

УДК 791.229.2:351.858](477:1-87)(045)

**MODERN DOCUMENTARY FILMMAKING IN UKRAINE : TRANSFORMATION OF GENRES**

**Dmytro KONOVALOV** – PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor of the Department of Photographic Art and Cinematography, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7951-9718>  
<https://doi.org/10.35619/ucpmk.52.1134>  
drach.tamara@gmail.com

**Yuliya SOLOVYOVA** – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Art Criticism, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6116-3733>

**Maryna CHAIKA** – Lecturer at the Department of Photographic Art and Cinematography, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3960-8686>

**Sofia KONOVALOVA** – Lecturer at the Department of Film and Television Directing and Screenwriting, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-1429-9459>

**Diana STRYZHAK** – Lecturer at the Department of Photographic Art and Cinematography, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8769-4819>

**Цитування:**

Konovalov D., Solovyova Y., Chaika M., Konovalova M., Stryzhak D. Modern documentary filmmaking in Ukraine : transformation of genres. *Українська культура: минуле, сучасне, шляхи розвитку*. 2026. № 52. С. 164–171. <https://doi.org/10.35619/ucpmk.52.1134>

*The purpose of the article* is to explore the formation of new genres in contemporary Ukrainian documentary cinema. The study focuses on the processes of genre hybridisation that have reshaped the boundaries between artistic and journalistic discourse, resulting in the rise of new documentary forms such as infotainment, documentary activism, mockumentary, and science-popular cinema. *The methodology*. Achievement of the research is to reveal the multifaceted nature of documentary filmmaking and to approach as closely as possible to the realities of its artistic and communicative specificity. The study applies a systemic and comparative approach that enabled the identification of key tendencies in the transformation of Ukrainian non-fiction cinema. The structural and typological methods were used to describe the peculiarities of genre formation and transformation, while the case study method allowed for an analysis of specific examples from the works of contemporary Ukrainian filmmakers such as Serhii Bukovskiy, Iryna Tsilyk, Alina Gorlova and Roman Bondarchuk. The mentioned methods made it possible to determine the degree of genre diversification and to identify the key trends of hybridisation in modern Ukrainian documentary film. *The results*. The study revealed that contemporary Ukrainian documentary cinema is undergoing an active process of transformation, reflected in the blurring of boundaries between fiction and non-fiction, and in the formation of new hybrid genres that combine artistic imagery with factual representation. Documentary film has evolved from a purely informative medium into a creative audiovisual space of cultural reflection that integrates media, artistic, and civic practices. *The scientific novelty* is in the conceptualisation of Ukrainian documentary cinema as a flexible genre system, capable of adapting to socio-cultural changes in society.

The practical significance of the study is in the development of theoretical foundations for further research of genre transformations of Ukrainian documentary cinema, as well as in the application of the proposed analytical framework for the study of hybrid media forms in post-digital cinema.

*Key words*: documentary studies, documentary cinema, genre paradigm, hybrid genres, infotainment, documentary activism, mockumentary, chronicle film.

*The relevance of the article*. The system of cinematic types and genres began to take shape within the first decades of film history. The origins of cinematography are directly linked to documentary filming, which was initially perceived as an attempt to capture reality directly. It is well known that the Lumière brothers' films of 1895, documenting everyday life, initiated the history of cinema as an art form. In the Ukrainian context, the conventional starting point of national non-fiction cinema is considered to be A. Fedetsky's filming in Kharkiv the procession with the Wonderworking Icon of the Mother of God «The Sign» being carried to the Pokrovsky Monastery. In modern documentary film studies, the question of the nature of documentary filming remains a subject of ongoing debate. Classical theories define documentary cinema as a means of «objective» reproduction of reality; however, contemporary theorists – notably Bill Nichols – emphasize that any documentary film is not merely a record of events but, first and foremost, a auteur's perspective of reality, constructed through framing, editing, sound dramaturgy, and other elements of film language. The very term *documentary film* emerged in the 1920–1930 s and

became established through the definition by Scottish filmmaker John Grierson as a «creative treatment of reality». This definition determined the further trajectory of documentary genres and their transformations.

*Problem statement.* The question of how genre transformation occurs in Ukrainian documentary cinema is both relevant and methodologically significant, as the socio-political context of Ukrainian reality amplifies the potential of documentary film to represent «objective truth» through creative interpretation.

