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Abstract---Acting is an ancient art form that has existed since time immemorial. Acting as a creative activity is one of several types of performing arts, and they all have three common phases of development; training/preparation, rehearsal/practice and performance. In addition, any study of the performing arts must take into account the reality that a performer is always embedded in the contextual environment and participates in one or more of the three phases of development. Acting in modern cinema remains an activity that involves instantaneous interaction with others, while maintaining the ability to draw from personal past experiences and imaginations about oneself, others and/or the environment. The purpose of this study was to identify the features of acting in cinema and to identify the difference with the work in the theatrical environment. The main methods of this study were analysis and comparison. Although theatrical and cinematographic traditions represent stylistic and aesthetic differences, the actor's training and the concepts of the play are more similar than contradictory. What crosses time, culture and the environment is the need to train the actor.
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Introduction

In some circles, theatre is considered more prestigious than working in film and television. But working on a film and a TV show is more profitable than on any other production. The stage actor may have to work on his skills for years before he or she can star in a popular Broadway play. But participating in a TV show or movie can start a career overnight. Movies and TV shows can be broadcast again and again around the world, appearing in a movie or TV show allows appearing in front of millions of people every day for several years. People know better the names of the actors who appear in sitcoms and movies than their political representatives.

Actions in film and television take place in excerpts and scenes. Unlike the Theatre, where the actors have the whole story from start to finish every night. A movie actor or TV series actor can spend an entire day shooting just a few scenes, and there's a good chance that an editor will remove the worst version from the final version. However, as a theatrical actor, nothing can hide a lousy play. For a film or television actor, appearance is everything, and talent is secondary to how you look. It is important to note that not all theatre actors can switch to film and television, and the same applies to television actors trying to get into the theatre. Theatre actors may find the performance in front of the camera boring; TV presenters can find a much more demanding game in the Theatre. Another big difference is the degree of responsibility that acting requires. For example, a theatre actor has to work night after night. However, the reaction that actors receive from the audience will allow them to know what works and what doesn't, and they will be able to change their game accordingly (Visch & Tan, 2009; Visch & Tan, 2008).

Film and television actors must perform in front of the camera; they do not have the opportunity to see what works for the audience and what does not. For example, if it is a comedy, an actor has no idea what's funny and what's not until a movie hits the screens. Many sitcoms try to improve the situation by shooting them in front of a live studio audience. To compensate for the lack of audience, film and television actors often act out the same scene over and over again with several changes in play, block, or attitude. A director will then choose the best scene to use. Often playing in film and on television gives an actor the opportunity to experiment more freely with his acting. Many works by foreign researchers have been devoted to the difference between acting in cinema and elsewhere: Cronyn (1949); Gay (2007); Naremore (2012); Bailey (2013); Auslander (2017); Clarke et al. (2017); Scholte (2017); Cassidy & Knox (2018); Hendrykowski (2018); Cañas-Bajo et al. (2019); Eken (2019); Hafez et al. (2019); Senelick (2020).

As a rule, empirical studies of the performing arts lag behind other areas of art. This is probably because acting is more process-oriented, even if a product is running. To ensure some coherence on this topic, creativity research is often grouped into two general approaches: individualistic and contextual. Individualistic research includes the study of the qualities of actors (cognitive, personal, biological), while contextual research examines the socio-cultural dynamics operating in creative ensembles and between actors and their audience. In fact, understanding acting requires the integration of both. It is also important
to note that acting in theatre and cinema has its differences. The film actor must understand that his every action, gesture and facial expression is transmitted by the camera a hundredfold. That is why it is important to train the qualities needed for filming. These questions are considered by a number of researchers, on a theoretical basis of which the authors wrote their work: Pritzker & Runco (2011); Alifragkis & Penz (2015); Zherebko (2017); Radošinská (2017); Dunbar & Harrop (2018); Koskinen (2019).

