Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 2026, **16**(3), e202644
e-ISSN: 1986-3497

OPEN ACCESS

Research Article

Special effects in early cinema: Technological and narrative evolution in Soviet, German, and American film traditions

İbrahim Etem Zinderen [1*]
0000-0003-2921-4857

Yusuf Yurdigül [2]
0000-0002-9903-4176

[1] Department of Journalism, Faculty of Communication, Atatürk University, Erzurum, TÜRKİYE
[2] Department of Radio, Television and Cinema, Faculty of Communication, Atatürk University, Erzurum, TÜRKİYE
[*] Corresponding author: ibrahim.zinderen@atauni.edu.tr

Citation: Zinderen, İ. E., & Yurdigül, Y. (2026). Special effects in early cinema: Technological and narrative evolution in Soviet, German, and American film traditions. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies, 16*(3), Article e202644. https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcmt/18969

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 26 Nov 2025
Accepted: 23 Jun 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines the use of special effects in early cinema through the lens of Soviet, German Expressionist, and American film traditions. It analyses the functions of special effects within cinematographic narrative, their historical development, and their ideological implications. As case studies, the films Aelita: Queen of Mars (1924) from Soviet cinema, Metropolis (1927) from German Expressionist cinema, and King Kong (1933) from American cinema were selected. The methodological framework of this study consists of historical analysis, content analysis based on film analysis, and comparative analysis techniques. The films were evaluated on technical, aesthetic, and narrative levels through qualitative content analysis. Thematic analysis was employed to explore the narrative functions of special effects, while formal analysis examined the influence of audiovisual techniques on aesthetic construction. Historical analysis assessed the role of special effects in the evolution of film technology and their place within cinematic traditions. Comparative analysis revealed differences in the use of special effects across the three film traditions in terms of technique, aesthetics, and ideology. This study concludes that in early cinema, special effects functioned not only as tools of visual innovation but also as fundamental cinematographic elements shaping the ideological and aesthetic structures of different cinematic traditions.

Keywords: early cinema, special effects, cinematographic narrative, Soviet cinema, German expressionist cinema, American cinema

INTRODUCTION

Cinema, development of which has been closely tied to technological innovation, has made use of various techniques to enrich visual storytelling and deliver captivating experiences to audiences (Vaniuha et al., 2024). Cinema constructs a cinematographic narrative form by bringing together various elements (sets, miniature models, actors, and painted backdrops) to create a representational perception of space (Prince, 2012). The practice of telling stories through moving images relies on cinematic techniques that constitute the core of visual language (Brown, 2018; Lotman, 1999). Special effects, a vital component of this narrative, emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries through experimental techniques aimed at creating illusions. Over time, special effects became increasingly complex and evolved into one of the foundational elements of cinema (Das, 2023; McCarthy, 1992). These design techniques are used to present visuals that cannot be captured directly and to create immersive atmospheres that elicit a sense of realism in the viewer (Bogdanova, 2021; R. Miller, R., 2006; Şenyapılı, 2003).

In early cinema, the boundary between on-screen images and reality was often indistinct for audiences. This ambiguity amplified cinema's enchanting effect and transformed viewers from passive spectators into

physically responsive bodies (Bottomore, 1999). Special effects played a significant role in this transformation through the visual shock and illusions they generated.

From the outset, special effects were not merely visual novelties but instruments that complemented cinematographic storytelling and shaped ideological and aesthetic structures. In this period, special effects served as expressions of magical and fantastical narratives. As cinema gained global significance in the early 20th century, different cinematic traditions developed distinct approaches to the use of special effects (McCarthy, 1992; Trifonova, 2004; Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2013). In American cinema, special effects were strategically employed to reduce production costs and enhance box office appeal through visual spectacle (Bordwell et al., 2005, pp. 238-239; McCarthy, 1992). The action-image structure dominating the classical Hollywood cinema created a formal framework, in which visual spectacle and sensory-motor continuity were mutually reinforcing (Deleuze, 1986, p. 141). In Soviet cinema, they were considered narrative tools that reinforced artistic and ideological expression (Beumers, 2016). In German Expressionist cinema, light, shadow, and optical illusions were utilized to construct psychological atmospheres (Bergstrom, 2014; Burns, 2016; Elsaesser, 2016).

This study focuses on early special effects practices in Soviet, German Expressionist, and American cinema. It explores the techniques used to produce special effects, their contributions to narrative structure, and their positioning within different cinematic traditions. The analysis centers on three films: in Soviet cinema, *Aelita: Queen of Mars* (1924), where effects blend propaganda and avant-garde art; in German Expressionist cinema, *Metropolis* (1927), where effects serve surreal narratives and atmospheric construction; and in American cinema, *King Kong* (1933), where effects are used to generate commercial and spectacular impact.

Accordingly, the primary objective of this research is to analyze special effects in early cinema not only as technical innovations but also as integral narrative and ideological elements embedded within specific cinematic traditions. The present study is guided by four research questions concerning the technical and aesthetic construction of special effects, their narrative functions, their ideological shaping within each tradition, and the similarities and differences across the selected films. By adopting a comparative approach to Soviet, German Expressionist, and American films, this study aims to contribute to film history by demonstrating how special effects function as culturally and historically contingent components of cinematic language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept and Types of Special Effects

Special effects are techniques based on visual and auditory impact that are widely used not only in cinema but also in other fields such as theatre, television, gaming, and entertainment. Special effects make it possible to create scenes that are difficult or impossible to realize through natural means or direct execution, thereby enhancing credibility and impact at the perceptual level for the viewer. The primary aim of special effects is to present images that do not exist in reality in a way that evokes a sense of realism. In this sense, special effects are often described as a form of "cinematic trickery." As a design strategy, special effects serve both technical and aesthetic functions in cinema (R. Miller, 2006; Şenyapılı, 2003; Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2013). However, a significant portion of previous studies, including R. Miller (2006) and Bogdanova (2022), primarily focused on the technical aspects of special effects, often overlooking their narrative and ideological dimensions, which remain comparatively underexplored.

Special effects in film evolved from illusionist performance traditions found in pre-cinematic visual cultures such as shadow play, magic shows, optical illusions, and early trick film practices (Shubert, 2024). The significance of special effects in cinema lies in their capacity to translate imagination onto the screen (Finch, 1984). Their defining characteristic is the production of illusion, which is also employed to intensify the impact on the viewer (McCarthy, 1992). According to Manovich (2001), special effects not only represent what already exists; they also possess the power to "create what has never existed," thereby enabling the technological construction of reality in cinema. While this perspective emphasizes the capacity of digital media to construct new realities, Trifonova (2004) highlighted the constraints imposed by material production conditions, revealing a tension between technological potential and industrial limitations in the use of special effects.

By presenting images manipulated through editing and animation, special effects primarily function to guide the viewer's perception and reinforce the narrative's effect. This function facilitates the reconstruction of cinematic reality (Beumers, 2016; Vorontsova & Alieva, 2024). At the same time, special effects not only offer imaginary representations but also reflect the boundaries and possibilities of production technologies (Trifonova, 2004). Despite this dual perspective, there is a lack of systematic studies that integrate both the technical and narrative dimensions of special effects within a unified analytical framework. This indicates that previous studies tend to treat special effects either as technological innovations or as representational tools, rather than addressing their simultaneous operation across both dimensions.

Special effects play a critical role in enhancing realism and have undergone significant advancement, particularly since the 1990s with the integration of computer technology (Cubitt, 2004). With the development of cinematic techniques, special effects have become more cost-effective, safer, and more feasible to implement, thereby providing considerable economic advantages in the production and distribution processes of film (Bogdanova, 2022; Bordwell et al., 2005, pp. 474-475). In this context, as Klein (2004) argues, Hollywood's increasing dependence on global markets has encouraged the production of spectacle-driven films, particularly those relying on special effects. This tendency can be traced back to earlier periods of American cinema, where special effects were already being used as tools to enhance visual appeal and commercial success (McCarthy, 1992). The use of these technologies, which make the filmmaking process more flexible and manageable, has attracted increasing interest from filmmakers. Nevertheless, the dominance of studies focusing on digital effects led to a relative neglect of early cinema practices, particularly in relation to their aesthetic and ideological functions, which remain insufficiently theorized.