*Related works.* Genre is defined as «a group of screen works united by the similarity of their internal structure» [12; 58]. In Ukrainian academic tradition, there are several approaches to genre theories. interprets documentary cinema as an instrument in shaping the national narratives; her studies combine historiographical analysis with authorial interpretation, emphasizing the relationship between genre forms, cultural context, and film production practices. K. Shershnova develops a genre-typological model of Ukrainian documentary cinema, conceptualizing it as a «multigenre artistic phenomenon» that includes elements of epic, lyric, and drama. Her classification integrates classical genre markers (epic, portrait, chronicle, interview) with functional attributes (propagandistic, informative, lyrical). It allows to analyze genre shifts within a historical perspective. K. Chorna explores the emergence and specificity of the *documentary drama* in Ukrainian television channels, pointing to such aspects as infotainment, the blending of fiction and non-fiction, and the risks of genre ambivalence («fact» versus «fabrication»). O. Venhrynovych reveals the special role of scientific and educational documentaries as an autonomous field of screen art, focusing on their genre foundations and evolution within educational and popular science contexts. His works underline the importance of functional classification in defining documentary forms. M. Kondratieva gives special attention to the impact of digital technologies on documentary stylistics – editing and sound design – as well as to the emergence of new hybrid genres, ranging from short-form documentaries for online platforms to *docu-fiction* hybrids in full-length cinema. Recent studies also demonstrate a shift in thematic priorities: the Russian–Ukrainian war has become one of the central topics, giving rise to distinct subgenres (war chronicles, eyewitness testimony, heroic epics). Scholars analyze how this theme shapes Ukraine’s international representation.

It is widely recognized that contemporary Ukrainian documentaries combine observational, poetic, and participatory modes, forming poetic-observational or participatory-performative hybrids. The influence of online platforms (YouTube and social media) and filming on mobile phones has significantly altered both production and consumption practices: the growing prevalence of short-form documentaries, micro-documentaries, and thematic reports demands a renewed framework of genre differentiation.

Despite the significant amount of research devoted to the history and theory of documentary cinema, the question of genre transformation in Ukrainian documentary filmmaking after 2014 remains insufficiently studied. Modern Ukrainian documentary cinema is undergoing an active phase of transformation – from observational formats toward hybrid models, where the boundaries between documentary and fiction become increasingly fluid. A systematic analysis of these processes is considered to be essential in the context of global theoretical approaches.

*The purpose of the article* is to analyze and identify the main patterns of genre transformation in contemporary Ukrainian documentary cinema, and to define the principal directions of its development within the framework of Ukrainian theoretical discourse.

The results. *Type and Genre as the Principal Categories in the Typology of Documentary Cinema: The Problem of Transformation.* In recent decades, we have witnessed the emergence of new genres of documentary cinema. This process is closely related both to the transformation of cinema as a whole and to the expansion of the traditional boundaries of the documentary cinema. A crucial factor in this transformation is the blending, combination, and modification of genres, which, according to L. Bryukhovetska, constitutes the natural state of cinema as a specific art form. In our view, her conclusion that «the best examples of film resist simplicity in various ways, including the organic combination of different genres, at times through a rejection of genre altogether, through visual sophistication and intellectual depth» [4; 15] remains particularly significant. However, Bryukhovetska’s assertion that «the blending, combination and modification of genres represent the natural state of cinema» [ibid.] – though it undoubtedly reflects a real tendency in contemporary film – requires some clarification. In the context of postmodern culture, dominated by hybridity and intermediality, the merging of genre codes is no longer an exceptional feature but rather a mechanism through which cinema adapts to a multiplatform environment. Consequently, to speak of the «naturalness» of genre diffusion without considering its media context risks essentialising a process that is social and cultural as much as it is aesthetic. Moreover, the claim that «the rejection of genre» serves as a marker of higher artistic value can also be questioned. In the realm of contemporary theoretical approaches [19], genre is understood not as a limitation but as a communicative framework that ensures recognisability and trust between author and audience. Therefore, the «deconstruction of genre» does not necessarily result in a more complex structure – it may, in some cases, lead to a loss of narrative coherence. In Ukrainian documentary cinema, this issue manifests itself in the

growing prevalence of «essayistic» and «hybrid» forms when the director's authorial subjectivity dominates over factual material (for example *This Rain Will Never Stop* by A. Gorlova and *Myth* by L. Diakiv and I. Yasniy).