In order to determine the features of acting in movies, it is important to know what genres are popular now in the world and in the country. The general trend is that entertainment genres such as action movies and comedies have long remained popular with moviegoers and streaming services. The state of Ukrainian cinema in different periods of development is difficult to study. Examining the state of cinema, it can be noted that the genre features of the film product, the number of viewers attending Ukrainian cinema, as well as government spending and their implementation will be described by statistics. Analysing the current state of Ukrainian TV, actress Anikina (2009), notes that the most popular genres of Ukrainian TV are films about the historical past of the people and comedy. However, unpopular films are horror films, philosophical and auteur films, action and folklore and ethnographic films, as well as detective stories. The genre range is expanding, but the genre of historical drama remains relevant.

Method

The analysis is based on the main research question: what external and internal conditions determine the current practice of the development of feature films and how does this practice affect the final quality of feature films (measured by commercial and artistic success). In the context of this topic, it is important to identify the features of acting in modern films. Individualistic research methods allowed for a better understanding of the psychological aspects of the actors. For example, performing artists are generally viewed as interpreters rather than creators; however, many interpreter artists have described their experiences as highly creative. His research showed that performing artists have innate talent and preparation, strong memory skills, physical dexterity and emotional expression (Finsterwalder et al., 2012; Miller & Shamsie, 1999).

In addition, actors had stable internal attribution (they believed they were in control of their performance) and external attribution of failures (not being able to hire them to audition because they were not fit for the role). The authors examined a group of professional actors who demonstrated higher levels of extraversion, openness to experience, compliance, and empathy compared to the general population. Actors are actually better at theory of intelligence, but do not exhibit higher levels of empathy.

The theoretical and methodological basis of this study was the fundamental provisions of foreign and domestic scientists, on the study and generalisation of the substantive characteristics of acting methods of playing in modern feature films. This article used the analysis method. Analysis is a method of thinking that involves the separation of an integral subject into its constituent parts (sides, signs, properties or relationships) for the purpose of their comprehensive study.
The world and Ukrainian cinematographic base were analysed. The main genre features of films and the specifics of acting in them were highlighted. The main acting methods of acting were also analysed: the Stanislavski method, the Meissner technique, the Laban movement, the Mikhail Chekhov technique. Also, a comparison was made of the features of acting of a theatre and film actor (Correia & Barbosa, 2018; Boot & Simons, 2012).

Any theatre school in relation to each student faces two main tasks: the formation of the student’s creative personality and the disclosure of this personality. The first task includes the ideological and political, aesthetic and disciplinary and ethical education of a future actor (the formation of a worldview, artistic taste and moral character). The disclosure of creative individuality is achieved mainly through the professional education of the future actor. However, in Soviet theatre schools, such educational practice has long since become a thing of the past, in which the professional education of a future actor was separated from the task of ideological, political and moral formation of his personality. The best acting teachers strive to help their students combine in their creative practice all the knowledge and skills they have acquired over the years of study within the walls of the theatre school. All of them are combined in different methods and approaches to acting. Today, there are several fairly widely used methods. Dwell on the main ones (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Stanislavski method</td>
<td>His technique is perhaps the most widely accepted method. The idea stems from a solid foundation that an actor should experience the emotions that a character experiences every time he steps on stage. According to Stanislavski’s method, an actor must think, act and behave truthfully, just like a character; ergo to become one with a character. To delve into the details of how a character will behave in certain situations and look for genuine psychological reasons for why a character does what he does. This pushes an actor to embody life on stage. An actor lives life and suddenly finds himself in a situation (given the circumstances) that happens on stage. He forgets about the audience, this is the fourth wall, and just lives his life with these seemingly harmless events, and then... Something offensive happens. What does he do? What if this happened to him? What would he think and what would he do? Everyone has a desire, how they behave now (internal objects), whether they force someone to do something or do something themselves. The big question is, what will he (a character) be in these fictional moments and how would he achieve this (Stanislavski, 1953).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Meissner technique</td>
<td>Sanford Meisner tried to expand Stanislavski’s teachings by developing the character’s way of thinking. The practices involve a complex teaching structure that works on actor’s improvisational skills, putting forward his emotional reactions, interpreting the script, and finally putting them all together in a...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
realistic manner to bring out the character traits of his own experiences that break out into the work. An actor does not need to think on stage, he must be at the moment and react accordingly. Meissner’s technique focuses on the character’s overarching emotion, as opposed to the parallel words of a playwright.