In the visual arts, particularly in cinema, special effects have often emerged as multifaceted structures that defy easy categorization (Griffiths, 2010). In this regard, special effects can be classified by their fields of application, methods of execution, stages of implementation, and defining characteristics (Cram, 2012; Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2012). However, these classifications tend to remain descriptive and technical, offering limited insight into how special effects operate as meaning-producing elements within specific cultural and narrative contexts. Broadly speaking, special effects can be categorized into three main types: physical/practical effects, optical effects, and digital effects.

Physical effects, also referred to as practical or mechanical effects, encompass techniques that are physically implemented during the shoot. These include elements such as makeup and prosthetics, pyrotechnic explosions, miniature models, puppets (animatronics), and atmospheric effects like rain, fog, and wind. Scenes involving explosions, bullet impacts, collapsing buildings, or weather phenomena like rain and wind, created live in front of the camera, fall under this category (Netzley, 2000; Rickitt, 2000). Especially before the widespread adoption of digital technologies, these effects constituted the core visual tools of the film industry and shaped the viewer's perception of reality through tangible, physical means. As such, they were among the most frequently employed techniques during the early periods of cinema (Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2012).

Optical effects are techniques used in film production to create visual illusions by manipulating light, lenses, and the film medium itself. More specifically, optical effects typically refer to interventions carried out directly on the camera. Initially produced during shooting through in-camera manipulation, such effects were commonly referred to as photographic effects or trick photography. Techniques such as glass painting, matte painting, rear projection, and front projection serve as notable examples of these practices. With the advent of optical printer technology in the early 1930s, such effects began to be implemented during the post-production phase as well. In this period, techniques like multiple exposures, dissolves, and the compositing of live-action footage with miniature sets were executed using optical printers. In this way, optical effects became an integral component of cinematic language not only during shooting but also in the editing process (Netzley, 2000; Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2013). Widely employed during the Classical Hollywood era, these techniques significantly expanded the spatial perception of cinematic worlds by integrating actors into otherwise inaccessible or imaginary environments. They offered aesthetically inventive solutions by combining low-tech methods with high imaginative power. While these pre-digital methodologies were prevalent during the early phases of cinema history, they were typically perceived by audiences not as manipulations of physical reality, but rather as organic elements of the narrative itself (Prince, 2012). Even though later supplanted by computer-generated imagery (CGI)-based applications in the digital era, both

Table 1. Pioneer films and early special effects techniques

Period	Key developments/films	Techniques/notes
1890s-1910s	Georges Méliès – *A Trip to the Moon* (1902)	Stop-motion, double exposure, in-scene transitions. Effects used for illusion, pre-narrative phase.
1910s-1920s	Edwin S. Porter – *The Great Train Robbery (1903)* Winsor McCay – *Gertie the Dinosaur* (1914)	Matte shot, glass-shot, animation, interactive techniques.
1920s	Raoul Walsh – *The Thief of Bagdad (1924)* Harry O. Hoyt – *The Lost World (1925)* Fritz Lang – *Metropolis (1927)*	Miniatures, stop-motion, Schüfftan process, optical illusions. Silent cinema's golden age.
1930s	Merian C. Cooper & Ernest B. Schoedsack – *King Kong (1933)* David Hand – *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs (1937)*	Compositing, matte painting, transition to sound cinema. Effects fully integrated into narrative.

optical and practical effects played a foundational role in shaping cinema on both technical and narrative levels.

Digital effects, in contrast to these earlier categories, encompass all computer-assisted visual manipulations. In this regard, digital effects represent a comprehensive mode of production that includes techniques such as CGI, digital compositing, 3D modeling, and motion capture (Prince, 2012). Evolving with the introduction of computer-assisted technologies in the 1980s, digital effects heralded a paradigm shift in cinema following the widespread adoption of techniques like CGI, motion capture, and chroma keying (green screen) in the 1990s. As structural components of narrative construction, special effects serve various narrative functions: creating atmosphere, generating dramatic tension, empowering characters, and visualizing surreal worlds (McCarthy, 1992; R. Miller, 2006). In this capacity, digital special effects enable the visualization of scenes that are physically impossible to construct yet rendered with a high degree of realism. Films such as *Terminator 2: Judgment Day* (1991) and Jurassic Park (1993) are among the earliest examples in which CGI played a transformative role in cinematic narration. While allowing for the construction of visual worlds that extend beyond classical narrative forms, digital effects have increasingly been used in hybrid combinations alongside practical and optical techniques (Netzley, 2000). Thus, special effects are culturally and narratively embedded elements, inherently tied to the technological conditions and aesthetic sensibilities of their respective eras. The evolving nature of special effects and their methods of application continues to shape the visual language of cinema as one of its fundamental expressive tools.

History of Special Effects

In the early years of cinema, special effects emerged as a technical innovation designed to captivate audiences and quickly became one of the fundamental components of cinematic narrative (Vorontsova & Alieva, 2024). Rather than serving merely as an aesthetic choice, these effects played crucial roles in establishing temporal atmospheres, transforming spatial perception, and facilitating the interaction between narrative and historical context. Stylistic choices were shaped less by individual preferences than by technological capabilities and narrative demands, with special effects playing a defining role in this process (Elsaesser, 2000). The historical development of these techniques was not only influenced by technological advancements but also molded by the evolving aesthetic and narrative needs of the time. The evolution of special effects from the late 19th century reflects the formal and narrative transformations of cinema itself.

During the 1900s, cinema rapidly gained popularity due to its capacity to represent space and motion on screen. This growing interest pushed filmmakers to develop new narrative forms and technical innovations. By the late 19th century, aided by technological progress, cinema moved beyond the mere reproduction of reality and evolved into an artistic medium capable of delivering imaginative and fictional experiences (Grace, 2005). **Table 1** offers a chronology of pioneering films and special effects techniques that contributed to the early development of cinematic visual language.

It is well established that special effects first emerged in cinema in late 19th century France and gradually diversified through technological advancements to become a key area of innovation. Georges Méliès's *A Trip to the Moon* (1902) demonstrated cinema's capacity for illusion through techniques such as stop-motion, double exposure, and seamless scene transitions; the use of substitution shots marked a significant turning point in the development of special effects (Das, 2023; Onaran, 1994). Méliès's use of masks, lighting effects,

and miniatures quickly spread across Europe and the USA (Abisel, 2006). Another early example of special effects can be seen in Alfred Clark's T*he Execution of Mary Stuart* (1895), where the beheading scene was rendered through puppet use and a pause in filming, creating a strikingly realistic illusion (Şenyapılı, 2003). Similarly, the glass-shot technique employed in Edwin S. Porter's *The Great Train Robbery* (1903) is considered one of the earliest instances of spatial manipulation in cinema (Onaran, 1994). While early cinema tended to resemble documentary footage, the desire for variation soon catalyzed the advancement of special effects (Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2013).

From the 1910s onward, special effects became an integral component of narrative construction. Winsor McCay's *Gertie the Dinosaur* (1914) is regarded as one of the first films to merge animation with live-action performance, while Frank Williams's development of the blue screen technique offered new possibilities for manipulating background imagery (Grace, 2005).

The 1920s marked the artistic peak of silent cinema and a period of standardization for special effects. During this era, Eugen Schüfftan's eponymous technique was used to create dystopian settings in Fritz Lang's *Metropolis* (1927) (Fielding, 1985; Şenyapılı, 2003). At the same time, films such as The Lost World (1925) and *The Thief of Bagdad* (1924) enriched visual storytelling through methods like stop-motion animation, miniature sets, and rear projection.