*Features of Documentary Representation in the Formation of Typological and Genre Characteristics of Documentary Cinema.* According to K. Shershniova, the question of typological and genre distinctions in contemporary film studies is examined primarily in the context of the *genre-thematic evolution* of documentary cinema, which she regards as «one of the most important yet least explored problems of contemporary art studies» [18; 112]. In analysing documentary practice, researchers often «overlook the contradictions inherent in defining the very concept of genre» [18; 114].

It is therefore essential to identify the *typological* and *generic* features of documentary cinema to address the issue of its artistic specificity. In our view, the most characteristic *typological* features include: a clearly articulated representation of events aimed at constructing a factographic conception of a theme or narrative; a focus on real circumstances; and a deliberate emphasis on the reality through cinematic means. These marks make it possible to distinguish between fictional and non-fictional domains – an especially important distinction when determining the typological characteristics of cinema as an art form. For instance, K. Milcheva, who studies documentary representation in the context of journalism, classifies documentary film among «the oldest genres of cinematography», thereby disregarding its typological specificity [13; 79]. Conversely, typological features function as a system of artistic representation through which documentary cinema continuously coexists with media visual practices and video journalism within a shared communicative space. The *generic* characteristics of documentary cinema manifest themselves primarily in the process of cinematic representation and are largely determined by the film's orientation. Both the narrative and analytical aspects of documentary depiction acquire special importance, as each contributes to the formation of new formal and expressive qualities in cinema. Among the defining features of documentary genre is the focus on the event or fact. Yet the artistic interpretation of events and facts in visual form inevitably entails evaluative judgement and interpretive engagement. Therefore, within documentary filmmaking – even in its purely artistic variants (for instance, the *documentary elegy*) – interpretation and the establishment of the author's perspective constitute formative elements of genre construction.

*The Interrelation of Documentary and Television Genres.* The most extensive exploration of the interrelation between documentary and television genres in Ukrainian film studies has been undertaken by Z. and A. Alfiorov. They note that «television has become a significant factor in the transformation of the documentary film genre system» [1; 353]. They argue that television documentary «originates from classical non-fiction film» but subsequently acquires new functions and expressive forms due to changes in the media environment. Television, as a medium, not only determines new methods of content presentation but also «reconstructs the genre system of documentary representation», adapting it to the rhythm, structure, and communicative model of broadcast media. Z. and A. Alfiorov further specify the problem, emphasising that it is precisely the «structures of narrativity», embodied through screen-based means, that activate audiovisual genres, which in such cases become nothing other than «screen narratives». Given that, from a historical perspective, the genres of audiovisual art are deeply rooted in two principal modes of screen narration – cinematic and televisual – the contemporary genre system organically relies on them as the primary sources of *species and generic energy* [1; 355–356].

As for documentary cinema itself, as a non-fictional typology, this mode of narration has «diffusely evolved into so-called *docu-fiction*, *mockumentary*, and *drama-media* forms» [1; 356]. Such diffusion illustrates a general tendency towards *hybridisation* of genres, whereby the boundary between factuality and fictionality becomes increasingly fluid. This phenomenon is not merely a matter of stylistic innovation but reflects a deeper epistemological shift within contemporary audiovisual culture: the understanding of documentary as a *creative treatment of reality* rather than as its objective reproduction.

Consequently, the mutual influence of cinematic and televisual documentary practices has contributed to the formation of new hybrid forms in Ukrainian non-fiction cinema, including *infotainment*, *documentary activism*, and *docu-drama*. These genres integrate journalistic, artistic, and performative strategies, thus broadening the representational and expressive potential of documentary film as both an art form and a medium of cultural reflection.

*Hybridisation and New Genre Tendencies in Contemporary Ukrainian Documentary Cinema.* At the beginning of the twenty-first century, Ukrainian documentary cinema entered a phase of intense transformation, marked by the erosion of rigid boundaries between artistic and journalistic discourses. This process has led to the emergence of hybrid genres and creative models in which factual observation merges with authorial interpretation.

Contemporary Ukrainian documentarians frequently combine observational, participatory, and poetic modes of representation, creating multidimensional forms that go beyond the classical taxonomy of Bill Nichols. The works of Iryna Tsilyk, Roman Bondarchuk, Alisa Kovalenko, and Serhii Bukovskyyi illustrate this tendency. In their films, the documentary image becomes a vehicle of self-reflection and symbolic

expression, engaging the viewer in an interpretive dialogue.

