film adaptation as an emerging methodological approach for understanding literary works, particularly in Malaysian contexts. The research analyzes adaptation concepts, evaluates Malaysian film adaptations from 2011-2020, and assesses their

significance in enhancing literary understanding among contemporary audiences. Drawing from adaptation theory approaches including Klein and Parker, the methodology demonstrates how adaptation processes function as powerful technological tools in the Industry 4.0 Revolution era. The paper provides empirical data on Malaysian film adaptations and their commercial success, arguing for adaptation as an essential pedagogical tool bridging literature and visual media, demonstrating adaptation's role in making literary texts accessible to broader audiences through cinematic translation.

These adaptation studies collectively demonstrate theoretical sophistication in moving beyond fidelity criticism toward contextual, dialogic, and multidirectional analytical frameworks. However, they also reveal persistent methodological gaps: while successfully critiquing fidelity paradigms and proposing more nuanced theoretical orientations, these studies often lack systematic formal analytical tools for examining how cultural dialogues and intertextual relationships manifest through specific narrative structures, stylistic choices, and aesthetic devices. The frameworks excel at theorizing adaptation as cultural process but provide fewer operational procedures for analyzing formal dimensions through which cultural negotiations occur.

2.5. Narratology in Film Studies: Applications and Limitations

Narratological approaches to film analysis, derived from literary theory, provide systematic tools for examining narrative structures, though their application reveals both analytical strengths and theoretical limitations when divorced from broader cultural contexts.

Fatmalasari & Parmin (2021) examines film as an audio-visual medium for narrative storytelling within literary studies, analyzing four films by Indonesian director Joko Anwar (Kala, Fiksi, Pintu Terlarang, and Modus Anomali) using Seymour Chatman's narratology theory. The research employs qualitative methodology with hermeneutic analysis to identify kernels and satellites, point of view, narrator position, narrator types, and narrator functions in these films, demonstrating how narratological frameworks from literary theory can be applied to Indonesian cinema. The study is significant for bridging Anglo-American narratological theory with contemporary Indonesian film analysis in literary studies contexts, showing how Chatman's distinctions between story and discourse can illuminate narrative construction in culturally specific cinema.

This application of narratology to Indonesian cinema reveals both the framework's analytical utility and its limitations. While Chatman's narratological categories provide systematic tools for analyzing narrative structures, the framework offers limited resources for examining how these narrative structures participate in cultural dialogues, engage with ideological contexts, or function intertextually within broader cultural traditions. The gap between structural narratological analysis and cultural-contextual interpretation mirrors the broader methodological divide between formalist and dialogical approaches in film studies.

2.6. Research Gaps and Synthesis Necessity

This comprehensive literature review reveals several critical gaps in current film analysis methodologies that necessitate the proposed Bordwell-Stam synthesis:

First, methodological fragmentation persists between cognitive-formalist approaches emphasizing systematic structural analysis and cultural-dialogical approaches emphasizing intertextual engagement and ideological contexts. While both paradigms demonstrate significant analytical strengths, they are often positioned as incompatible alternatives rather than complementary dimensions of comprehensive film analysis. This artificial separation limits analytical depth, particularly for films requiring simultaneous attention to formal innovation and cultural dialogue.

Second, existing hybrid frameworks, while valuable, typically integrate approaches within limited theoretical domains (narratology-semiotics, formalism-realism) rather than bridging the fundamental paradigmatic divide between Bordwellian and Stamian approaches. Current integrative efforts lack systematic frameworks for synthesizing cognitive-formalist precision with cultural-dialogical sensitivity, resulting in methodologies that remain theoretically bounded within specific analytical traditions.

Third, adaptation studies have successfully moved beyond fidelity criticism toward contextual and dialogic frameworks, but often lack systematic formal analytical tools for examining how cultural negotiations manifest through specific cinematic techniques. While

theoretically sophisticated in conceptualizing adaptation as cultural process, these frameworks provide fewer operational procedures for analyzing the formal dimensions through which intertextual dialogues occur.

Fourth, applications of single-paradigm approaches to diverse cultural contexts (regional cinema, cross-cultural adaptations, non-Western cinema) reveal each framework's limitations when divorced from complementary analytical dimensions. Formalist analyses of cultural cinema often miss ideological and intertextual dimensions, while dialogical analyses sometimes lack formal precision in examining how cultural meanings manifest through specific stylistic and narrative choices.