With the integration of sound in the 1930s, special effects became embedded in both visual and auditory narratives. Technical advances during this period contributed to the development of higher-quality and more ergonomic production systems. In Hollywood, professional teams and dedicated studios were established to systematically produce special effects (Abisel, 2006; Jacobs, 2012). Merian C. Cooper's *King Kong* (1933) stands as a landmark in film history, combining stop-motion, matte painting, and rear projection. The 1920s and 1930s represent a transitional phase during which techniques such as matte painting, miniature modeling, and rear projection became entrenched in cinematic language (Murodillayev, 2024). Although pre-digital cinema operated within certain limitations, these constraints often stimulated creative expression (Vorontsova & Alieva, 2024). Within this context, special effects functioned not only as technical innovations but also as imaginative tools that contributed to narrative, aesthetic, and cultural transformations.

Special Effects on Soviet Cinema

Building on the premise that art cannot be separated from the context in which it is produced, cinema likewise cannot be considered independently of political processes. In Soviet society, cinema assumed paradoxical roles, both as a tool for the production of historical knowledge and as a vehicle for mass entertainment. In this respect, cinema in the Soviet Union functioned both as a novel and accessible art form and as a powerful instrument of propaganda aimed at ideologically educating the public. The nationalization of the film industry in 1919, officially sanctioned by Stalin, clearly illustrates the strategic significance attributed to cinema by the Soviet leadership (J. Miller, 2006; Lyman, 1997; Taylor & Spring, 1991; Youngblood, 1991). Accordingly, while cinema may have served multiple functions, its most definitive role can be identified as that of propaganda.

The Soviets made parallel advancements in film technology alongside the West, developing alternatives to Hollywood. However, structural problems such as dependency on imported film equipment, limited production capacity, lack of qualified personnel and infrastructure, and insufficient capital adversely affected the film sector. Additionally, the weakness of the distribution system curtailed the screening of completed films (Beumers, 2016; J. Miller, 2006). These limitations also hindered the development of special effects in Soviet cinema.

Cinema evolved into a narrative medium that reconstructs lived experiences in various forms, with editing assuming a vital artistic function in enhancing narrative impact (Grace, 2005). For instance, Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* stands out for its construction of aesthetic and emotional meaning through montage (Lyman, 1997). Similarly, Kuleshov's editing experiments in the 1920s were instrumental both in the creation of meaning and in developing early forms of special effects (Beumers, 2016).

Special effects gained broader prevalence only long after Stalin's death, largely under the influence of Hollywood. Prior to the 1920s, such techniques were generally referred to as "film tricks" (kinotriuki). Whereas technical virtuosity was emphasized in the West, in the Soviet Union these tricks were employed with

ideological and aesthetic transparency. Dziga Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929) serves as a striking example of this approach, in which the audience is consciously made a participant in the technological illusion, thus becoming part of the socialist imaginary (Moss, 2020).

Inspired by Méliès' cinematic illusions, Soviet filmmakers employed special effects both as a means of visual astonishment and as carriers of ideological narratives. Imagery depicting life in space can be interpreted as a reflection of the socialist utopia (Beumers, 2016). The role of set design in constructing this ideological vision was particularly significant; as demonstrated by Rees (2021), the evolution of the Soviet cinema set designer from a decorative craftsman to an ideologically engaged architect reflects the broader transformation of cinema's relationship with constructivist aesthetics and material culture. This approach, shaped by the post-revolutionary conception of art, laid the groundwork for the effective use of special effects as tools of propaganda.

During the 1920s and 1930s, special effects in Soviet cinema were utilized to project revolutionary ideas into space and construct a vision of a socialist universe (Beumers, 2016). In this process, special effects techniques evolved in both aesthetic and ideological dimensions, ultimately acquiring a systematic structure. Methods developed by figures such as Aleksandr Ptushko and cinematographer Nikolay Renkov, particularly combined perspective and painted set extensions, enabled the integration of real sets with models and drawings in a single exposure. The impact of these techniques is clearly visible in films such as *Zolotoy Klyuchik* (1939), *Russlan i Lyudmila* (1939), and *Vesyolye Rebyata* (1934). The combined perspective method allowed for spatial depth and continuity within scenes, while the painted extension technique enabled the cinematic visualization of environments that could not be physically constructed. In this way, Soviet cinema embraced special effects not only as a technical innovation but also as a cost-effective production tool (Bogdanova, 2021, 2022). Moreover, the use of these techniques was not limited to studios in major cities. Following the First All-Union Scientific-Technical Conference held in 1939, their application spread to regional studios as well.

The First All-Union Scientific and Technical Conference, held in 1939 under the auspices of НИКФИ (All-Union Cinema and Photo Research Institute), marked a significant turning point in the institutionalization of special effects techniques in Soviet cinema. Attended by directors such as Aleksandr Ptushko, cinematographers, and technical specialists, the conference addressed both the technical and theoretical dimensions of methods such as rear projection, finishing drawing, and combined perspective. Convened in line with a 1938 decree by the Council of Ministers of the USSR aimed at improving the structure of film production, the conference contributed substantially to the proliferation of special effects across the industry. Dedicated special effects departments were established in studios such as Mosfilm, Lenfilm, and Detfilm, while technical studios like Mostekhfilm and Lentechfilm expanded their application of such techniques. Special effects courses were also incorporated into the curriculum of the State Institute of Cinematography, and infrastructure development was supported through the use of domestically produced equipment such as the PSK-1 camera (Bogdanova, 2021).

These developments demonstrate that special effects in Soviet cinema served not only an aesthetic function but also played pedagogical and industrial roles. Pioneering efforts contributed to the advancement of national cinema technology, and the emphasis placed on editing helped shape the use of special effects. The integration of surreal scenes in alignment with the aesthetics of montage was seen as necessary for achieving both technical precision and narrative coherence. In this context, special effects were not merely employed to enhance formal capacity; they also became tools for establishing a cinematic language compatible with socialist realism. Thus, special effects emerged as a multidimensional element within Soviet cinema (Malin & Changsong, 2025).

Special Effects in German Expressionist Cinema (Weimar Cinema)

German Expressionism espoused an aesthetic approach that sought to externalize the inner worlds of characters through distorted spaces, stark contrasts of light and shadow, and abstract symbolism. Drawing inspiration from this movement, German Expressionist cinema, also known as Weimar Cinema, emerged in the early 1920s during the Weimar Republic. This cinematic tradition, in which visual style and atmosphere often took precedence over narrative, is characterized by its distinct aesthetic codes and its capacity to reflect the political, cultural, and psychological climate of Weimar-era Germany. Within this framework, special effects functioned as essential tools that enhanced the visual power of cinema through distorted sets,

perspectival illusions, and optical tricks. Rather than aiming to reproduce reality, they focused on visualizing emotional and psychological depth (Abdel-Ghani, 2020; Bergstrom, 2014; Elsaesser, 2016). In this respect, German Expressionist cinema presents a richly layered filmic language that symbolizes the collective unconscious through irrational and intuitive elements (Stojanova, 2019). These films do not present singular or fixed meanings; rather, their scenes are open to multiple interpretations. Elsaesser (2000) explains this quality by describing Expressionist films as being "constructed like puzzles".

As emphasized by Elsaesser (2016), Expressionist cinema represents themes such as the unconscious mind, fear, and alienation through abstract spaces and stylized imagery. Special effects help to create emotional atmospheres, evoke nostalgic associations, or hold together thematically related yet formally distinct narratives. These functions are evident in seminal films of the era, such as *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari* (1920) and *Destiny* (1920).