This hybridisation is reflected in the rise of such genres as infotainment, documentary activism, mockumentary, and science-popular film, each of which reconfigures the relationship between fact and imagination. The boundaries between documentary and fiction are thus increasingly blurred: the camera no longer merely observes but *constructs* reality, articulating the author's vision and ethical stance. The «authorial gaze» of the filmmaker transforms documentary cinema into a creative medium capable of producing both aesthetic and epistemological meaning. Digital technologies further catalyse this transformation. The use of mobile phones cameras, social media platforms, and micro-documentary formats has democratised film production and diversified its thematic scope. Short-form online documentaries, video essays, and participatory projects redefine traditional notions of cinematic authorship, shifting focus from institutional production to networked collaboration. Consequently, the genre system of Ukrainian documentary cinema is becoming more open, fluid, and interactive.

Thematically, after 2014 Ukrainian documentary cinema has been defined with the Russian–Ukrainian war, civic resistance, and the rearticulation of national identity. These topics have generated specific subgenres – war chronicles, eyewitness testimonies, and heroic epics – that simultaneously perform social, political, and memorial functions. The documentary hero often embodies collective trauma or resilience, serving as both a witness and an interpreter of national experience.

In this context, the notion of the «declared genre» acquires new relevance. It functions as a strategic tool for positioning a film within the contemporary art space, signalling its intended communicative mode and audience reception. Whether labelled as *creative documentary*, *docu-fiction*, or *hybrid film*, such self-designation frames viewer expectations and defines the film's epistemic contract with reality.

Thus, modern Ukrainian documentary cinema no longer functions solely as a means of recording actuality; it operates as a space of cultural reflection, integrating artistic, media, and civic practices. This evolution aligns Ukrainian documentary film with global trends in non-fiction cinema, where hybridity, subjectivity, and reflexivity have become defining principles of the genre's twenty-first-century paradigm.

The analysis of typological and genre transformations in contemporary documentary cinema demonstrates that the documentary form today functions as a dynamic and adaptive system rather than a fixed aesthetic category. The traditional division between fiction and non-fiction modes has become increasingly unstable due to the processes of hybridisation, remediation, and media convergence. Ukrainian documentary cinema exemplifies this tendency, revealing a shift from observational and reportorial modes towards more performative, poetic, and essayistic structures, where the author's perspective assumes a decisive interpretative function. This development not only broadens the expressive potential of the genre but also redefines the boundaries of documentary truth, authenticity, and ethical responsibility. At the same time, the research confirms that genre remains a productive analytical framework for understanding documentary cinema. Despite the apparent fluidity of contemporary forms, the communicative, structural, and functional dimensions of genre continue to provide coherence to the documentary discourse. The theoretical models proposed by Ukrainian scholars – including L. Briukhovetska, K. Shershnova, K. Chorna, and others – underscore the necessity of correlating aesthetic evolution with media, technological, and sociocultural factors. Their work offers valuable conceptual tools for interpreting the genre system of documentary cinema as a multilayered, processual network rather than a hierarchical taxonomy.

In conclusion, the genre paradigm of documentary cinema in the 21st century should be reconsidered as an open, self-reflexive formation that integrates artistic, journalistic, and philosophical functions. The Ukrainian experience – particularly in the post-2014 sociohistorical context – reflects broader global tendencies towards hybridity and personal authorship in non-fiction film. Such a perspective not only enriches the understanding of documentary typology but also situates Ukrainian documentary within the wider discourse of world cinema, where the quest for truth increasingly coincides with the search for new forms of cinematic expression.

*The New Genre Paradigm of Documentary Cinema in the Early 21st Century.* We believe that there is a need to define the range of relevant genres that led to a rethinking of the problem of identity in Ukrainian documentary cinema. At the core of our analysis there is the concept of *documentarism* as the correlation between the fictional and non-fictional components, which, in a broader context, generates a discussion about the boundaries of fiction and non-fiction film. For instance, R. Sviato characterizes the films presented at the «Kontakt» Festival (2007) as follows: «It is difficult to speak about particular artistic merits of the film, since the directors' initial goal was different – to tell, to inform, perhaps to open viewers' eyes to facts previously unknown to them. The chosen form was appropriate for this aim: we have numerous eyewitness accounts, footage of former prisons, excerpts of television chronicles, and so on. In other words, this is a solid television project» [16; 44–45]. As this brief description suggests, the researcher does not seek to clearly separate artistic and documentary contexts, nor to demarcate the genre features that define the film's mode of address. In her view, cinema is capable of representing both properties simultaneously, while retaining its fundamental ability to convey narrative meaning.