Movement is an essential part of acting, believe it or not. If an actor stood there delivering lines or kicked the laundry basket the same way as he steps, it would look strange. Laban sought to collect all the ways that human movement could be investigated, and went further in quantifying it than anyone else. Focusing on the 4 main categories (body, effort, form, space), understanding the relationship between each of them can help a performer to characterise his role on stage using aspects in different ways. Thus, Laban’s movement should be at the centre of any actor’s training.

Body – how the body works internally. How limbs are connected / How body movement begins / What influences the body. An effort is the intention with which the movement is carried out. Power / Control / Time of movement are integral to the audience's understanding of what an actor is trying to do. Form is the way the body changes due to the movement it takes. Space is the way the body interacts with the environment. How do an actor go / How does he pick up a bucket, etc.

Chekhov, taking Stanislavski’s abilities as a basis, created his own method as a way to get closer to a teacher. The next direction was based on the idea of separating an actor’s being from a character, reducing his own ego and lifestyle to nothing, so that only a character remains. Chekhov’s technique. When an actor enters the creative space, he needs to let go of everything so that all preconceived fears and doubts are overcome only by the character’s state of mind. According to Chekhov, inspiring performances do not arise from wild strikes in the dark, but from careful preparation to mentally enter the right space. Thus, allowing an actor to associate with anyone is bold and unique (Chekhov, 1986).

Some plays require an additional element: a general mood or pervasive texture that surrounds a play or from which it arose. However, trying to define it can lead to an excess of verbal and mental gymnastics that have no real value if actors are not trained in the proper procedures. Actors must act out the elements involved in the analysis in order to derive concrete benefit from it; otherwise, he may remain superficial or simply intellectual.

Another area that deserves attention is the rehearsal process. This is primarily the time when the director’s concept of a play must be aligned with the concept of actors. An actor must approach the rehearsal with a creative spirit, ready to broaden the interpretations of both his own and his colleagues. Without a logical sequence of rehearsals, an actor’s creativity cannot be stimulated properly. Without an understanding of the psychology of rehearsal procedure, much of the
work of an actor and director can be played in production. There are, for example, significant opportunities in reading rehearsal where actors, usually sitting in a circle, read the script aloud and discuss its implications as they progress. Improvisation is of the utmost importance when properly understood and used. The relationship between an individual actor and an ensemble grows together during rehearsals, and it is during rehearsals that a director “blocks” scenes, and actors remember their lines.

**Results and Discussion**

In an effort to breathe new life into plays of the past and present and expand the creative possibilities of cinema and theatre, a new discovery of “style” took place in the 20th century. Style is an attribute of any complete achievement; it is not just the mores and customs of a certain period (Priadko et al., 2021; Sargent et al., 2001). Such manners may be strikingly elegant compared to the present, but they remain only manners. The Elizabethan form of the theatre had conflicting styles, judging by their description in Hamlet, as did the Greek and French classical theatre. Even in Kabuki and No theatres, there were style conflicts, like in the Western theatre.

Style is not the opposite of realism, as is sometimes assumed. Moreover, it is not necessarily broad in scope. Style is an angle of view of reality. This is an attribute of all creative activity, not just old or classical plays. The search for the concrete content and reality of the play leads to style. The search for style in oneself or in the traditions of the past often leads to empty forms. Just as style cannot be identified with a specific period, it cannot be associated with specific playwrights. Terms such as Shakespeare's style or Chekhov's style actually refer to the theatrical conventions traditionally associated with these dramas: the rhetorical manner “more than life” in the first and the static “mood” in the latter. These elements have little to do with style; otherwise, the great Shakespearean and Chekhovian productions could be recreated from generation to generation in the same way. The point is that these dramas must be constantly recreated taking into account the new views of each new generation.

The term “style” is often misused to refer to a theatrical setting that mimics the original concept, structure and dynamics of a piece. The re-discovery in the 20th century of the Shakespearean scene, for example, led to a new speed and fluidity, almost cinematic technique, in the presentation of Shakespeare’s plays, but these methods should not be interpreted as original and therefore correct staging style. Shakespeare is still represented in a wide variety of styles, even by the Royal Shakespeare Troupe, which presented “Midsummer Night’s Dream” as a circus and “The Merry Wives of Windsor” as a didactic play from the 1950s.