Directed by Fritz Lang, *Metropolis* (1927) stands as one of the most striking examples of German Expressionist cinema, both technically and narratively. With architectural representations designed by Lang and architect Erich Kettelhut, the film used techniques such as the Schüfftan process, stop-motion animation, and multi-layered exposures to visualize a dystopian future and class divisions on an aesthetic level. Through special effects, the underground realm of the working class is portrayed as dark and mechanical, while the world of the upper class is depicted as symmetrical and luminous. Subjective perspectives, superimpositions, and stylized sets also emerge as core elements of Expressionist aesthetics in productions such as *Nerven* (1919), which utilized similar techniques (Burns, 2016; Choe, 2016; Elsaesser, 2016; Germani, 2019; Jacobsen & Sudendorf, 2000; Loew, 2021). Features such as exaggerated perspectives, intense shadow play, and stylized set designs helped define the visual language of Weimar cinema up until the early 1930s (Saul & Ells, 2019). The special effects integral to this period's stylistic visuality were not only aesthetic tools but also essential components in conveying the ideological and atmospheric context of the era (Elsaesser, 2000). Consequently, special effects played a decisive role in articulating cultural memory, psychological atmospheres, and symbolic narratives on screen.

Special Effects in American Cinema

Early American cinema represents a transformative phase during which cinema was shaped technically, narratively, and in terms of production, marking the transition from the aesthetics of attractions to story-driven structures. Filmmakers laid the stylistic and structural foundations of modern cinema by moving from painted backdrops to volumetric set designs and from static framing to dynamic editing techniques (Keil, 2001). From this perspective, early American cinema served as a foundational platform for the development of classical narrative cinema.

Early American films, closely following developments in Europe, similarly adopted the *cinema of attractions* aesthetic. Especially after 1896, special effects were extensively employed as tools to astonish and entertain audiences (Phillips, 2018). During the first decade of early cinema, stage magic and trick films became intertwined with popular imagination, and precursor performance forms such as *shadow pantomime* helped shape cinematic aesthetics (Solomon, 2010).

Stage techniques such as *Pepper's Ghost*, used in the 19th century to create supernatural illusions, provided the foundation for the aesthetic of special effects in cinema. These techniques enabled the creation of illusions in which characters could vanish from the stage or appear to float in midair. As precursors to cinematic visual magic, they added a sense of wonder to early American films (Phillips, 2018). In this way, early American cinema constructed its own visual enchantment by reimagining stage illusions through cinematographic means.

Toward the end of the 1890s and into the early 1900s, trick films became one of the most prominent forms of special effects usage in early American cinema. Visual illusions that amazed audiences were created through rapid editing, stop-motion, and montage techniques (Phillips, 2018). In these films, stylized sets and effects that pushed the boundaries of cinematic technology were employed to captivate viewers (Keil, 2001). As such, trick films are considered pioneering works that expand the technical and narrative possibilities of cinema.

After 1907, realistic set decorations with greater volume and detail began to replace painted backdrops. Improved production quality enabled the use of more advanced techniques for both visual effects and set design. These advancements directly influenced the stylistic evolution of cinema. According to Keil, during this period, camera tricks, lighting, and changes in mise-en-scène were developed to enhance narrative credibility (Keil, 2001).

From the early period onward, special effects were instrumentalized in American cinema to increase visual impact, achieve commercial success, and support storytelling. The Hollywood cinema that emerged in the 1920s and 1930s strategically emphasized the economic and emotional functions of special effects (McCarthy, 1992; Yurdigül & Zinderen, 2013). These effects were utilized to produce visuals aimed at mass audiences, particularly in big-budget, box office-oriented productions.

In early American cinema, special effects served purposes beyond visual spectacle; they were also employed to explore ideological themes such as religious fears, representations of the "Other," and confrontations with the unknown. This demonstrates that special effects contributed not only on a technical level but also rhetorically and narratively, adding multiple layers to the cinematic discourse (Phillips, 2018).

By the late 1920s, the narrative function of special effects began to take precedence over mere technical prowess. Rather than relying solely on surface-level spectacles like "colliding trains" to impress audiences, filmmakers increasingly favored scenes that were emotionally impactful and organically integrated into the narrative. This shift required special effects artists to be proficient not only in technical execution but also in storytelling. During this period, cinema workers previously known as "trick men" evolved into "special effects men," a transformation that reflected not merely a technical innovation but also a pursuit of professional prestige (Turnock, 2015a). This transition can be viewed not just as a terminological shift, but as a strategic repositioning aimed at gaining industry recognition and elevating the status of the profession.

Techniques such as the traveling matte employed during the 1920s expanded the creative possibilities of cinematic storytelling but ultimately proved unsustainable due to their technical complexity. However, by the 1930s, advancements in lighting technologies and synchronized projection systems helped integrate special effects as a standardized component of studio production practices. Although the techniques underlying many of the special effects familiar to us today were initially developed and applied in-house within studios, beginning in the mid-1930s they were gradually transferred to a limited number of specialists, and by the 1940s, outsourced to external firms (Turnock, 2015b, pp. 36, 79-80). This process of professionalization rendered special effects an indispensable element of narrative cinema.

As technological progress continued, special effects became increasingly prevalent in big-budget productions, studio-based filmmaking, and box-office-driven features, serving as effective tools for creating visual spectacles aimed at mass audiences. The widespread use of special effects can be attributed to several factors: the high cost of physically modeling scenes, the audience's sense of wonder evoked by technological innovation, and the economic benefits studios gained during both the production and distribution phases (Bordwell et al., 2005, pp. 474-475; Rickitt, 2000). These factors collectively positioned special effects as an essential component of cinema, with Hollywood transforming the technology into a marker of brand identity and a mechanism for sustaining industrial viability.

METHODOLOGY

Objective and Significance of the Study

The present study primarily aims to examine the technical and aesthetic uses of special effects in early cinema and to analyze how these practices were related to narrative structures and ideological contexts across different cinematic traditions. In doing so, this study focuses on a comparative analysis of selected films from Soviet, German Expressionist, and American cinema.

The term "early cinema" in this study refers to the period between 1895 and 1935, encompassing the silent era as well as the immediate prelude to the transition to sound (Frymus et al., 2021). This timeframe was chosen as the historical framework due to its inclusion of both experimental and industrial turning points in the evolution of special effects. Rather than offering a general historical overview, this study approaches early

cinema as a methodological framework through which the development and functions of special effects can be systematically analyzed.

Accordingly, the significance of this study lies in its attempt to examine special effects not only as technical innovations but also as narrative and ideological components shaped by different cinematic traditions. By comparatively analyzing these elements, this study aims to contribute to film history through a structured and methodologically grounded approach.

In line with the aim stated above, this study is guided by the following research questions, which also informed the design of the analytical framework:

- How were special effects constructed technically and aesthetically in early Soviet, German Expressionist, and American cinema?
- What narrative functions did these effects perform within each film?
- How were special effects shaped by the ideological and cultural contexts of each cinematic tradition?
- What similarities and differences can be identified in the use of special effects across the selected films?

Study Method

This study is based on a qualitative research approach. Within the methodological framework, historical analysis, content analysis grounded in film analysis, and comparative analysis methods were employed in combination. Rather than being applied independently, these methods were used in an integrated and sequential manner. First, historical analysis was conducted to contextualize each film within its technological, cultural, and ideological conditions. Second, qualitative content analysis was employed to examine the films at thematic and formal levels. Finally, comparative analysis was utilized to identify similarities and differences across the three cinematic traditions. This integrative approach enabled a multi-layered interpretation of special effects as simultaneously technical, narrative, and ideological elements, with the findings obtained from each method interpreted jointly rather than treated in isolation.

The films *Aelita: Queen of Mars* (1924) from Soviet cinema, *Metropolis* (1927) from German Expressionist cinema, and *King Kong* (1933) from American cinema were selected as the sample. Purposeful sampling was utilized in the selection process, focusing on units that could provide the most relevant data in line with this study's objectives (Erdoğan, 2012). These films were chosen as iconic examples reflecting the early use of special effects in their respective cinematic traditions, as well as period-specific aesthetic and narrative approaches. From this perspective, the films provide a robust analytical foundation upon which theoretical analyses can be conducted.

