



UDC 792.028:808.5:159.9
DOI: 10.63009/noac/2.2025.43

Article's History: Received: 09.06.2025 Revised: 07.11.2025
Accepted 22.12.2025 Published: 29.12.2025

Vladyslav Bravorichenko*

Lecturer at the Department of Music and Performing Arts
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
02154, 18/2 Ihor Shamo Blvd., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9263-4080>

Differences between acting and public speaking: Psychological and communicative aspects of interacting with an audience

Abstract. The digitalisation of cultural space and the emergence of new formats of stage presence (online performances, streaming, interactive performances) require a rethinking of traditional approaches to interaction with the audience. The aim of the study was to identify the differences between acting and public speaking in order to improve the training of future actors. The study revealed fundamental differences between acting and public speaking in the context of interaction with the audience. It was established that an actor created artistic reality through psychophysical transformation into a character, working within the “fourth wall” system, while an orator conveyed their own position through structured argumentation and direct communication with the audience. The specifics of working with text have been revealed: an actor fully assimilated the dramatic material and “exists” in the image of the character, while an orator memorised key points, leaving room for improvisation and flexible response to the audience. A difference in the use of voice and body has been established: the actor’s words were born from the character’s inner actions, and the plasticity was fixed in the *mise-en-scène*, while the orator consciously controlled their voice for impact, and gestures and movements were subordinated to the goal of effective communication. Differences in psychological mechanisms have been identified: the actor was in a state of double consciousness and developed empathy within the image, while the orator retained a holistic self-identification and directed emotional intelligence outward toward the audience. A typology of communicative situations has been developed based on four parameters: degree of conventionality, directionality, technological mediation, and temporal structure of communication. A system of six criteria for choosing interaction strategies has been substantiated: the goal of communication, identification of the performer, audience expectations, feedback opportunities, time constraints, and level of formality. It has been proven that the synthesis of acting and public speaking practices formed a universal performer-communicator capable of consciously choosing a strategy depending on the professional context. The proposed typology and system of criteria form the methodological basis for the development of integrated training programmes for performing arts specialists, combining acting and public speaking techniques for the effective adaptation of communicative behaviour to various situations in the modern cultural space

Keywords: actor; orator; communication strategies; psychological mechanisms; performing arts

Introduction

In the contemporary performing arts space, there was a growing need to rethink the interaction between performers and audiences. The digitalisation of the cultural space required performers to have universal competencies and the ability to adapt their skills to various professional contexts, which made comparative research

into the differences between acting and public speaking skills practically significant. In the context of contemporary research on the psychological and communicative aspects of acting and public speaking, scholars have systematically analysed the impact of acting practice on psychosocial well-being and the effectiveness of interac-

Suggest Citation:

Bravorichenko, V. (2025). Differences between acting and public speaking: Psychological and communicative aspects of interacting with an audience. *Notes on Art Criticism*, 25(2), 43-51. doi: 10.63009/noac/2.2025.43.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

tion with the audience. Researcher G. Brott *et al.* (2025) demonstrated that regular acting activities contributed to the development of emotional self-regulation and stress resistance. Similar conclusions were confirmed by the study of L. Berkemeyer *et al.* (2025), who found that improvisational training significantly increased creative self-efficacy, confidence in one's professional abilities, and self-esteem, while reducing anxiety and promoting emotional regulation, which was important for both actors and speakers. However, improvisation was not the only factor that determined the effectiveness of an actor's communication: T. Stevenson *et al.* (2025) showed how the acoustic characteristics of the voice during the performance of emotionally charged roles form non-verbal signals that were important for the audience's perception of the scene. The study by A. Trofimov *et al.* (2021) broadened the understanding of the psychological nature of stage interaction by analysing the role of playback theatre as a form of dramatic activity that promoted the development of spontaneity, the ability to react instantly and creatively interpret situations, while emphasising the psychological aspect of empathic listening and the actor's ability to capture and reflect emotions in stage interaction.