Similar reasoning is found in an interview with renowned Ukrainian documentary filmmaker Serhii

Bukovskiy. When asked about the distinctions between the fictional and non-fictional cinematic spaces, he stated: «For me, it is a single entity; I do not distinguish between fiction and non-fiction film. I say simply – this is cinema, a film text – the structural laws are almost identical. The only difference is that one cannot always intrude into a person's private life; this gives rise to ethical issues specific to the genre and the profession» [5; 408].

In our opinion, this example vividly illustrates the specificity of genre analysis in documentary cinema as the main interpretive tool influencing the evaluation of meaning, including reflections on identity.

At the beginning of the 21st century, documentary cinema continued to undergo active transformation, which is reflected in the emergence of new genres and the renewal of existing ones.

*Infotainment as a Genre of Contemporary Documentary.* Infotainment appeared within the media spectrum of documentarism and reflect the practice of presenting media narratives in an entertaining, playful form designed to generate a positive emotional attitude toward the subject matter and to motivate its consumption. However, within the realm of documentary cinema, this property has acquired a different meaning. The spread of this genre was conditioned by the development of Ukrainian documentary cinema in the first half of the 1990 s, leading to a reorientation of screen discourse from abstract topics to the viewer as such. The defining features of infotainment (from *information* + *entertainment*) are employed as motivational devices that activate the narrative by appealing to socially significant topics while adopting commercially successful forms of representation. K. Chorna identifies two typical forms within the palette of this genre:

1. Films of self-expression with intense dramaturgy;
2. Problem-centered works on social issues that employ sociological methods such as street interviews [17; 164].

In both cases, documentary direction relies on a real individual – or, as the researcher puts it, a *documentary hero* – which clearly articulates the principal feature of documentary infotainment: «the primacy of the hero who narrates real events and his or her role in them» [ibid.].

It should be noted that the issue of identity in documentary cinema necessitates addressing and speaking *through* the hero, since such a construction, while preserving objectivity, remains within the boundaries of journalistic engagement.

*The Genre of Documentary Activism.* The genre of *documentary activism* emerged in the mid-1990 s at the intersection of sociopolitical movements and the need for urgent interpretation of current events.

The term *documentary activism* entered academic discourse through Canadian film critics E. Winton and S. Turnin [19]. According to S. Fedoniuk, «Documentary activism constitutes cross-relations constructed on screen between the audience and the director, the audience and the film's subject. It visually unites two worlds and two perspectives—that of the documentary artist and that of the civic activist».

Fedoniuk further notes that in Ukraine today, documentary activism – capable of organically combining filmmaking, civic engagement, and politics – serves not only as the «voice of society in the geopolitical discourse and an audiovisual means of strengthening civil solidarity, but also as an authorial form of documentary art recognized at international film festivals and even nominated for the Academy Awards» [16; 135]. Researchers aptly describe this genre as «cinema that speaks to both the emotions and the intellect». For example, L. Pidkuimukha interprets documentary activism related to Russia's war against Ukraine as a *synthetic genre* – a cinematic response to the collective need to endure, comprehend, and avoid repeating the tragic lessons of the past [Pidkuimukha, 2019].

*Mockumentary and the Challenge of Hybrid Form.* At the intersection of fiction and non-fiction lies the *mockumentary* – a genre regarded by many scholars as the greatest challenge to documentary authenticity. The term, an ironic reworking of *documentary*, reflects the inversion of factual representation into creative simulation. While documentary film strives for factual accuracy and objectivity, pseudo-documentary preserves the form of factual narration while filling it with purely fictional content.

The authors of *The Mockumentary Genre as a Cinematic Phenomenon of the Postmodern Era* describe its emergence as follows: «Fact acquires imagery; the hero becomes a type. The artistic image is created not only through conventional means but also via video documents and televisual methods of presenting historical events and phenomena. At the junction of fiction and non-fiction cinema, the mockumentary – or pseudo-documentary – genre emerged» [9; 182]. Characteristic features of this genre involve the creation of an illusion of documentary context aimed at producing broad generalization. Natural lighting and location shooting foster in the viewer a sense of presence, often used to elicit emotional engagement with what is depicted. Imperfections in image quality contribute to the impression of authenticity – of «life as it is».