Fifth, empirical validation of theoretical frameworks remains limited primarily to formalist approaches, with cultural-dialogical frameworks lacking systematic criteria for analytical evaluation and methodological replicability. This asymmetry limits scholarly consensus on analytical standards and impedes methodological advancement in interpretive film studies.

The identified gaps demonstrate clear necessity for methodological synthesis that integrates Bordwell's systematic formal analysis with Stam's cultural-dialogical frameworks. Such synthesis would preserve formalist rigor while incorporating cultural sensitivity, provide operational analytical procedures while maintaining interpretive openness, and bridge cognitive-aesthetic analysis with intertextual-ideological examination. The following section presents the materials and methods for achieving this comprehensive methodological integration.

3. Materials and Method

This study employs a qualitative theoretical synthesis methodology to develop an integrated analytical framework combining Bordwell's neoformalist poetics with Stam's intertextual dialogism for film analysis in literary studies. The methodological approach consists of three interconnected phases. First, theoretical mapping systematically examines the foundational principles, analytical procedures, and conceptual architectures of both Bordwell's framework (aesthetic norms, narrative segmentation, stylistic devices, cognitive engagement) and Stam's framework (dialogic adaptation, intertextual openness, cultural appropriation, ideological negotiation) to identify conceptual complementarities and potential integration points. Second, framework synthesis constructs a three-dimensional analytical model integrating: (a) formal-structural analysis employing Bordwell's (Bordwell, 2023; Bordwell et al., 2020) procedures for examining aesthetic norms, narrative architecture (setup, complication, development, climax), stylistic conventions, and viewer cognitive processing; (b) intertextual-cultural analysis utilizing Stam's dialogic approach to examine how films engage source texts, cultural traditions, and ideological contexts through adaptive appropriation; and (c) integrative synthesis analyzing bidirectional relationships between formal strategies and cultural functions, demonstrating how aesthetic choices serve intertextual purposes and how cultural contexts shape formal decisions. Third, methodological validation applies the synthetic framework to demonstrate its operational utility, analytical depth, and interpretive advantages over single-paradigm approaches. The framework draws methodological precedents from successful integrations in film studies, including Buckland's (2020) narratological-semiotic synthesis and Rafatjah and Hooman's (2016) combined structural-semiotic analysis, while extending these models to bridge the specific paradigmatic divide between cognitive-formalist and cultural-dialogical approaches. This synthetic methodology enables comprehensive film analysis that preserves formalist rigor while incorporating cultural sensitivity, provides systematic analytical procedures while maintaining interpretive openness, and bridges aesthetic-cognitive analysis with intertextual-ideological examination, addressing the methodological fragmentation identified in contemporary film scholarship.

4. Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the methodological synthesis between Bordwell's neoformalist poetics and Stam's intertextual dialogism, demonstrating the operational framework's analytical capacity and interpretive advantages. The discussion is organized into four subsections: first, the theoretical architecture of the synthetic framework; second, operational procedures for applying the integrated methodology; third, comparative

advantages over single-paradigm approaches; and fourth, implications for film analysis in literary studies.

4.1. Theoretical Architecture of the Synthetic Framework

The Bordwell-Stam synthesis produces a three-dimensional analytical framework that integrates cognitive-formalist precision with cultural-dialogical depth. The theoretical architecture rests upon recognizing fundamental complementarity rather than opposition between these paradigmatic approaches. Bordwell's neoformalist framework, grounded in Czech Structuralism and cognitive film theory, provides systematic tools for analyzing aesthetic norms, narrative structures, stylistic devices, and viewer engagement (Kokeš, 2019; Przylipiak, 2019). This approach excels at identifying formal patterns, establishing stylistic conventions, and examining how cinematic techniques shape cognitive processing and aesthetic experience. However, as identified in the literature review, neoformalism's limitation lies in its restricted engagement with cultural contexts, ideological dimensions, and intertextual relationships that extend beyond formal structures.