In the study by R. Schmäzle *et al.* (2025), a "thin-slicing" technique was used to evaluate the effectiveness of public speaking, which made it possible to compare the communication strategies of actors and speakers. In addition, V. Jakkamsetti *et al.* (2023) proved that training in improvisational theatre increased behavioural plasticity and affected the rhythm and duration of continuous speech, which has become important for adapting communication strategies in different situations. In the Ukrainian scientific field, the issues of acting communication and the psychology of stage interaction were examined by M. Barnych & N. Horbachuk (2021), who analysed the process of creative transformation as the basis of stage action. M. Tatarenko (2022) noted that the key problem in theatrical art remained the improvement of acting skills to create an expressive and original stage image. The author emphasised that different acting styles – characterisation, mask, alienation, transformation – form the basis of the artistic and creative process and ensure the richness of stage forms. I. Lennik (2025) analysed the individual style of an actor as a communicative phenomenon. I. Kabanova (2024) noted that although online formats allowed for the development of individual technical and analytical competencies, it cannot completely replace the practice of acting partnership and audience contact. At the same time, experience working with studio students and university students has demonstrated the need to search for new models of distance learning that can compensate for the lack of a live theatre environment. Taken together, these studies have outlined the psychological and communicative aspects of stage interaction that were relevant for a comparative analysis of acting and public speaking skills.

The aim of the article was to identify the differences between acting skills and public speaking skills in order to develop a system for training specialists, who were able to effectively adapt their communicative behaviour to different professional contexts. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: 1) to conduct a comparative analysis of acting and public speaking skills in order to identify their differences; 2) to investigate the psychological mechanisms of interaction between the performer and the audience in acting and public speaking practices; 3) to determine the criteria for the communicative adaptation of the performer to different professional contexts and to develop a scientifically based model for selecting techniques for interacting with the audience. The novelty of the research was that for the first time a comprehensive system of criteria for the conscious choice of acting or public speaking techniques depending on the communicative context has been developed. The specifics of the psychological mechanisms underlying different types of interaction between the performer and the audience have been identified.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of the study was an interdisciplinary approach that integrated the theatre studies aspect (analysis of stage craft, principles of transformation, work with image, specifics of existence in a role), the psychological aspect (study of the mechanisms of emotional intelligence, attention processes, concentration and psychological stability of the performer, the phenomenon of the actor's double consciousness) and the communicative aspect (the study of strategies for interacting with the audience, types of feedback, ways of establishing trust, mechanisms for maintaining attention). A systematic analysis of the concepts of classical theatre pedagogy (L. Kurbas, J. Grotowski, P. Brook) and contemporary communication researchers (D. Carnegie, S. Sinek, A. Cuddy) provided a theoretical justification for the identified patterns, in particular: the principle of the actor's double consciousness as opposed to the speaker's holistic self-identification; the difference in the mechanisms of building trust through artistic truth and through the demonstration of competence; the specifics of empathy directed inward toward the image in acting practice and empathy directed outward toward the audience in public speaking practice; differences in working with feedback from the audience.

The comparative method was used to compare acting skills and oratory skills according to the criteria of working with text (memorisation and transformation in acting versus memorisation of theses and improvisation in public speaking), use of voice and body (mis-en-scène fixation in an actor versus natural plasticity in an orator), and the nature of interaction with the audience (the "fourth wall" system in theatre versus direct dialogue in public speaking), which revealed fundamental differences in the target settings of both types of performers.

Psychological analysis of the mechanisms of interaction between the performer and the audience was used to reveal the specifics of emotional intelligence, feedback processes, mechanisms of attention and concentration in acting and public speaking. Typological modelling was used to systematise communicative situations based on four parameters: degree of conventionality, directionality, technological mediation, and temporal structure of communication. The structural-functional method was used to develop a system of criteria for selecting interaction strategies, which made it possible to identify six key parameters: the purpose of communication, performer identification, audience expectations, feedback opportunities, time constraints, and level of formality. The integration of theoretical and practical methods provided a comprehensive understanding of the differences between acting skills and public speaking in the context of the modern cultural space.

Results and Discussion

Despite the growing need to introduce various communication practices in the training of performing arts specialists, there are a number of unresolved issues that require scientific consideration. One of them is the problem of distinguishing between competencies – future actors successfully transformed themselves on stage, but lost their persuasiveness during public performances, presentations of creative projects or communication with the media. This indicated an insufficient understanding of the nature of the differences between acting organically and speaking in a structured manner. The problem of methodological uncertainty was that existing methodologies often viewed acting and public speaking as parallel rather than intersecting systems, which made it difficult to create individual development strategies for each student. Actors needed to learn to find a balance between sincerity in their performance and the ability to communicate effectively with the audience. The problem of the psychological aspect was the lack of systematic research into the psychological mechanisms underlying different types of interaction with the audience. The problem of communicative adaptation was that modern performers needed a clear understanding of when to use acting techniques and when to use public speaking techniques. The lack of scientifically based criteria for such a choice led to communication failures and reduced professional effectiveness.