Qualitative content analysis aims at systematically interpreting media content. This method offers a flexible approach that facilitates the organized and meaningful processing of data (Berelson, 1952; Geray, 2004; Schreier, 2014). Content analysis aims to reveal not only explicit meanings but also the implicit and contextual layers of the text (Mayring, 2000). The qualitative content analysis was conducted based on a clearly defined analytical procedure. The unit of analysis was determined as key scenes in which special effects played a significant narrative or aesthetic role. Scenes were selected by considering the prominence and duration of special effects use, as well as their direct relevance to the film's central narrative or ideological themes, in alignment with the research questions. A coding framework was developed based on two main dimensions:

- Thematic dimension:
  - Narrative function (e.g., atmosphere, tension, and symbolism)
  - Ideological representation (e.g., class conflict, utopia, and commercialization)
- Formal dimension:
  - Type of special effects (e.g., miniature models, stop-motion, and optical effects)
  - Cinematographic techniques (e.g., lighting, composition, and editing)

The films were systematically analyzed considering these categories, and recurring patterns were identified through iterative examination. These categories were derived both from the literature and from repeated observations during the analysis process. For example, in Aelita, scenes depicting the Martian city

were coded under "ideological representation (utopia)" within the thematic dimension, and under "formal technique (miniature models and constructivist design)" within the formal dimension, illustrating how the two dimensions were applied in tandem. The thematic dimension was designed to address the first three research questions regarding the technical-aesthetic construction, narrative functions, and ideological shaping of special effects, while the formal dimension provided the empirical basis for identifying similarities and differences across the selected films, thereby responding to the fourth research question.

Historical analysis, commonly employed in film criticism, evaluates cinematic texts as narratives that reflect, interpret, and reconstruct historical realities (Corrigan, 2008; Rosenstone, 2012). This method was applied to understand the historical development of special effects within the technological and aesthetic paradigms of cinema. Accordingly, the emergence of special effects in film history, the technological conditions under which they developed, and their formation within different cinematic traditions were examined through historical analysis. The selected films were analyzed within this methodological framework in light of their production periods, technological contexts, artistic approaches, and cultural settings.

Comparative analysis, a significant method in communication studies, is a multifaceted approach that examines film texts produced in different contexts with regard to production, distribution, and audience experience. This method aims to systematically compare various cinematic traditions by considering films relationally alongside other texts (Esser & Vliegenthart, 2017; Zhang & Lauer, 2017). Such a structure allows for the analysis of films both within their own contexts and in relation to each other. Accordingly, this study comparatively evaluates the use of special effects across three distinct cinematic traditions through the selected films. In practice, the comparative analysis involved systematically juxtaposing the findings obtained from each film's thematic and formal analysis against the others, using the coding categories as a common reference framework. This enabled the identification of both tradition-specific patterns and cross-traditional similarities in the construction and function of special effects.

To ensure the reliability of this study, several qualitative research criteria were considered. Credibility was enhanced through methodological triangulation by combining historical, content, and comparative analyses. Reliability was addressed by clearly defining the analytical procedure and coding framework. Transferability was strengthened by providing detailed descriptions of the films and their contexts, allowing readers to assess the applicability of the findings to other cases.

FINDINGS

In line with the methodological framework, the films were examined using thematic and formal coding categories. Each film was approached within its historical context, and the findings were derived by systematically implementing these analytical categories to selected scenes. The findings combine thematic and formal dimensions to reveal the narrative functions and aesthetic contributions of special effects.

The interpretations were made through iterative comparison across films, and alternative readings were considered in relation to the identified themes and formal features. The findings were comparatively evaluated across technical, ideological, and aesthetic dimensions.

Soviet Cinema and the Aesthetic of Science Fiction: Aelita: Queen of Mars (1924)

The analysis of *Aelita* is based on the thematic categories of ideological representation and narrative function, as well as formal categories related to visual construction and special effects techniques.

Historical context and narrative structure (historical and thematic analysis)

Yakov Protazanov's 1924 film *Aelita: Queen of Mars* is among the earliest science fiction productions in the Soviet Union. Adapted from Aleksey Tolstoy's novel of the same name, the film reflects the social and ideological atmosphere of the post-revolutionary Soviet era, as well as the utopian visions prevalent at the time.

The narrative centers on an engineer who embarks on a journey to Mars to escape the social problems of Earth. This scientific quest is allegorically presented as a symbol of the universalization and projection of the Soviet Revolution into the future. The class structure and themes of rebellion depicted on Mars are directly associated with the revolutionary ideals of Soviet society. From a thematic analysis perspective, while *Aelita* is

a work of fantastic fiction, it stands out as a propaganda film representing cinematic portrayals of class conflict, revolutionary ideology, and utopian imagination (Malin & Changsong, 2025).

Technical applications and aesthetic approach (formal and thematic analysis)

Within the technological constraints of its time, *Aelita* is notable for its creative and innovative special effects that construct a visually striking world. The film employs a variety of formal techniques, including miniature sets, scale city models, painted backdrops, double exposures, chiaroscuro lighting, and stage designs based on geometric illusions. Particularly in scenes depicting the Martian surface, constructivist sets, bringing together architecture and ideology, manifest the avant-garde artistic sensibility of the period (Rees, 2021).

The effects used in the film create a clear visual distinction between Mars and Earth. While Earth scenes are simpler and more realistic, the Mars sequences are composed symmetrically, stylized, and geometrically structured. This aesthetic contrast reinforces the class structures within the narrative on a visual level. Consequently, the special effects serve both as devices for visual spectacle and as thematic elements supporting the film's aesthetic and ideological coherence.

Comparative evaluation and place within cinematic schools (comparative, thematic, and historical analysis)

Shaped by avant-garde and expressionist aesthetics, Soviet productions of this era pushed the boundaries of realism to establish utopian, experimental, and symbolic narratives. *Aelita* is one of the earliest and most striking exemplars of this approach. Moreover, the film is among the pioneering Soviet works integrating special effects as both ideological representation and cinematic experimentation. In this regard, the effects function as an aesthetic expression of the revolutionary worldview.

Whereas German Expressionist cinema often presents settings that are bleak and dystopian, the spaces in *Aelita* transform into stages for revolutionary utopias. Concurrently, contemporary American productions tended to focus on visual appeal absent a strong ideological charge. The effects in *Aelita*, by contrast, are explicitly ideological. Thus, *Aelita* holds a seminal position in Soviet science fiction cinema, exemplifying how special effects operate not only as technical tools but also as modes of ideological representation.

German Expressionism and Mechanical Dystopia: Metropolis (1927)

The analysis of *Metropolis* follows the same coding framework, focusing on how thematic and formal elements intersect in the representation of technological dystopia and class division.

Historical context and narrative structure (historical and thematic analysis)

Directed by Fritz Lang, *Metropolis* (1927) stands as one of the most significant examples of the Weimar Republic era, German Expressionism, and early science fiction cinema. The film addresses the class inequalities engendered by the Industrial Revolution, the oppressive impact of technological progress on humanity, and the alienating facets of modernization through an epic narrative framework.

At the core of the narrative lies the division between the privileged upper class living in the magnificent city above and the oppressed working-class laboring underground. This division is explicitly embodied as a class metaphor within the film's spatial architecture. The society dominated by machines clashes with the individual's desire for liberation. Thematically, this opposition highlights the menacing implications of technological advancement for human existence. The recurrent motif of "the intermediary hand" underscores that reconciliation between classes is conceived as a utopian ideal. The film dramatizes the existential entrapment of the individual in the face of a mechanized society through an exaggerated and striking cinematographic style. In this regard, special effects function as a crucial complement in visually constructing both aesthetic and sociopolitical segregation.

Technical usage and aesthetic approach (formal and thematic analysis)

Metropolis is distinguished by its use of special effects techniques that were well ahead of its time. The Schüfftan process, a method combining miniature city models with live-action footage, creates a visually

arresting spectacle. This technique enabled the visualization of the sprawling cityscape in both realistic and stylized forms (Loew, 2021).