The use of handheld cameras further enhances this sense of immediacy, provoking an «event effect» through unstable framing. This technique, associated with traditional newsreel documentary, is often employed to imitate spontaneity. As Honcharuk, Levchenko, and Tsimokh note, «Rapid changes in framing, camera zooms and movements create the illusion of natural unpredictability. Another consequence of the handheld technique is the prevalence of longer takes and fewer cuts compared to conventional fiction films» [9; 185].

Equally important is the use of actor improvisation to enhance the impression of «liveness». Combined with the cinematographic techniques mentioned, it reinforces the sense of immediacy. Manipulation of textual expressivity – particularly when it appears to come from a real narrator or protagonist – serves as an additional means of blurring the boundary between fact and fiction [9].

*Scientific, Popular-Science, and Chronicle Documentary.* Another significant field of documentary cinema is the *scientific* and *popular-science* film, which became increasingly prominent at the turn of the 21st century. Scholars note that scientific cinema is «historically and logically a continuation and a variation of documentary film» [3; 160]. However, we consider it a specific genre formation emphasizing a distinct thematic and epistemological focus. While some researchers treat popular-science film as a subgenre of documentary or newsreel cinema, we concur with O. Venhrynovych, who interprets scientific documentary as a genre of «intellectual cinema», emphasizing the conceptual depth and analytical orientation of this approach [7; 21].

Equally important is the *chronicle* genre – one of the oldest and most influential forms of documentary practice. Although not an invention of the 21st century, newsreel cinema has experienced renewed interest in Ukraine, particularly since the early 2000s, with the revitalization of national studios devoted to factual documentation. As the British documentarian K. Loach argued in the 1970s, realism in cinema can be achieved only when «the camera does not interfere with the course of events», merely recording and transmitting what it observes. M. Kondratieva adds that reality should not be embellished or simplified but observed in all its diversity, granting life itself the opportunity to represent itself [10; 248–249].

According to Kondratieva, the stylistic identity of the chronicle genre manifests through a characteristic set of traits – dynamism, informational flow, conciseness, and clarity of content [ibid., p. 254]. These form the basis on which «the soul and emotion invested by the author determine the film's meaning». Yet, the proximity of this genre to propaganda remains a potential danger, particularly when the author's subjectivity intersects with the *apparent realism* of archival footage [6; 12].

Given the constant evolution of documentary genres, it is difficult to establish a definitive taxonomy of those most relevant to questions of identity. Hence, K. Chorna's notion of the *declared genre form* is especially significant. This term explains the discrepancy between the true generic nature of a film and its marketed «genre wrapper». The declared genre functions as a commercial label – a promotional construct designed to position a film within the art market [17; 162].

For our analysis, this concept is crucial, since post-production and marketing strategies are directly linked to the film's identification as a «niche» cultural product.

Documentary cinema, as a genre form, remains the subject of ongoing debate [8; 16]. Despite its complex historical development and multiplicity of interpretations, documentarism as an idea – a specific mode of dialogue with reality – continues to ensure the artistic relevance of documentary practice.

Returning once again to Bukovskyi's reflections: in the Western cinematic tradition, there is no rigid division between «artistic» and «documentary». The stereotype that documentary film is «non-artistic», merely factual, is, as he notes, deeply flawed. Authorial vision, symbolic imagery, and compositional choices make even documentary works fully artistic creations. «If there is an author – an evident one – it is already art» [5; 409]. O. Venger and Kh. Yambor likewise emphasize that «working within the documentary genre is a symbiosis of skills and qualities required in both informational and entertainment genres» [6; 11]. The interaction of these domains enriches both contexts: non-fiction cinema increasingly approaches artistic forms, while fictional cinema often adopts documentary techniques.

Z. Alfiorova observes that since the beginning of Russia's war against Ukraine in 2014, there has been a noticeable shift toward documentary-oriented themes within Ukrainian fiction cinema – especially in attempts to reinterpret national history through the prism of contemporary conflict and the revolutionary experiences of the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity [2; 2020].

Thus, the complexity of defining the relationship between documentary and fiction within cinema that seeks to represent reality artistically is evident. This issue extends beyond established genres to include emerging phenomena that are only beginning to articulate themselves in specific typological forms.

For example, M. Kondratieva classifies the film *Exit Through the Gift Shop* (2010) as a *documentary comedy* – a work in which documentary elements intertwine with the provocativeness of fiction. She also introduces the notion of the *documentary joke* as a new hybrid genre of the mid-2010s [11; 143].