Given the problems identified, for the effective training of performing arts specialists, it is necessary to identify the fundamental difference in the goals of an actor and an orator. An actor creates an artistic reality in which he exists in the image of a role, while a orator conveys own position while remaining himself. This difference in the starting point determines all further differences in the technical arsenal and psychological mechanisms of work. In the context of working with text, there are fundamental differences between an actor and a orator. The

actor fully assimilates the dramatic material, memorising it and constructing each line within the framework of the artistic whole. In teaching practice, attention is drawn to the fact that the actor's words are formed as a result of the character's internal actions. The actor does not speak the text – he acts with words, and the voice becomes an instrument of this action. Intonation, tempo, and pauses arise organically from the psychophysical state of the character. Improvisation in acting usually occurs only when the actor forgets the text or is looking for a way to “save” the scene, with the exception of specially constructed improvisational forms of theatre. In contrast, the orator uses the voice consciously: he controls the volume, tempo and pauses to emphasise important points and hold attention. In public speaking, improvisation is a natural component, as the orator has much more freedom in his choice of words and can respond flexibly to the mood of the audience. In this regard, Y. Bekh *et al.* (2021) noted that working with text for an actor is a process of deep transformation, where each word acquires emotional and intonational form and expressiveness through movement and physicality. D. Gustianing *et al.* (2024) pointed out that the orator works with the text differently, as they do not memorise the speech word for word, but only remember the main points, leaving room for improvisation and lively responses to the audience. Their speech is based on a logical structure – introduction, main part, conclusion – but the manner of delivery remains natural and conversational. The speaker's intonation is calm, confident, focused on convincing the listener rather than creating an artistic image.

Embodiment manifests in fundamentally different ways in actors and orators. For the actor, physicality and movement are fixed within the *mise-en-scène* during rehearsals: gestures, gait, and posture are conceived by the director and determined by the demands of the role, while simultaneously reflecting the inner state of the stage character. The actor moves within the stage space according to the logic of stage action and interaction with partners. By contrast, the orator's physicality is natural and unforced, formed on the basis of bodily sensation. Gestures, movement, and posture are subordinated to the aim of effective communication: they emphasise meaning, structure space, and create a sense of confidence and authority in front of the audience. The nature of interaction with the audience is also different. A.A. Mehr *et al.* (2024) noted that an actor works within the “fourth wall” system – they are aware of the presence of the audience but do not engage in direct communication with them, maintaining the illusion of independent existence in the stage space. The orator, on the other hand, does not separate themselves from the audience but remains on the same level with them. The speech is constructed as a direct dialogue with listeners: eye contact is established, audience reactions are taken into account, and the communicative strategy is adjusted in response to feedback (Huang *et al.*, 2023). Feedback

processes therefore have a different nature. For example, an actor receives feedback through the audience's energetic response – laughter, silence, applause – but does not adjust their performance directly to this response, as this would disrupt the logic of the stage action. The orator, by contrast, actively works with feedback, instantly adapting the speech to audience responses. Examples may be changed if misunderstanding is detected, arguments strengthened in the face of resistance, or humour introduced to release tension. Such flexibility is not a violation of the speech structure, but rather a marker of oratorical mastery. The mechanisms of attention and concentration also function in a specific way. The actor divides his attention between several objects: his partner, the stage space, the inner life of the character, and the technical elements of the performance. The actor learns to shift their attention from focusing on themselves to encompassing the entire space naturally, without visible effort, creating the illusion of organic life on stage. The speaker's attention has a different structure. It is directed primarily at the audience, at controlling the flow of communication, at tracking their own plan for presenting the material. D. Carnegie & J.B. Esenwein (2007) emphasised the importance of the speaker's "distributed attention" – the ability to simultaneously monitor the reactions of different parts of the audience, noticing both the general mood of the room and the individual reactions of individual listeners. At the initial stage, speakers often "lose" their audience by immersing themselves in their own thoughts or the text of their speech, while experienced speakers constantly hold the audience's attention by creating a dialogue. Psychological resistance to stress is formed in both practices, but through different mechanisms. Actors learn to trust the process, let go of control, and allow themselves to be vulnerable on stage. The orator overcomes anxiety through the opposite mechanism – increasing control and confidence in their own competence. Amy Cuddy has proven in her research that even physical postures of confidence ("power posing") reduce cortisol levels and increase feelings of control (Kyivstar Business, 2024). Orators build psychological resilience through thorough preparation, knowledge of the material, and proficiency in presentation techniques. The better they know the subject, the less prone they are to destructive anxiety.