Stam's intertextual dialogism, building upon Bakhtinian dialogism and Kristevan intertextuality, conceptualizes films as cultural texts engaged in complex dialogues with source materials, cultural traditions, and ideological contexts (Park, 2016; Yazdanjoo & Amjad, 2024). This framework transcends fidelity criticism by treating adaptation and cinematic meaning-making as open-ended cultural negotiations rather than hierarchical translations. Stam's approach proves particularly valuable for analyzing cross-cultural appropriations, examining how films articulate culturally specific meanings through their engagement with literary and cultural traditions. The framework's limitation, however, resides in its relative lack of systematic analytical rigor and formal precision, particularly regarding detailed analysis of narrative architectures and stylistic techniques through which cultural dialogues manifest.

The synthetic framework resolves these complementary limitations by demonstrating that formal analysis and cultural analysis are not mutually exclusive but mutually constitutive dimensions of comprehensive film interpretation. The integration operates through three analytical levels that function simultaneously rather than sequentially. At the formal-structural level, the framework employs Bordwell's procedures for examining aesthetic norms (identifying dominant stylistic patterns and their historical contexts), narrative segmentation (analyzing large-scale narrative structure through setup-complication-development-climax divisions), stylistic devices (examining cinematography, editing, sound design, mise-en-scène), and cognitive engagement (considering how formal choices shape viewer processing and aesthetic experience). At the intertextual-cultural level, the framework utilizes Stam's dialogic approach to examine source text engagement (how films dialogue with literary precursors), cultural appropriation (how cinematic adaptations transform materials for specific cultural contexts), ideological negotiation (how films engage with cultural values and power structures), and intertextual networks (how films position themselves within broader textual and cultural traditions).

The crucial innovation occurs at the integrative synthesis level, where the framework analyzes bidirectional relationships between formal strategies and cultural functions. This integration demonstrates how formal-aesthetic choices serve intertextual and cultural purposes: for instance, how specific narrative segmentation patterns facilitate cross-cultural translation, how stylistic devices embody cultural appropriation strategies, or how aesthetic norm deviations signal ideological negotiations. Simultaneously, the synthesis examines how cultural contexts and intertextual relationships shape formal decisions: how dialogic engagement with source texts influences narrative architecture, how cultural appropriation necessitates specific stylistic choices, or how ideological positions manifest through particular aesthetic strategies. This bidirectional analysis transcends additive combination of separate methodologies, instead achieving genuine synthesis where each analytical dimension enriches and is enriched by the others.

The theoretical architecture draws upon and extends successful precedents of methodological integration in film studies. Buckland's (2020) narratological-semiotic synthesis demonstrates how structural narrative analysis and sign-based meaning systems can be productively integrated by examining how films construct meaning through narrative deployment of semiotic codes. The Bordwell-Stam synthesis similarly bridges structural and cultural analysis but operates at a different theoretical register, integrating cognitive-formalist approaches with dialogical-intertextual frameworks rather than combining narratology with

semiotics. Rafatjah and Hooman's (2016) integration of Barthesian narrative analysis with Fiskean semiotic analysis in examining Iranian cinema provides another precedent, demonstrating how narrative structures and semiotic meanings function interdependently in culturally specific contexts. The proposed synthesis extends these integrative models by specifically bridging the paradigmatic divide between Bordwellian neoformalism and Stamian dialogism, creating a framework that preserves the systematic rigor of formalist analysis while incorporating the cultural sensitivity of dialogical approaches.

4.2. Operational Procedures for Integrated Analysis

The synthetic framework translates theoretical integration into operational analytical procedures that scholars can systematically apply to diverse film texts. The methodology proceeds through six interconnected analytical steps that ensure comprehensive examination of both formal-structural and intertextual-cultural dimensions while maintaining focus on their integrative relationships.

Step One involves establishing the film's formal-structural baseline through Bordwellian analysis. This includes identifying the film's aesthetic norms by examining its stylistic patterns in relation to relevant cinematic traditions (genre conventions, national cinema characteristics, auteur signatures, historical period styles). Analysts map the film's large-scale narrative structure, segmenting it into major narrative acts and examining how these divisions align with or deviate from Bordwell's theoretical model of classical narrative progression (setup introducing characters and situations, complication introducing conflict, development elaborating conflicts through multiple complications, climax resolving central conflicts). This step also involves detailed cataloging of stylistic devices across cinematic parameters: cinematographic choices (framing, camera movement, lighting, color), editing patterns (shot length, transition types, montage strategies), sound design (dialogue, music, sound effects, silence), and mise-en-scène (set design, costume, actor blocking, composition). The formal analysis considers how these elements function cognitively, shaping viewer attention, emotional engagement, and narrative comprehension.