Practice has shown that the use of techniques traditionally associated with certain types of theatre can bring fresh understanding into completely unrelated theatrical forms. The fundamentals of acting remain the same no matter how bizarre the dramatic context is: actors can portray abstractions, such as Stanislavski’s 1908 production of Maurice Maeterlinck’s allegorical fantasy “The Blue Bird”; they can play a group of actors putting on a play that is then played in a vibrant theatrical manner; they can go on stage as people who demand that
their story be told to the public; or they may adopt a distorted attitude appropriate to the expressionist world.

The rise of cinema, especially the emergence of “sound films” beginning in 1927, greatly influenced acting as theatrical talents were diverted from the stage. The requirements for acting in film, television, theatre and opera are basically the same, although some techniques are different. It is possible to tie the tapes together and create a performance that never happened. A play is created not by an actor, but by a director. There were film actors who were thus entirely produced by the camera and contributed little from the actor’s point of view, rather depending on their physical charm and personality. Others, however, were real actors who developed a style that was perfect for this environment. Despite the technical requirements unique to each environment, a properly trained actor can easily move from one environment to another without any diminution of his talent. In the past, those who have been trained in rhetorical and theatrical gestures have sometimes found it difficult to transition to films. Theatre can reduce the impact of action and voice, requiring increased intensity to convey emotion and meaning to the audience. However, the camera exaggerates the action and emotion. Some actors find it difficult to act out of turn, as is usually done in films, while for others, close-ups can be intimidating (Nilsson & Johansson, 2009; De Valck, 2014).

Contemporary theatre is characterised by a multitude of plays that require actors to act more dynamically and creatively than ever before, and which use a variety of audio-visual effects and multimedia devices, especially in musicals. The action can easily revert to its old-fashioned externalised forms when needed to meet these requirements. Moreover, the development of repertoire theatres in North America, Great Britain and elsewhere, with their eclectic repertoire and combination of contemporary and classical pieces, may have led to a search for a phantom “style” rather than genuine content. However, these pitfalls can be avoided in much the same way as those faced by an actor in previous eras, by understanding the true foundations of the art of acting.

The centrality of the storytelling means that in most films, actors adjust the quality and energy of their gestures, voices and actions to convey the changing desires of their characters and dynamic relationships with other characters. At each moment of the film, the actions of actors are tied to the narrative, which provides a (musical) score for the film’s rising and falling action. The scale and quality of the physical and vocal expression of actors also depend on the style or genre of a film. For example, there is a noticeable difference in the energy underlying performances in the eccentric comedy of the 1930s and the action-adventure film of the 1990s. The material details of the actors’ performances also depend on the functions of their characters. Extras are usually less expressive than those of the central actors.

In mainstream and experimental cinema, performance details serve to create and sustain the director’s overall vision. Based on discussions with a director, an actor can use related or tightly controlled movements to portray a character who is constantly on guard while the other works in counterpoint, using light and free-floating movements to portray a character open to experience. Through rehearsal
and individual analysis of the script, actors discover the quality and energy that their intonation and intonation must have in order to convey the changing experiences of their characters. Harsh, sudden, abrupt bursts of words can be used to indicate that a character is alert, while a smooth, steady legato vocal rhythm will be used to indicate that a character is relaxed (Alforova et al., 2021; Sunikka-Blank et al., 2020).

In mainstream and experimental cinema, drama and comedy storytelling, the presentation of the performance in a film will also reflect the stylistic vision of a director. Films present performances in different ways because filmmakers use differently the expressiveness of actors, that is, the degree to which actors project or not project the subjective experiences of the characters. The presentation of a performance also differs from film to film because filmmakers use cinematic expressiveness differently, or the degree to which other cinematic elements reinforce, trim, or in some way mediate and alter the access to the actors' performances. Working in different periods, aesthetic directions and production modes, the directors presented the performances in completely different ways. On the one hand, filmmakers use performance elements as part of the film's audio-visual design. In these films, actors often suppress the expression of emotions, and the elements of non-use of a film become especially important. This approach to the presentation of performances can be found in many modernist films, which often use framing, editing and sound design to make it difficult to identify with the characters. Films by French director Robert Bresson (1901-1999) and Italian director Michelangelo Antonioni (b. 1912) exemplify the presentation of performance at this end of the spectrum, as actors use their physical and vocal expressiveness so limitedly by filmmakers that glimpses of their characters' inner experiences are often more clearly conveyed through the choice of directors for framing, editing, sound and production design. At the other end of the spectrum, actors' movement and interactions are the foundation of a film's visual and sound design. Here, elements of non-performance are orchestrated in such a way as to amplify the thoughts and emotions that actors convey to the audience through the details of their physical and vocal expressions. Films at this end of the spectrum use lighting, sets, costumes, camera movement, framing, editing, music, and sound effects to give viewers a privileged view of the characters' inner experience. This approach to the presentation of the performance focuses the audience's attention on the connotative qualities of the actors' movements and vocal expressions.