An analysis of pedagogical concepts for training performers demonstrates that Ukrainian and global theatre schools have accumulated significant experience that can serve as a foundation for integrating acting and oratory techniques. Les Kurbas, in his "Berezil" concept, developed the idea of the universal actor-creator capable of various forms of stage communication. His principle of transformational theatre involved not only psychological transformation but also the conscious construction of stage action, which resonates with the oratorical strategy of speech planning (Vitenchuk, 2025). Jerzy Grotowski, in his concept of "poor theatre", emphasised

the psychophysical training of the actor and the capacity for full control over voice and body. His method of "via negativa" – the removal of blocks and constraints – has proven productive for both acting and oratorical practice. Developing students' awareness of their own psychophysical processes is equally important for organic existence within a role and for convincing public speaking (Fruktova, 2011). Peter Brook substantiated the idea of "living theatre", in which the actor establishes direct energetic contact with the audience. This principle reveals a point of convergence between acting and oratorical practices, as both require the ability to create a live connection with the spectator or listener. Brook emphasised that genuine communication occurs not through technical perfection but through the presence of a sincere performer in the here and now (Donchenko & Yermukanova, 2022). The Ukrainian researcher N. Kornienko (2020), in her work on theatre pedagogy, developed the concept of the actor's emotional–imagery thinking, which presupposes a synthesis of rational analysis and intuitive lived experience. It is precisely this synthesis that can become a bridge between acting organicity and oratorical structure. An actor who understands the logic of communicative construction gains an additional tool for directing the audience's attention without losing artistic truthfulness.

Identifying points of convergence between acting and oratorical practices makes it possible to formulate principles of balance between artistic truth and communicative effectiveness. First is the principle of conscious organicity: students and professional actors must learn to distinguish situations that require the character's spontaneous reaction from those that demand structured argumentation of a personal position. Second is the principle of vocal adaptability: understanding that the voice may function both as an instrument of inner action and as a means of logical persuasion. Third is the principle of contextual physicality: the ability to change the nature of bodily expression depending on the communicative situation. In practical terms, this implies the development of training exercises that combine acting and oratorical techniques. For example, work on a monologue may include both the lived experience of a character's inner states in the spirit of Kurbas and the use of rhetorical devices to clearly articulate key theses.

An understanding of pedagogical concepts in acting and oratorical techniques necessitates the study of the psychological mechanisms underlying these practices, since it is the psychological nature of audience interaction that determines why the same techniques function differently in acting and oratorical contexts. The actor exists in a state of dual consciousness: simultaneously being oneself and the character, controlling performance while organically living each moment. Les Kurbas described this as a state of "transformation", in which the actor's consciousness splits into the creator of the image and the image itself. This psychological duality

requires specific inner settings: the actor must believe in the given circumstances and activate emotional memory (Vitenchuk, 2025). The orator, by contrast, remains in a state of coherent self-identification. The orator's psychological orientation is towards persuasion through the demonstration of competence, logical thinking, and emotional engagement with the topic. The orator consciously manages emotions: pathos may be employed to enhance impact, but emotions are always subordinated to the goal of conveying ideas and influencing the audience's position. Emotional intelligence operates differently in these practices. The actor develops empathy through the technique of the "magic if", asking: "What would I do if I were in the character's situation?" This empathy is directed inward towards the character and serves to create psychological credibility. The actor must be sensitive to the emotional states of the character and stage partners, responding to the most subtle changes in their behaviour (Melnyk, 2024). The orator also employs emotional intelligence, but directs it outward. The orator reads the audience's mood, influences it, tracks reactions, and notices moments of waning attention or heightened interest. Oratorical empathy is the ability to sense the audience's needs, anticipate questions, and find arguments that resonate with a particular group of listeners. In pedagogical practice, students should be taught to "feel" the audience: to recognise when to accelerate the tempo or pause, when to add emotional intensity, and when to shift to rational argumentation.