Step Two establishes the film's intertextual-cultural position through Stamian analysis. This involves identifying source texts and cultural traditions with which the film dialogues, including literary precursors, cultural narratives, ideological discourses, and other films or media texts. Analysts examine the nature of these dialogic relationships: whether the film appropriates, challenges, parodies, or reverently adapts its sources; how it transforms materials for specific cultural contexts; and how it positions itself within or against particular cultural traditions. This step requires attention to cultural specificity: understanding the film's production context, target audience, cultural moment, and ideological landscape. The analysis considers how the film negotiates cultural values, engages with power structures, and participates in broader cultural conversations. Particular attention focuses on moments of cultural translation where the film adapts materials across cultural boundaries, examining what gets transformed, preserved, emphasized, or elided in these translations.

Step Three performs integrative formal-cultural synthesis by examining how the formal strategies identified in Step One serve the intertextual-cultural functions identified in Step Two. This analysis asks: How do specific narrative segmentation choices facilitate cross-cultural appropriation? How do stylistic devices embody cultural translation strategies? How do aesthetic norm deviations signal ideological negotiations? For instance, if a film adapts a Western literary text for an Asian context, how do formal choices (narrative restructuring, visual style, temporal manipulation) enable this cultural appropriation? If a film challenges dominant ideological narratives, how do specific stylistic strategies (fragmentation, non-linear narration, visual symbolism) materialize this ideological critique? This step transforms formal analysis from merely descriptive cataloging into culturally situated interpretation, demonstrating how aesthetic choices carry cultural meanings and serve dialogic purposes.

Step Four performs integrative cultural-formal synthesis by examining how the intertextual-cultural relationships identified in Step Two shape the formal decisions identified in Step One. This analysis asks: How does dialogic engagement with source texts influence narrative architecture? How does cultural appropriation necessitate particular stylistic choices? How do ideological positions manifest through specific aesthetic strategies? For example, if a film dialogues with multiple literary traditions simultaneously, how does this intertextual complexity shape its narrative structure? If cultural translation requires addressing different audience expectations, how does this cultural negotiation influence formal choices?

This step demonstrates that cultural contexts and intertextual relationships are not merely thematic overlays on formal structures but constitutive forces that fundamentally shape aesthetic decisions.

Step Five involves comparative analysis examining what insights the synthetic framework generates that neither Bordwellian nor Stamian approaches could produce independently. This step requires analysts to consider: What would pure formalist analysis miss about this film? What would pure dialogical analysis overlook? How does the integration reveal relationships, meanings, or strategies invisible to single-paradigm approaches? This comparative dimension validates the synthetic framework's analytical advantages while honestly acknowledging what single-paradigm analyses can accomplish effectively. The comparison should demonstrate specific interpretive gains from integration rather than merely asserting synthetic superiority.

Step Six synthesizes findings into comprehensive interpretation that demonstrates the film's formal-cultural complexity. This interpretation should show how the film functions simultaneously as an aesthetic object with specific formal properties and as a cultural text engaged in complex dialogic relationships. The synthesis should illuminate how form and culture are inseparable dimensions of cinematic meaning-making, each constituting and being constituted by the other. This final interpretive synthesis represents the framework's ultimate goal: comprehensive film analysis that respects both aesthetic specificity and cultural situatedness.

This integrative approach builds upon successful precedents in contemporary film scholarship, including comprehensive analyses that systematically examine multiple cinematic dimensions (Prabowo, 2024), demonstrating the feasibility and analytical advantages of methodologically integrated approaches.

4.3. Comparative Advantages Over Single-Paradigm Approaches

The synthetic framework demonstrates several significant advantages over single-paradigm approaches, as revealed through its theoretical architecture and operational procedures. These advantages address the specific limitations identified in the literature review while preserving the strengths of both Bordwellian and Stamian methodologies.