*Conclusions.* The analysis conducted allows us to consider the generic and typological nature of contemporary Ukrainian documentary cinema as a crucial instrument for understanding its essence, representational strategies, and communicative aims. The typological characteristics of documentarism reveal its interaction with other cinematic systems (such as fiction film) and its distinction from media-based forms of factual representation (such as television journalism). Types and genres serve as key categories for the typologization of documentary cinema, which remains in a constant state of transformation. Natural documentarism, factuality, and event-centered representation constitute the principal factors shaping its genre identity. Throughout the late 20th and early 21st centuries, Ukrainian documentary

cinema has undergone an uneven yet dynamic evolution, reflecting the broader sociopolitical and cultural processes that underlie the construction of national identity. The documentary film has become a space for recognition, reflection, and interpretation of events and phenomena that compel collective introspection and demand the articulation of the boundaries and norms of identity («self» vs. «other», «true» vs. «false», «authentic» vs. «inauthentic»).

#### Список використаної літератури

1. Алфьорова З., & Алфьоров А. Жанрові метаморфози в контексті дії принципу нелокальності в практиці та теорії мистецтва (на основі аудіовізуального мистецтва). *Культура України*, 2018 (61). С. 352-359. <https://doi.org/10.31516/2410-5325.061.035>.
2. Алфьорова З. «Нове» українське кіно в контексті сучасного аудіовізуального мистецтва. *Вісник КНУКіМ*. Серія: Аудіовізуальне мистецтво і виробництво, 2020. 3 (2). С. 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.3.2.2020.217646>.
3. Безклубенко С. Як робиться фільм (Види і жанри). *Питання культурології* : зб. наук. пр. Вип. 23. Київ : Видав. центр КНУКіМ, 2007. С. 160-169.
4. Брюховецька Л. Кіномистецтво: навч. посіб. Київ: Логос, 2011. 391 с. <https://kmaecm.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/bryuhoveczka-l.i.-2011-kinomystecztvo.pdf>.
5. Буковський С. Жанр – кінодокументалістика : розмова Сергія Іванюка із Сергієм Буковським. ПЕ (цінності, ідентичність, мислення, воля...) : *наук.-навч. посіб.* / [упоряд.: В. Моренець, О. Саврук ; наук. ред. В. П. Моренець] ; Києво-Могилян. бізнес-школа (kmbs), Нац. ун-т «Києво-Могилянська академія». Київ : Дух і Літера, 2020. Вип. 2. С. 406-421. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/20442>
6. Венгер О. & Ямбор, Х. Ведучий у сучасному документальному кіно: в кадрі та поза ним. *Вісник КНУКіМ*. 2024. Серія: Аудіовізуальне мистецтво і виробництво, 7 (1). С. 8-19. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.7.1.2024.302754>
7. Венгринович О. «Наукове кіно» як особлива галузь екранного мистецтва. *Вісник КНУКіМ*, 2015. Серія «Мистецтвознавство», (32). С. 21-26. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1176.32.2015.158448>
8. Гавран І. Ботвин М. Документальне кіно в сучасному екранному дискурсі. *Вісник КНУКіМ*, 2020. Серія: Аудіовізуальне мистецтво і виробництво, 3 (1). С. 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.3.1.2020.202649>
9. Гончарук С. Левченко О. і Цімох Н. Жанр мок'юментарі як кінематографічний феномен доби постмодерну. *Вісник КНУКіМ*, 2022. Серія: Аудіовізуальне мистецтво і виробництво, 5 (2). С. 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.5.2.2022.269523>
10. Кондратьєва М. Документальна стилістика початку ХХІ ст. *Сучасне мистецтво*, 2004. С. 247-254. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/S\\_myst\\_2004\\_1\\_20](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/S_myst_2004_1_20)
11. Кондратьєва М. Інше документальне кіно. *Художня культура. Актуальні проблеми*, 2012 (8). С. 143-147.
12. Миславський В. Західний кінематограф : концептуально-термінологічний словник : наук.-довідк. вид. Харків : Точка, 2024.
13. Мільчева К. Документальне кіно крізь призму телевізійної журналістики. *«Молода наука-2015»* : 36. наук. пр. студ., аспірантів і молодих учених: у 5 т. Запоріжжя : ЗНУ, 2015. Т. 5. С.78-83.
14. Міщенко М. Документальний кінематограф України: між історичною реконструкцією та філософським осмисленням. *Вісник ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна*. Серія: Філософія. Філософські перипетії, 2014. 1116 (50). С. 47-51. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKbIFLO\\_2014\\_1116\\_50\\_9](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKbIFLO_2014_1116_50_9)
15. Свято Р. «Контакт»: українці та документальне кіно. *Кіно-Театр*. 2007. № 4. С. 44-46. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/29499>
16. Федонюк С. Документальний активізм як взаємодія мистецтва і громадянського суспільства. *Духовна культура України перед викликами часу* : тези доп. учасників ІV Всеукр. наук.-практ. конф. (м. Харків, 14 трав. 2021 р.) Нац. юрид. ун-т ім. Я. Мудрого, каф. культурології. Харків : Право, 2021. С. 133-135.
17. Чорна К. Виникнення нових жанрових утворень, зокрема жанру infoteinment. *Вісник Маріуполь. держ. ун-ту*. Серія: Філософія, культурологія, соціологія, 2014, Вип. 7. С. 160-166. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vmdu\\_fks\\_2014\\_7\\_25](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vmdu_fks_2014_7_25)
18. Шершньова К. Особливості розвитку документального кіно України у контексті жанрової специфіки мистецтва. *Наук. вісник Київ. нац. ун-ту театру, кіно і телебачення ім. І.К. Карпенка-Карого*, 2014 (15). С. 112-121. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkkarogo\\_2014\\_15\\_17](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkkarogo_2014_15_17)
19. Winton Ezra & Turnin, Svetla. Documentary Activism: The Politics of Programming, Grassroots Screening Organization and Social Movements. 2015. URL: <https://docudays.ua/eng/2015/events/docuklas/ezra-winton-ta-svetla-turnin-dokumentalnyi-aktyvizm/>