E.-J. Lee (2025) noted that the phenomenon of presence, which means the ability of the performer to be completely "here and now", creating a sense of authenticity and engagement, is of particular importance. Theatre pedagogy emphasises the importance of developing a special state of readiness for creativity, when the actor is as sensitive as possible to every moment of action. This state is achieved through systematic exercises in concentration, relaxation and the development of sensory sensitivity. For the orator, presence means the

ability to establish genuine contact with the audience, to experience oneself not merely as a source of information but as a participant in a shared process of understanding. Brené Brown demonstrates in her talks how a speaker's true presence emerges from a willingness to be sincere, to acknowledge uncertainty, and to share not only knowledge but also doubts. It is precisely this authenticity, rather than flawless technique, that creates a deep connection with the audience (TEDx Talks, 2010). Within the mechanisms of trust building, the actor builds trust in the stage reality through the presence of "life truth" on stage – when the viewer believes in what they see, even if it is a completely conventional theatrical form. The orator builds trust by demonstrating competence, honesty, and respect for the audience. Simon Sinek formulated the "golden circle" principle: people trust not because of "what" is done, but because of "why" – if an orator can convincingly explain their motivation, goal, and beliefs, they will gain much deeper trust from the audience than simply by demonstrating facts (The "Golden circle" model for..., 2023). Thus, understanding how the performer's psyche works during a performance allows not only technical improvement, but also the development of true mastery – the ability to consciously choose the right tools depending on the situation, audience, and communication goal. Modern performing arts professionals operate in a multi-dimensional communicative space, which requires the systematisation of various situations of interaction with the audience. The proposed typology based on four main parameters, each of which significantly influences the choice of communication strategy (Table 1). Understanding the typology of communicative situations, in which an actor functions necessitates the formulation of clear criteria by which the performer can choose an adequate strategy for interacting with the audience. These criteria should function as analytical tools that help to make informed decisions about the use of acting or public speaking techniques (Table 2).

Table 1. Typology of communicative situations

<p>Degree of conventionality of communication</p>	<p>Essence of the parameter: determines the relationship between the artistic (role-playing) and real (authentic) nature of communication. Main poles: high conventionality ↔ complete authenticity. Examples of communicative situations: classical drama (high conventionality); documentary theatre, stand-up (mixed form); educational lecture, scientific report (complete authenticity). Key communicative challenges: awareness of the role, balance between the stage image and one's own personality. Optimal strategies for the performer/communicator: developing role reflection, the ability to transition from "acting" to "presence", training authenticity in public speaking</p>
<p>Directionality of communication</p>	<p>Essence of the parameter: the nature of the interaction between the performer and the audience. Main poles: unidirectional ↔ dialogical. Examples of communicative situations: theatre performance (unidirectional); forum theatre, immersive performance (mixed); master class, training, discussion (dialogical). Key communication challenges: maintaining attention, adapting to reactions, managing the dynamics of interaction. Optimal strategies for the performer/communicator: developing flexibility, improvisation skills, active listening</p>

Table 1, Continued

Technological mediation	<p>Essence of the parameter: the presence and type of technological mediation between the performer and the audience.</p> <p>Main poles: direct (offline) ↔ digital (online).</p> <p>Examples of communication situations: theatre, concert, live lecture (direct); television programme, podcast (technological); online course, stream, VR performance (digital).</p> <p>Key communication challenges: loss of direct contact, technical limitations, fragmented attention.</p> <p>Optimal strategies for the performer/communicator: mastering media language, working with the camera, visualising content, interactivity</p>
Temporal structure of communication	<p>Essence of the parameter: temporal organisation of the communication event.</p> <p>Main poles: one-time ↔ serial/long-term.</p> <p>Examples of communication situations: speech, performance, presentation (one-time); TV show, podcast, lecture course (serial); educational course, creative project (long-term).</p> <p>Key communicative challenges: managing attention and resources, shaping expectations, building trust.</p> <p>Optimal strategies for the performer/communicator: building a narrative, presenting material in stages, maintaining audience interest</p>