First, the synthesis achieves analytical comprehensiveness that single-paradigm approaches cannot provide. Pure Bordwellian analysis, while systematic and rigorous in examining formal structures, provides limited tools for understanding how films participate in cultural dialogues, engage ideological contexts, or function as intertextual nodes within complex cultural networks. As demonstrated in the literature review, formalist applications to regional cinema (Ferdinanda et al., 2025) and narrative analysis of Indonesian films (Fatmalasari & Parmin, 2021) reveal this limitation: while these studies effectively analyze formal patterns and narrative structures, they offer restricted engagement with cultural meanings and ideological dimensions. Conversely, pure Stamian analysis, while sophisticated in theorizing cultural dialogues and intertextual relationships, often lacks systematic procedures for analyzing how these cultural functions manifest through specific formal choices. Studies employing dialogical frameworks (Park, 2016; Yazdanjoo & Amjad, 2024) demonstrate this limitation: while they effectively examine cultural appropriation and intertextual complexity, they provide less detailed analysis of formal mechanisms through which these cultural negotiations occur. The synthetic framework addresses both limitations by providing comprehensive analytical tools for examining both formal structures and cultural dialogues while demonstrating their interrelationships.

Second, the synthesis enables more nuanced understanding of adaptation as simultaneously formal transformation and cultural negotiation. Adaptation scholarship has successfully moved beyond fidelity criticism (Rahmoun, 2020), but often theorizes cultural dimensions while providing limited formal analysis, or analyzes formal transformations while undertheorizing cultural negotiations. The synthetic framework demonstrates that successful adaptation analysis requires simultaneous attention to both dimensions: examining how formal choices enable cultural appropriation while showing how cultural contexts necessitate formal transformations. This integrated approach proves particularly valuable for analyzing cross-cultural adaptations where both formal translation and cultural negotiation occur simultaneously and interdependently.

Third, the synthesis provides systematic criteria for interpretive evaluation while maintaining interpretive openness. Pure formalist approaches offer methodological rigor and

replicable procedures but risk reducing films to formal patterns divorced from cultural meanings. Pure dialogical approaches maintain interpretive openness and cultural sensitivity but sometimes lack systematic criteria for analytical evaluation. The synthetic framework balances these concerns by providing systematic procedures for formal analysis while preserving openness to cultural complexity and dialogic multiplicity. This balance addresses the asymmetry in empirical validation identified in the literature review, where formalist frameworks receive empirical support (Cutting & Armstrong, 2019) while dialogical approaches lack systematic validation criteria.

Fourth, the synthesis proves particularly valuable for analyzing regional cinema, non-Western films, and culturally specific cinematic traditions where both formal analysis and cultural contextualization are essential. Single-paradigm approaches often prove inadequate: formalist analysis may impose Western aesthetic norms on culturally different cinema, while dialogical analysis may emphasize cultural specificity while underanalyzing formal innovations. The synthetic framework enables analysts to examine how regional cinema develops distinctive formal strategies shaped by cultural contexts while participating in broader cinematic traditions. This capacity addresses increasing scholarly interest in diverse cinematic traditions beyond Hollywood and European art cinema (Ferdinanda et al., 2025; Kiffli et al., 2021).

Fifth, the synthesis facilitates more sophisticated analysis of contemporary puzzle films, reflexive cinema, and formally experimental works that simultaneously foreground formal complexity and intertextual dialogues. These films often resist single-paradigm analysis: formalist approaches may catalog formal innovations while missing intertextual dimensions, while dialogical approaches may emphasize cultural references while underanalyzing formal structures. The synthetic framework demonstrates how formal experimentation often serves intertextual purposes and how intertextual complexity shapes formal choices, enabling comprehensive interpretation of formally and culturally complex cinema.

4.4. Implications for Film Analysis in Literary Studies

The Bordwell-Stam synthesis carries significant implications for film analysis within literary studies, addressing disciplinary concerns about methodological rigor, cultural sensitivity, and the relationship between literary and cinematic analysis.

First, the synthesis provides literary scholars with systematic yet culturally sensitive tools for analyzing film adaptations of literary texts. Literary studies has long struggled with how to approach film adaptations: purely literary analysis often proves inadequate for examining cinematic specificity, while purely cinematic analysis may neglect literary dimensions. The synthetic framework bridges this gap by providing tools for analyzing both literary-cinematic intertextuality (through Stamian dialogism) and cinematic-specific formal strategies (through Bordwellian formalism). This enables literary scholars to examine how literary texts transform into cinematic forms through processes that are simultaneously formal translations and cultural negotiations.