Formal elements such as dramatic light-shadow contrasts, sharply defined architectural forms, exaggerated sets, and symmetrical framing effectively manifest the Expressionist aesthetic. In the scene where Maria's body transforms into a machine-human hybrid, the animation effects, circular light trails, and vibrating images strikingly convey the simultaneous terror and fascination elicited by technological metamorphosis. From a formal perspective, this sequence can be regarded not merely as a technical achievement but also as an early example of cinematic shock aesthetics. The visualization of the human-machine tension via special effects elevates the film's technological dystopia to an aesthetic plane. Here, effects enrich the visual experience while contributing ideologically to the narrative by symbolically embodying the central conflict.

Comparative evaluation and place within cinema traditions (comparative, thematic, and historical analysis)

Metropolis represents a compelling fusion of German Expressionist visual codes with science fiction themes, demonstrating how special effects can be integrated into narrative form (Jiang, 2024). The effects serve as meaning-producing devices that underpin cinematic representations of class divisions, authoritarian structures, and technological alienation. In this respect, *Metropolis* contrasts with Soviet cinema's *Aelita*, which reflects revolutionary ideals; instead, it portrays technology as a threat and social order as a mechanism of repression. Whereas contemporaneous American cinema leaned toward commercial success and entertainment, *Metropolis* employs effects for dramatic, critical, and symbolic functions. This comparison underscores how special effects are ideologically embedded within diverse cinematic traditions.

Metropolis stands as a historical milestone, revealing how special effects can function as a visual, political, and aesthetic mode of expression in film art. Within this framework, Fritz Lang's cinema not only presents a dystopian vision but also interrogates technology's transformative impact on humanity through a distinctive cinematographic language.

American Cinema and the Commercialization of Special Effects: King Kong (1933)

The analysis of *King Kong* is structured around the same analytical categories, with particular emphasis on the relationship between spectacle, emotional engagement, and commercialization.

Historical context and narrative structure (historical and thematic analysis)

Directed by Merian C. Cooper and Ernest B. Schoedsack, the 1933 film *King Kong* stands as an iconic work that synthesizes the anxieties, desires for exploration, and technological fascination of American society in the aftermath of the Great Depression. The film dramatizes the conflict between the untamed natural world and modern civilization through the figure of a monstrous creature. Considering its production within the framework of contemporary mass culture, *King Kong* can be considered both a source of entertainment and a reflection of dominant ideological discourses.

At the narrative core lies the confrontation between "wild nature" on an exotic, newly discovered island and the forces of modern civilization. *King Kong* is depicted both as a terrifying threat and a tragic figure. The narrative arc revolves around the capture, spectacle, and eventual destruction of the exotic other. From a thematic perspective, this structure can be read allegorically as a critique of Western colonialism, humanity's desire to dominate nature, and the paradoxes of modernity. These themes are powerfully reinforced through the film's special effects. Beyond its commercial dimension, the film thus encodes multiple interpretive layers within its use of special effects (Roche Cárcel, 2022).

Technical usage and aesthetic structure (formal and thematic analysis)

King Kong represents a groundbreaking achievement in special effects technology of the 1930s. The extensive integration of techniques such as stop-motion animation (by Willis O'Brien), rear projection, miniature models, double exposure, and moving sets made the film visually striking. Particularly, the animation of *King Kong*'s movements through frame-by-frame stop-motion pushed the technical boundaries of the era. This method required painstaking labor to convincingly render the creature's physical presence.

Table 2. Comparative overview of special effects techniques and their functions across cinematic traditions

Movie	Methods used	Narrative-ideology function
Aelita(1924)	Miniature sets, double exposure, Constructivist design	Revolutionary utopia, socialist representation, ideological imagination through outer space
Metropolis (1927)	Schüfftan process, animation, architectural illusions	Class conflict, critique of mechanization, dystopian aesthetics
King Kong (1933)	Stop-motion animation, rear projection, miniature creatures	Emotional tension, visual spectacle, emphasis on commercialization

The successful execution of these effects enabled a believable integration of live actors with animated figures within the same frame. This technique, innovative for its time, significantly enhanced the audience's suspension of disbelief. From a formal standpoint, the special effects contribute not only to a spectacular visual experience but also to the generation of tension and emotional intensity. The climactic finale atop the Empire State Building is especially notable for its technical impressiveness and its role as the dramatic apex of the narrative. Here, the effects function as an active component shaping the emotional rhythm of the story.

Comparative evaluation and position within the cinematic tradition (comparative, thematic, and historical analysis)

King Kong is among the earliest and most influential American films to utilize special effects not only as visual spectacle but also to enhance emotional engagement and box office success. Special effects became an integral part of Hollywood's big-budget production model and were embraced as a spectacle element crucial to fulfilling audiences' expectations of a "visual miracle."

While special effects in *Aelita* functioned as an aesthetic expression of socialist utopia, and in *Metropolis* were linked to class oppression and technological dystopia, *King Kong* employed them primarily to create emotional intensity and entertainment-driven viewing pleasure. This distinction signifies *King Kong*'s role in the commercialization of special effects within the film industry, emphasizing sensory experience over purely aesthetic concerns. Yet this characterization does not fully exhaust the film's ideological complexity. As the historical and thematic analysis of *King Kong* reveals, the film's special effects simultaneously encode concerns associated with colonialism, racial otherness, and the ambivalent relationship between modern civilization and nature, dimensions that exceed the purely commercial logic of Hollywood production. The film marks the beginning of an era when special effects became not only a narrative device but a fundamental element of marketing and commodification. This dual character (at once commercial spectacle and ideologically charged representation) distinguishes *King Kong* from its contemporaries and anticipates the multifunctional role that special effects would play in the history of cinema. *King Kong* thus represents a pivotal moment in the technological, economic, and cultural evolution of special effects in cinema.

Comparative Evaluation Across Cinematic Traditions

The films examined in this study reveal how special effects diverged across technical, aesthetic, and ideological dimensions during the early years of cinema. Each film constructs the function of special effects in a manner unique to its respective cinematic tradition. This demonstrates that special effects are not universal tools, but rather contextually shaped cinematic devices.

Aelita stands out as a pioneering Soviet production in which special effects are integrated with ideological representation. Through Constructivist set designs, double exposures, and dynamic uses of light and shadow, the film constructs a new vision of the world that imagines revolution in outer space. Here, special effects function as visual articulations of socialist ideology. *Metropolis*, on the other hand, is a striking example of how German Expressionist cinema merges its aesthetic sensibilities with science fiction, utilizing special effects as instruments of social critique. Techniques such as the Schüfftan process, animation, and architectural illusions serve to visualize class divisions, mechanization, and oppressive social structures. In this film, aesthetic and political discourse are effectively intertwined through the use of special effects. *King Kong* represents a turning point in American cinema, marking a period when special effects became commercialized and embedded within mass production. Through techniques like stop-motion animation, miniature creatures, and rear projection, the film not only fosters emotional engagement but also evokes a sense of awe and suspense in the viewer.

Table 2 presents a comparative summary of the prominent special effects techniques used in the selected films, along with their narrative and ideological functions. These comparative findings were derived from the systematic application of thematic and formal coding categories across the selected films. In *Aelita*, Constructivist design and double exposure serve to visualize a socialist utopia through the metaphor of space. In *Metropolis*, the Schüfftan process transforms class division into an aesthetic signifier. In *King Kong*, special effects contribute to the film's commercial success by eliciting curiosity, fear, and wonder through the figure of the monster. This comparison reveals that special effects are not merely feats of technical skill, but rather multilayered narrative devices shaped by the aesthetic sensibilities and ideological codes of their time.

DISCUSSION

This study undertakes a comparative analysis of the multifaceted relationship between special effects, narrative structure, aesthetics, and ideology in early cinema. The findings suggest that the meaning of special effects varies across cinematic traditions and is directly shaped by historical, cultural, and ideological contexts.