Source: developed by the author

Table 2. Analysis of the communicative situation and criteria for choosing a strategy

Criterion	Description
Purpose of communication	The fundamental criterion is the dominant goal of the event. If the goal is aesthetic experience, artistic image, emotional catharsis → acting techniques. If the goal is to convey information, persuade, teach → public speaking techniques. It is possible to combine goals, but it is important to be clearly aware of the dominant goal
Identification of the performer	Degree of identification with the message: high identification (character speech) → acting techniques; authentic expert position → public speaking techniques. Practical recommendation: perform exercises for a smooth transition from role-playing to expert speech
Audience expectations	Understanding the audience's request: theatregoers expect aesthetics and empathy, conference participants expect specifics and applicability. A mismatch between strategy and expectations leads to dissonance
Feedback opportunities	The presence/nature of feedback determines the readiness for improvisation: limited feedback (classical performance, recording) → thorough preparation and "programmed" influence. Active feedback (training, stream) → flexibility, improvisation, techniques for dialogue
Time constraints	Strict time frames (conference, media interview) → clear structure, conciseness, priority of key messages. Flexible frameworks (master class, training) allow for deeper immersion, practical exercises, and gradual unfolding of material. In theatre – working with "stage time"
Level of formality	Degree of formality: highly formal contexts (defences, official ceremonies) → protocol, restraint; informal (creative meetings) → personal tone, humour, freedom of expression. Recommendation: find a balance and adapt intonation and manner of behaviour

Source: developed by the author

These criteria do not function in isolation, but create a multidimensional system for analysing communicative situations. The performer must consistently evaluate the situation according to each criterion, which allows to construct a complete picture of the performance. In teaching practice, the use of these criteria facilitates the analysis of real communicative situations – students learn not to mechanically apply a set of rules, but to consciously analyse the context and make informed decisions about the choice of communicative strategy. Thus, the integration of the typology of communicative situations and the system of criteria for choosing interaction strategies forms a comprehensive methodological basis for training modern performing arts professionals who are capable of flexible adaptation in various professional contexts.

Conclusions

A comparative analysis of two types of performance activity allowed to formulate key differences at the level of target orientations: creating an aesthetic experience through image as opposed to conveying ideas through a personal position. This difference determined all further features of the technical arsenal and methods of communication with the audience. The study of psychological mechanisms showed that actors develop the ability to empathically immerse themselves in the inner world of a character using the technique of "magic if" and emotional memory. Orators develop skills of external empathy aimed at understanding the needs of listeners, anticipating their questions, and finding resonant arguments. Feedback processes also have the opposite nature: the audience's energetic reaction does not directly correct the actor's

performance, while for the orator, instant adaptation to the audience's reactions was a sign of professional skill.

The proposed four-component typology of communicative situations created an analytical toolkit for systematising various contexts of performing arts, from classical theatre performances to online broadcasts and interactive performances. The system of six criteria for choosing an interaction strategy functioned as a multi-dimensional decision-making matrix that helped performers consciously choose between acting and public speaking techniques depending on the specifics of the situation. An analysis of the pedagogical concepts of various theatre schools revealed points of contact between acting and public speaking practices, which made it possible to form principles of balance: conscious organicity, voice adaptability, and contextual plasticity. These principles will allow the development of training exercises that combine the emotional score of a role with the logical structure of argumentation. The results of the study proved that modern performing arts professionals

do not need to choose between acting and public speaking techniques, but rather develop the ability to integrate them flexibly. This has formed a new professional quality – communicative universality, which has become important in the context of the digitalisation of cultural space and the emergence of new formats of stage presence. A promising direction for further research is the development and testing of an integrated training programme for performing arts specialists, which systematises acting and public speaking techniques based on the proposed typology of communicative situations.

● Acknowledgements

None.

● Funding

None.

● Conflict of Interest

None.