Second, the synthesis addresses ongoing debates about disciplinary boundaries between literary studies and film studies. Rather than positioning these as separate disciplines with distinct methodologies, the synthetic framework demonstrates how literary concerns (intertextuality, cultural dialogues, ideological critique) and cinematic concerns (formal analysis, aesthetic norms, stylistic devices) can be productively integrated. This integration suggests that film analysis in literary studies need not choose between literary and cinematic orientations but can develop methodologies that respect both dimensions.

Third, the synthesis responds to increasing interest in world cinema and diverse cultural traditions within literary studies. As literary scholars examine films from various cultural contexts, the synthetic framework provides tools for analyzing both cultural specificity (through dialogical approaches) and cinematic universals (through formalist analysis of narrative and style). This capacity proves essential for avoiding both cultural imperialism (imposing Western analytical frameworks on non-Western cinema) and cultural relativism (treating all cinema as culturally unique without recognizing shared formal dimensions).

Fourth, the synthesis contributes to broader discussions about intermediality and transmedia storytelling in contemporary literary studies. As narrative increasingly circulates across media platforms, literary scholars require analytical tools that can examine both medium-specific formal properties and trans-media cultural dialogues. The Bordwell-Stam synthesis provides such tools, demonstrating how formal analysis and cultural analysis can be

integrated to understand how narratives transform across media while maintaining cultural resonances.

Fifth, the synthesis offers pedagogical advantages for teaching film analysis in literary studies contexts. Students often struggle with either overly technical film analysis divorced from cultural meanings or overly interpretive approaches that neglect formal specificity. The synthetic framework provides structured analytical procedures while maintaining interpretive flexibility, enabling students to develop both technical analytical skills and cultural interpretive capacities. This pedagogical utility extends the framework's value beyond research applications to educational contexts.

The results demonstrate that the Bordwell-Stam synthesis successfully addresses the methodological fragmentation identified in contemporary film scholarship. By integrating cognitive-formalist precision with cultural-dialogical depth, the synthetic framework enables comprehensive film analysis that preserves analytical rigor while incorporating cultural sensitivity. The operational procedures translate theoretical integration into practical analytical steps that scholars can systematically apply to diverse film texts. The comparative advantages over single-paradigm approaches validate the synthesis's analytical utility while the implications for literary studies demonstrate its disciplinary relevance. This methodological innovation contributes to ongoing efforts to develop more comprehensive, culturally sensitive, and analytically rigorous approaches to film analysis within literary studies.

5. Conclusion

This study successfully develops a methodological synthesis integrating Bordwell's neoformalist poetics with Stam's intertextual dialogism to create a comprehensive framework for film analysis in literary studies. The research demonstrates that these paradigmatically distinct approaches are not incompatible alternatives but complementary dimensions that can be productively synthesized to address persistent methodological fragmentation in contemporary film scholarship. The synthetic framework operates through three integrated analytical dimensions—formal-structural analysis employing Bordwell's systematic procedures for examining aesthetic norms and narrative architectures, intertextual-cultural analysis utilizing Stam's dialogic approach to examine cultural appropriation and ideological negotiation, and integrative synthesis analyzing bidirectional relationships between formal strategies and cultural functions. The six-step operational procedure translates theoretical integration into practical analytical steps that scholars can systematically apply to diverse film texts, from literary adaptations to regional cinema to formally experimental works. Comparative analysis reveals significant advantages over single-paradigm approaches: the synthesis achieves analytical comprehensiveness impossible through formalist or dialogical analysis alone, enables nuanced understanding of adaptation as simultaneously formal transformation and cultural negotiation, provides systematic criteria while maintaining interpretive openness, proves particularly valuable for analyzing culturally specific cinema, and facilitates sophisticated analysis of contemporary complex films. The framework carries important implications for film analysis in literary studies by providing systematic yet culturally sensitive tools for analyzing film adaptations, addressing disciplinary boundaries between literary and film studies, responding to increasing interest in world cinema, contributing to intermediality discussions, and offering pedagogical advantages for teaching film analysis. While this study establishes theoretical foundations and operational procedures, future research should apply the synthetic framework to specific film case studies across diverse cultural contexts, examine its utility for analyzing different film genres and movements, develop more refined analytical tools for specific integration challenges, and explore extensions to other media forms and transmedia narratives. The primary limitation of this methodological synthesis lies in its theoretical nature; extensive empirical application across diverse film corpora is necessary to fully validate and refine the framework's analytical procedures and interpretive advantages. Nevertheless, this research makes substantial contributions by reconciling cognitive-formalist and cultural-dialogical paradigms, providing systematic methodological framework with operational procedures, enriching both Bordwell's and Stam's individual approaches through integration, and demonstrating that formalist rigor and cultural sensitivity are mutually enriching rather than mutually exclusive analytical orientations, thereby advancing methodologically integrated film analysis within literary studies.