In Soviet cinema, *Aelita* transforms special effects into visual representations of political imagination (Malin & Changsong, 2025). The Constructivist set designs and multilayered editing in the film articulate socialist ideology through an aesthetic form. *Metropolis* visualizes class conflict within a technological dystopian narrative, rendered through the expressionist aesthetic. *King Kong* instrumentalizes the commercial potential of special effects through emotional tension and visual spectacle. Across these films, special effects function not only to support the scene but also to construct the aesthetic foundations of narrative and to mediate interactions with the prevailing ideologies of their time, thereby serving as a core cinematic design technique (Murodillayev, 2024; Vorontsova & Alieva, 2024).

However, the findings also reveal important tensions and ambiguities in the ideological functioning of special effects. In particular, *King Kong* demonstrates that special effects cannot be reduced to either purely commercial or purely ideological functions. While the film is embedded within the commercial logic of Hollywood cinema, it simultaneously reflects deeper concerns regarding colonialism, race, and the human relationship with nature in the context of the Great Depression (Roche Cárcel, 2022). This dual character suggests that special effects may operate as sites where economic, cultural, and ideological forces intersect, rather than as tools serving a single function. This tension reinforces the central argument of this study that special effects function as ideologically embedded narrative tools across different cinematic traditions.

The analyses reveal that special effects, which have evolved into an art form, have become foundational elements not only as technical applications but also as integral components of cinematic language and systems of representation (Elsaesser, 2016; Grace, 2005). In this context, this study approaches special effects not merely as a domain of visual innovation, but as a narrative, ideological, and aesthetic mode of representation, each constructing its own distinct cinematic universe. In doing so, it contributes to film history from a cultural and interdisciplinary perspective.

A growing body of studies increasingly emphasized that special effects should be considered not neutral technical tools but meaning-producing and ideologically embedded elements shaping audience perception (Cubitt, 2004; Manovich, 2001). In line with these perspectives, the present study demonstrates that even in early cinema, special effects functioned as culturally embedded and meaning-producing elements rather than neutral technical devices.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the technical, aesthetic, narrative, and ideological dimensions of special effects across early Soviet, German Expressionist, and American cinema through a comparative analytical framework. The findings achieved in this study demonstrated that special effects in early cinema were not neutral technical instruments but culturally embedded, meaning-producing elements that operated simultaneously at technical, aesthetic, and ideological levels.

In response to the first two research questions, the analyses revealed that each cinematic tradition developed a distinct technical and aesthetic approach to special effects. In *Aelita*, Constructivist set designs and double exposure served as visual articulations of socialist ideology, embedding revolutionary utopia

within the film's formal structure. In *Metropolis*, the Schüfftan process and expressionist visual codes transformed class conflict and technological alienation into aesthetic experience. In *King Kong*, stop-motion animation and rear projection were deployed primarily to generate emotional intensity and commercial spectacle, yet simultaneously encoded deeper concerns related to colonialism and modernity (Lyman, 1997; Turnock, 2015b). Addressing the third and fourth research questions, the comparative analysis confirms that while all three traditions employed special effects as narrative devices, the ideological and cultural contexts of each tradition fundamentally shaped the functions these effects were made to perform. Rather than converging toward a universal cinematic language, special effects diverged across traditions, each constructing its own distinct mode of representation (Manovich, 2001; Trifonova, 2004).

This study sheds light on the role and significance of special effects in the history of cinema, demonstrating that these techniques laid the groundwork for the development of creative modes of expression (Vorontsova & Alieva, 2024). At the same time, it also reveals that early films should not be viewed solely as examples of technological progress, but rather as narratives shaped by the intellectual and cultural structures of their time (Beumers, 2016; McCarthy, 1992; Saul & Ells, 2019). Thus, special effects must be reevaluated not only through the lens of technological advancement but also from intellectual and critical perspectives.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the corpus is limited to three films representing specific national cinematic traditions, which may not fully capture the diversity of early cinema practices across other regions or genres. Second, the qualitative nature of the analysis, while enabling interpretive depth, inevitably allows for alternative readings of the findings; the coding framework was implemented by a single researcher, and the absence of inter-rater reliability checks represents a methodological constraint inherent to the study design (Mayring, 2000; Schreier, 2014). Third, this study focuses on a defined historical period (1895-1935), and the findings should be interpreted within this temporal scope rather than generalized to the broader history of special effects.

The comparative analytical approach employed in this study challenges established narratives in film history and reveals how special effects have taken shape within diverse cultural and aesthetic contexts. In this regard, this study opens several productive directions for future research. In particular, the transformation of special effects in the digital age may be explored in relation to their continuities and ruptures with classical cinematic methods. A comparative analysis of early films from different regions could reveal how cultural codes and aesthetic choices are reflected in the conception of special effects. Revisiting the cultural and ideological dimensions of special effects, beyond technical analysis, in the context of digital era transformations holds significant potential for interdisciplinary film studies.

Author contributions: IEZ: conceptualization, data curation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; **YY:** writing – review & editing. Both authors approved the final version of the article.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

Ethics declaration: As the study does not include human subjects, it does not require ethics approval.

AI statement: During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) and Manus AI to improve the clarity and fluency of expression. After using these tools, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

Declaration of interest: The authors declared no competing interest.

Data availability: Data generated or analyzed during this study are available from the authors on request.

REFERENCES

Abdel-Ghani, T. (2020). City symphonies: The urban culture of expressionist cinema in 1920s Berlin. *The City and History, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.33542/MAD2019-2-04

Abisel, N. (2006). *Sessiz sinema* [Silent film]. De Ki Basım Yayım.

Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Free Press.

Bergstrom, J. (2014). Warning shadows: German expressionism and American film noir. In J. Bergstrom (Ed.), *Film Noir* (pp. 38-57). Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748691081-006

Beumers, B. (2016). Special/spatial effects in Soviet cinema. In V. Strukov, & H. Goscilo (Eds.), *Russian aviation, space flight and visual culture* (pp. 169-174). Routledge.

Bogdanova, E. S. (2021). Spetseffekty sovetskogo kino: Metod perspektivnogo sovmeshcheniya [Special effects of Soviet cinema: The method of perspective superposition]. *Sphere of Culture, 2*(2), 77-84. https://doi.org/10.48164/2713-301X_2021_4_77

Bogdanova, E. S. (2022). Special effects of the Soviet cinema: A method of finishing drawing. *Sphere of Culture, 3*(1), 98-109. https://doi.org/10.48164/2713-301X_2022_7_98

Bordwell, D., Staiger, J., & Thompson, K. (2005). *The classical Hollywood cinema: Film style and mode of production to 1960*. Taylor & Francis.

Bottomore, S. (1999). The panicking audience? Early cinema and the "train effect." *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, 19*(2), 177-216. https://doi.org/10.1080/014396899100271

Brown, B. (2018). *Sinematografi: Kuram ve uygulama* [Cinematography: Theory and practice] (S. Taylaner, Trans.). Hil Yayın.

Burns, W. F. (2016). From the shadows: Nosferatu and the German Expressionist aesthetic. *Mise-en-Scène: The Journal of Film & Visual Narration, 1*(1), 1-12.

Choe, S. (2016). Of nerves and men: Postwar delusion and Robert Reinert's Nerven. In O. Brill, & G. D. Rhodes (Eds.), *Expressionism in the cinema* (pp. 41-64). Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474403269-006

Corrigan, T. (2008). *Film eleştirisi el kitabı* [Film criticism handbook] (A. Gürata, Trans.). Dipnot Yayınları.

Cram, C. (2012). Digital cinema: The role of the visual effects supervisor. *Film History: An International Journal, 24*(2), 169-186. https://doi.org/10.2979/filmhistory.24.2.169

Cubitt, S. (2004). *The cinema effect*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/1832.001.0001

Das, S. (2023). The evolution of visual effects in cinema: A journey from practical effects to CGI. *JETIR: Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, 10*(11), 303-309.