● References

- [1] Barnych, M., & Horbachuk, N. (2021). Acting: From imagination to transformation. *Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Audiovisual Arts and Production*, 4(1), 18-27. doi: [10.31866/2617-2674.4.1.2021.235062](https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.4.1.2021.235062).
- [2] Bekh, Y., Romankova, L., Vashkevych, V., Yaroshenko, A., & Lipin, M. (2021). Artistic aspects of embodiment of postmodern theater practices in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(1Sup1), 313-322. doi: [10.18662/po/12.1Sup1/287](https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.1Sup1/287).
- [3] Berkemeyer, L., Binnewies, C., Hilbert, M., & Maunz, L. (2025). Creative and healthy through improv: Effects of training improvisational theatre on creative and work-related self-efficacy and self-esteem. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 56, article number 101757. doi: [10.1016/j.tsc.2025.101757](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2025.101757).
- [4] Brook, P. (1996). *The empty space: A book about the theatre: Deadly, holy, rough, immediate*. New York: Scribner.
- [5] Brott, G., Wilson, C., & Brooker, J. (2025). A qualitative study into the psychological effects of acting work among Australian-based actors. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 77(1), article number 2486775. doi: [10.1080/00049530.2025.2486775](https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530.2025.2486775).
- [6] Carnegie, D., & Esenwein, J.B. (2007). *The art of public speaking*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- [7] Donchenko, N., & Yermukanova, A. (2022). The stage universalism of Peter Brook's directed theater. *National Academy of Culture and Arts Management Herald*, 2, 206-211. doi: [10.32461/2226-3209.2.2022.262282](https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.2.2022.262282).
- [8] Fruktova, T. (2011). [Concept of action in Jerzy Grotowski's theatre: An attempt of interpretation](#). *Mahisterium. Culturology*, 42, 21-27.
- [9] Gustianing, D., Bastian, A.A., Yuniarti, E.P., & Sugiharto, P.A. (2024). Enhancing public speaking to English for young learners via extemporaneous speech: A comprehensive approach using speaking evaluation criteria. *Aisyah Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 234-244. doi: [10.30604/ajjelt.v3i1.1632](https://doi.org/10.30604/ajjelt.v3i1.1632).
- [10] Huang, Z., He, Q., Maher, K., Deng, X., Lai, Y.-K., Ma, C., Qin, S.-F., Liu, Y.-L., & Wang, H. (2023). SpeechMirror: A multimodal visual analytics system for personalized reflection of online public speaking effectiveness. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 30(1), 606-616. doi: [10.1109/TVCG.2023.3326932](https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2023.3326932).
- [11] Jakkamsetti, V., Broyles, C., Buttafarro, F., Myers, C.R., & Myers, S.K. (2023). Human behavior plasticity measured in speech epochs: A proof-of-concept study. *ArXiv*. doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2309.15862](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.15862).
- [12] Kabanova, I. (2024). Experience of training future actors in distance learning. *Culturological Almanac*, 1, 317-325. doi: [10.31392/cult.alm.2024.1.41](https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2024.1.41).
- [13] Kornienko, N. (2020). [On the threshold of quantum theater: The revolt of time in nonlinear systems](#). In *Proceedings of the Shevchenko Scientific Society* (Vol. 273). Lviv: Works of the Theatre Studies Commission.
- [14] Kyivstar Business. (2024). 5 communication TED Talk: How to communicate to achieve your goals. *Kyivstar Business Hub*. Retrieved from <https://hub.kyivstar.ua/articles/5-komunikacijnih-ted-talk-yak-spilkuvatisya-shhob-dosyagti-svogo>.
- [15] Lee, E.-J. (2025). Authenticity at the heart of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 75(2), 85-89. doi: [10.1093/joc/jqaf005](https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqaf005).