The biggest difference between acting on stage and acting on screen is audience positioning. In a theatre, the stage is usually far from the audience. Depending on the size of the theatre, actors need to exaggerate their facial expressions and gestures so that even the back row visitors can see what's going on. For example, on stage, actors cannot express sadness with one tear, because only the audience closest to the stage will see it. However, when working on screen, the camera can get very close to an actor, which narrows the gap between the audience and actors. Because of the close-up, the actors in the film must use more subtle, controlled and natural expressions and gestures. Large, exaggerated "stage play" can look awkward and silly on screen. For every live performance in a theatre, actors only have one chance to get it right! This is why it is so important to have a strong and healthy voice and memorize the lines. Microphones may or may not be
used depending on show budget or production during the performance. Even with a microphone, actors have to practice and execute their lines accurately each time, with clear diction and clear pronunciation. In musicals, actors must write the scores and lyrics correctly on the first try. During the live theatrical performance, there are no alterations.

In onscreen replays, actors have multiple takes to get the scene right. If they get confused in diction, tripped over a line, or messed up the words, they can play the scene again. In cinemas and on televisions, there are microphones all over the place to record lines. In post-production, actors often fall back on line rewriting to correct any mistakes they made during filming. In a theatre, performances take place in real time. Stage actors spend many hours rehearsing, developing the characters and quirks of their characters, and spending even more hours memorising their lines so that they can be performed in the sequence of a show. Despite all this preparation, actors need to get back on their feet quickly if something goes wrong (which often happens in theatre). A missed line, a forgotten prop, a broken line or a wardrobe malfunction – no matter what, a show must somehow go on! Live performances can be exhausting for stage actors. They must deliver the same performance with new energy every time they do their job.

In movies, performances do not take place in real time. If an actor missed, it’s easy to reference the script and correct the mistake in the next take. One of the problems with filmmaking, however, is that scenes are often shot out of turn due to budget issues, time of day or weather. An actor may have to act out a tense scene with a lot of running and screaming, immediately followed by a happy scene with laughter and a smile. There is little time between them to mentally “reset”. It can drain an actor emotionally. Screen actors also need to be prepared for impromptu script changes. Film actors often have to memorise a new script fragment on the fly.

**Conclusion**

Gestures and movements, speech and song, psychological discernment, storytelling and creative imagination are all skills that require a long learning curve to master and constant exploration to perform. Recent empirical research into acting has shown that actors do not become depressed despite the fact that they are in fact maintaining stressful careers. Whether the moment is good or bad, performers and audiences experience it. Ultimately, it is the poetic process of taking action during the creative process of imitating or depicting characters and situations. The inherent magic of acting challenges the spirit of the performers who sought to master the integration of mind, body, energy and spirit. Acting tradition teaches artists to balance technique and content. Stanislavski suggested that an actor, approaching work on a scene, ask himself four questions:

- who is he (a character);
- where is he (a place);
- what is he doing there (action and intention);
- what happened before he came there (under the circumstances).
The answers to these questions provide an actor with the necessary background for his performance, helping him create the scene. Approaching a play as a whole, an actor must subject his role to a more thorough analysis: he must look for the pivot or core of a play, as well as its division into separate parts or units of actions. He must distinguish between the rhythms of a play (that is, the smallest units of dramatic action into which each role can be divided), as well as the rhythms of a play as a whole, and he must determine what adjustments should be made to his performance for each of the other characters.
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