Deleuze, G. (1986). *Cinema 1: The movement-image* (H. Tomlinson, & B. Habberjam, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Elsaesser, T. (2000). *Weimar cinema and after: Germany's historical imaginary*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203388334

Elsaesser, T. (2016). Expressionist cinema—Style and design in film history. In O. Brill, & G. D. Rhodes (Eds.), *Expressionism in the cinema* (pp. 15-40). Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474403269-005

Erdoğan, İ. (2012). *Pozitivist metodoloji ve ötesi: Araştırma tasarımları, niteliksel ve istatistiksel yöntemler* [Positivist methodology and beyond: Research designs, qualitative and statistical methods]. Erk Yayınları.

Esser, F., & Vliegenthart, R. (2017). Comparative research methods. In J. Matthes, C. S. Davis, & R. F. Potter (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of communication research methods* (pp. 1-11). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0035

Fielding, R. (1985). *The technique of special effects cinematography*. Focal Press.

Finch, C. (1984). *Special effects: Creating movie magic*. Abbeville Press.

Frymus, A., Antoniazzi, L., & Carr, L. (2021). Introductory essay: Silent film historiography, digital technology and the archive. *Studies in European Cinema, 18*(3), 189-194. https://doi.org/10.1080/17411548.2021.1957624

Geray, H. (2004). *Toplumsal araştırmalarda nicel ve nitel yöntemlere giriş* [Introduction to quantitative and qualitative methods in social research]. Siyasal Kitabevi.

Germani, I. (2019). German expressionism in context: The First World War and the European avant-garde. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies, 16*, 11-34. https://doi.org/10.2478/ausfm-2019-0002

Grace, H. (2005). The life of fantasy and cinema: Lord of the Rings: Fellowship of the Ring. *Australian Screen Education, 39*, 143-148.

Griffiths, A. (2010). Wonder, magic and the fantastical margins: Medieval visual culture and cinematic special effects. *Journal of Visual Culture, 9*(2), 163-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412910372757

Jacobs, L. (2012). The innovation of re-recording in the Hollywood studios. *Film History, 24*(1), 5-34. https://doi.org/10.2979/filmhistory.24.1.5

Jacobsen, W., & Sudendorf, W. (2000). *Metropolis: A cinematic laboratory for modern architecture*. Axel Menges.

Jiang, L. (2024). Montage techniques and visual language under German Expressionism. *Journal of Modern Social Sciences, 1*(2), 464-480. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14562438

Keil, C. (2001). *Early American cinema in transition: Story, style, and filmmaking, 1907-1913*. University of Wisconsin Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.36032572

Klein, C. (2004). Martial arts and the globalization of US and Asian film industries. *Comparative American Studies, 2*(3), 360-365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477570004046776

Loew, K. (2021). *Special effects and German silent film: Techno-romantic cinema*. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1jf2c8c

Lotman, Y. (1999). *Sinema estetiğinin sorunları* [Problems of cinematic aesthetics] [O. Özügül, Trans.]. Öteki Ajans.

Lyman, S. M. (1997). Cinematic ideologies and societal dystopias in the United States, Japan, Germany and the Soviet Union: 1900-1996. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society, 10*(4), 497-542. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02098688

Malin, P., & Changsong, W. (2025). Through the looking-glass of the familiar: Reframing Soviet avant-garde cinema between aesthetics and ideology. *ASPIRATION Journal, 6*(2), 110-138.

Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2002v27n1a1280

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-1.2.1089

McCarthy, R. E. (1992). *Secrets of Hollywood special effects*. Focal Press.

Miller, J. (2006). Soviet cinema, 1929-41: The development of industry and infrastructure. *Europe-Asia Studies, 58*(1), 103-124. https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130500401715

Miller, R. (2006). *Special effects: An introduction to movie magic*. Twenty-First Century Books.

Moss, A. E. (2020). Cinema's "miracles": Film tricks and the production of Soviet wonder. *Film History, 32*(4), 33-59. https://doi.org/10.2979/filmhistory.32.4.02

Murodillayev, B. (2024). The impact of visual effects on the cinema experience: A comprehensive analysis. *Art and Design Review, 12*(4), 238-249. https://doi.org/10.4236/adr.2024.124016

Netzley, P. D. (2000). *Encyclopedia of movie special effects*. Oryx Press.

Onaran, Ş. A. (1994). *Sessiz sinema tarihi* [History of silent cinema]. Kitle Yayıncılık.

Phillips, K. R. (2018). *A place of darkness: The rhetoric of horror in early American cinema*. University of Texas Press. https://doi.org/10.7560/315507

Prince, S. (2012). *Digital visual effects in cinema: The seduction of reality*. Rutgers University Press.

Rees, E. (2021). From the cinema '*dekorator*' to the cinema '*arkhitektor*': Set design, medium specificity and technology in Russian cinema of the silent era. *Journal of Design History, 34*(4), 297-315. https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/epab015

Rickitt, R. (2000). *Special effects: The history and technique*. Billboard Books.

Roche Cárcel, J. A. (2022). "King Kong, the Black Gorilla." *Quarterly Review of Film and Video, 39*(5), 1113-1157. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2021.1905473

Rosenstone, R. A. (2012). *History on film/film on history* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Saul, G., & Ells, C. (2019). Shadows illuminated: Understanding German Expressionist cinema through the lens of contemporary filmmaking practices. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies, 16*(1), 103-126. https://doi.org/10.2478/ausfm-2019-0006

Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 170-183). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n12

Şenyapılı, Ö. (2003). *Görsel tasarım ve sinema* [Visual design and cinema]. Dost Kitabevi.

Shubert, A. (2024). "To become a devil": Special effects, magic tricks, and the technological image in Faust. *Film Criticism, 48*(1). https://doi.org/10.3998/fc.5693

Solomon, M. (2010). *Disappearing tricks: Silent film, Houdini, and the new magic of the twentieth century*. University of Illinois Press.

Stojanova, C. (2019). German cinematic expressionism in light of Jungian and post-Jungian approaches. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies, 16*(1), 35-58. https://doi.org/10.2478/ausfm-2019-0003

Taylor, R., & Spring, D. (1991). Russian & Soviet cinema: Continuity & change. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, 11*(2), 103-104. https://doi.org/10.1080/01439689100260121

Trifonova, T. (2004). Simulation in cinema. *Kinema: A Journal for Film and Audiovisual Media*. https://doi.org/10.15353/kinema.vi.1072

Turnock, J. (2015a). Patient research on the slapstick lots: From trick men to special effects artists in silent Hollywood. *Early Popular Visual Culture, 13*(2), 152-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/17460654.2015.1025531

Turnock, J. (2015b). *Plastic reality: Special effects, technology, and the emergence of 1970s blockbuster aesthetics*. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/columbia/9780231163538.001.0001

Vaniuha, L., Kyreia, M., Lemishka, N., Spolska, O., & Patron, I. (2024). History of the evolution of cinema in the context of considering the stages of development of science and technology: The first steps to the birth of cinema. *History of Science and Technology, 14*(2), 513-538. https://doi.org/10.32703/2415-7422-2024-14-2-513-538

Vorontsova, Y. V., & Alieva, E. A. (2024). Issledovaniye tselesoobraznosti ispol'zovaniya spetsial'nykh effektov v kinematografe [A study on the feasibility of using special effects in cinematography]. *Vestnik Universiteta, 7*, 34-43. https://doi.org/10.26425/1816-4277-2024-7-34-43

Youngblood, D. J. (1991). 'History' on film: The historical melodrama in early Soviet cinema. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, 11*(2), 173-184. https://doi.org/10.1080/01439689100260191

Yurdigül, Y., & Zinderen, İ. E. (2012). Sinemada özel efekt [Special effects in cinema]. *Atatürk İletişim Dergisi*, (2), 101-123.

Yurdigül, Y., & Zinderen, İ. E. (2013). *Sinema ve televizyonda özel efekt* [Special effects in film and television]. Doğu Kitabevi.

Zhang, Y., & Lauer, G. (2017). Introduction: Cross-cultural reading. *Comparative Literature Studies, 54*(4), 693-701. https://doi.org/10.5325/complitstudies.54.4.0693