- [16] Lennik, I. (2025). The formation of Bogdan Stupka's personality during his childhood and adolescence: Influence of family upbringing. *Culturological Almanac*, 2, 154-160. doi: [10.31392/cult.alm.2025.2.18](https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2025.2.18).
- [17] Mehr, A.A., Aref, M., & Kakasoltani, H. (2024). Redefining theatricality: How the fourth wall shapes audience interaction in gaming theater. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6(5), 325-331. doi: [10.34104/bjah.02403250331](https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.02403250331).
- [18] Melnyk, M. (2024). Theatre art: Conceptual and categorical problems. *Interdisciplinary Cultural and Humanities Review*, 3(1), 46-52. doi: [10.59214/cultural/1.2024.46](https://doi.org/10.59214/cultural/1.2024.46).
- [19] Schmälzle, R., Lim, S., Du, Y., & Bente, G. (2025). The art of audience engagement: LLM-based thin-slicing of scientific talks. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10, article number 1610404. doi: [10.3389/fcomm.2025.1610404](https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1610404).
- [20] Stevenson, T., Rees, C., & Hodder, S. (2025). The acoustic profiles of emotion: Analyzing the spoken voice in theater performance. *Voice and Speech Review*, 1-16. doi: [10.1080/23268263.2025.2482495](https://doi.org/10.1080/23268263.2025.2482495).
- [21] Tatarenko, M. (2022). Artistic and creative effectiveness of acting manners in the process of playing a role. *National Academy of Culture and Arts Management Herald*, 1, 213-218. doi: [10.32461/2226-3209.1.2022.257733](https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.1.2022.257733).
- [22] TEDx Talks. (2010). *The power of vulnerability*. Brené Brown. TEDxHouston. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/X4Qm9cGRub0>.
- [23] The "Golden circle" model for brand communication in media and social networks. (2023). *Semantrum*. Retrieved from <https://www.promo.semantrum.net/post/use-the-golden-circle-model-when-representing-the-brand-in-the-media-and-social-media>.
- [24] Trofimov, A., Yurchynska, H., Lovochkina, A., Pohorilska, N., Ananova, I., & Drobot, O. (2021). Forming of spontaneity and creativity during playback theater activities. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 431-441. doi: [10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1585](https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1585).
- [25] Vitenchuk, A. (2025). *Les Kurbas and the system of education and training of Berezhil actor*. (Bachelor's thesis, I.K. Karpenko-Karyi Kyiv National University of Theatre, Cinema and Television, Kyiv, Ukraine).

Владислав Браворіченко

Викладач кафедри музично-сценічного мистецтва
Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка
02154, бульв. Ігоря Шамо, 18/2, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9263-4080>

Відмінності акторської майстерності та ораторського мистецтва: психологічні та комунікативні аспекти взаємодії з аудиторією

■ **Анотація.** Цифровізація культурного простору та поява нових форматів сценічної присутності (онлайн-вистави, стримінг, інтерактивні вистави) вимагають переосмислення традиційних підходів до взаємодії з аудиторією. Метою дослідження стало визначення відмінностей між акторською майстерністю та ораторським мистецтвом для удосконалення підготовки майбутніх акторів. Дослідження виявило фундаментальні відмінності між акторською майстерністю та ораторським мистецтвом у контексті взаємодії з аудиторією. Встановлено, що актор створює художню реальність через психофізичне перевтілення в образ, працюючи у системі «четвертої стіни», тоді як оратор транслює власну позицію через структуровану аргументацію та пряму комунікацію зі слухачами. Виявлено специфіку роботи з текстом: актор повністю засвоює драматургічний матеріал та «існує» в образі героя, натомість оратор запам'ятовує ключові тези, залишаючи простір для імпровізації та гнучкого реагування на аудиторію. Встановлено різницю у використанні голосу та тіла: акторське слово народжується з внутрішньої дії персонажа, а пластика мізансценно зафіксована, тоді як оратор свідомо контролює голос для впливу, а жести та рухи підпорядковані меті ефективного комунікування. Виявлено відмінності у психологічних механізмах: актор перебуває у стані подвійної свідомості та розвиває емпатію всередину образу, натомість оратор зберігає цілісну самоідентифікацію та спрямовує емоційний інтелект назовні на аудиторію. Розроблено типологію комунікативних ситуацій на основі чотирьох параметрів: ступеня умовності, спрямованості, технологічного опосередкування та темпоральної структури комунікації. Обґрунтовано систему з шести критеріїв вибору стратегій взаємодії: мета комунікації, ідентифікація виконавця, очікування аудиторії, можливості зворотного зв'язку, часові обмеження та рівень формальності. Доведено, що синтез акторських та ораторських практик формує універсального виконавця-комунікатора, здатного усвідомлено обирати стратегію залежно від професійного контексту. Запропонована типологія та система критеріїв становлять методологічну основу для розробки інтегрованих навчальних програм підготовки фахівців сценічного мистецтва, які поєднують техніки акторської майстерності та ораторського мистецтва для ефективною адаптації комунікативної поведінки до різноманітних ситуацій сучасного культурного простору

■ **Ключові слова:** актор; оратор; комунікативні стратегії; психологічні механізми; сценічне мистецтво