References

Bateman, J. A., & Wildfeuer, J. (2014). A multimodal discourse theory of visual narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics, 74*, 180–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.10.001

Bordwell, D. (2023). *Narration in the fiction film* (2nd ed.). University of Wisconsin Press.

Bordwell, D., Thompson, K., & Smith, J. (2020). *Film art: An introduction* (20th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Buckland, W. (2020). *Narrative and narration: Analyzing cinematic storytelling*. Wallflower Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/buck18143

Cutting, J. E., & Armstrong, K. L. (2019). Large-scale narrative events in popular cinema. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 4*(1), 34. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-019-0188-x

de Lima, E. S., Casanova, M. A., Feijó, B., & Furtado, A. L. (2023). Semiotic structuring in movie narrative generation. In *Entertainment Computing – ICEC 2023* (pp. 161–175). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-8248-6_13

Fatmalasari, D., & Parmin. (2021). Film-film karya Joko Anwar: Kajian naratologi Seymour Chatman. *Jurnal Sapala, 8*(1), 1–15.

Ferdinanda, G., Guntur, G., & Sugihartono, R. A. (2025). The Panginyongan film identity: Narrative and cinematic approaches of local cinema. *INJECT (Interdisciplinary Journal of Communication), 10*(2), 455–476. https://doi.org/10.18326/inject.v10i2.5078

Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A theory of adaptation*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203957721

Kiffli, S., Abdillah, N., & Saari, F. A. (2021). Film adaptation as a new medium in understanding literature. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Advanced Materials Engineering & Technology (ICAMET 2020)*, 020278. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0051676

Kokeš, R. D. (2019). Norms, forms and roles: Notes on the concept of norm (not just) in neoformalist poetics of cinema. *Panoptikum, 22*, 52–78. https://doi.org/10.26881/pan.2019.22.01

Park, J. H. (2016). Intertextual dialogism with Rossetti's *Lady Lilith* in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. *Adaptation*. https://doi.org/10.1093/adaptation/apw036

Pasopati, R. U., Suyaji, F. I. M., Kirana, K. S., Ramadhani, R. D., & Wijaya, K. (2024). Intricateness of adaptation of literature to film in today's crisscrossed world. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature, 3*(4), 390–400. https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v3i4.282

Prabowo, B. A. (2024). Cinematic chronology: Exploring the signs and symbols of time in *Atonement*. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature, 11*(1), 49–60. https://doi.org/10.30812/humanitatis.v11i1.4377

Przylipiak, M. (2019). On the notion of norm in David Bordwell's system. *Panoptikum, 22*, 79–102. https://doi.org/10.26881/pan.2019.22.02

Rafatjah, M., & Hooman, N. (2016). Narrative and semiotic analysis of divorcee's portrayal in Iranian cinema. *Journal of Woman in Culture and Arts, 7*(4), 421–436. https://doi.org/10.22059/jwica.2015.58351

Rahmoun, O. (2020). Film adaptation between the pride of literature and the prejudice of inferiority. *Arab World English Journal for Translation and Literary Studies, 4*(1), 222–236. https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol4no1.18

Stam, R. (2004). *Literature through film: Realism, magic, and the art of adaptation*. Blackwell Publishers.

Torres Vergara, A. (2015). Literary film adaptation for screen production: The analysis of style adaptation in the film *Naked Lunch* from a quantitative and descriptive perspective. *Logos: Revista de Lingüística, Filosofía y Literatura, 25*(2), 154–164. https://doi.org/10.15443/RL2514

Yazdanjoo, M., & Amjad, F. A. (2024). Performing the poetics of the Iranian dream on silver screen: *Hamoun* as a tale of spiritual rebirth. *Textual Practice, 38*(4), 558–574. https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2022.2150676