#### References

1. Alforova Z., & Alforov A. Zhanrovi metamorfozy v konteksti dii pryntsyphu nelokalnosti v praktytsi ta teorii mystetstva (na osnovi audiovizualnoho mystetstva). *Kultura Ukrainy*, 2018 (61). S. 352-359. <https://doi.org/10.31516/2410-5325.061.035>.
2. Alforova, Z. «Nove» ukrainske kino v konteksti suchasnoho audiovizualnoho mystetstva. *Visnyk KNUKіM*. Seriiia: Audiovizualne mystetstvo i vyrobnystvo, 2020. 3 (2). S. 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.3.2.2020.217646>.
3. Bezklubenko S. Yak robytsia film (Vydy i zhanry). *Pytannia kulturolohii* : zb. nauk. pr. Vyp. 23. Kyiv : Vydav. tsentr KNUKіM, 2007. S. 160-169.
4. Briukhovetska L. Kinomystetstvo: navch. posib. Kyiv: Lohos, 2011. 391 s. <https://kmaecm.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/bryuhoveczka-l.i.-2011-kinomystecztvo.pdf>.
5. Bukovskyi S. Zhanr – kinodokumentalystyka : rozmova Serhiiia Ivaniuka iz Serhiiem Bukovskym. ShchE (tsinnosti, identychnist, myslennia, volia...) : *nauk.-navch. posib.* / [uporiad.: V. Morenets, O. Savruk ; nauk. red. V. P.

- Morenets]; Kyievo-Mohylian. biznes-shkola (kmbs), Nats. un-t «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia». Kyiv : Dukh i Litera, 2020. Vyp. 2. S. 406-421. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/20442>
6. Venher O., & Yambor, Kh. Veduchy i u suchasnomu dokumentalnomu kino: v kadri ta poza nym. Visnyk KNUKiM. 2024. Serii: Audiovizualne mystetstvo i vyrobnytstvo, 7 (1). S. 8-19. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.7.1.2024.302754>
7. Venhrynovych O. «Naukove kino» yak osoblyva haluz ekrannoho mystetstva. Visnyk KNUKiM, 2015. Serii «Mystetstvoznavstvo», (32). S. 21-26. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1176.32.2015.158448>
8. Havran I., Botvyn M. Dokumentalne kino v suchasnomu ekrannomu dyskursi. Visnyk KNUKiM, 2020. Serii: Audiovizualne mystetstvo i vyrobnytstvo, 3 (1). S. 11-19. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.3.1.2020.202649>
9. Honcharuk S., Levchenko O. i Tsimokh N. Zhanr mokumentari yak kinematohrafichnyi fenomen doby postmodernu. Visnyk KNUKiM, 2022. Serii: Audiovizualne mystetstvo i vyrobnytstvo, 5 (2). S. 181-188. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2617-2674.5.2.2022.269523>
10. Kondratieva M. Dokumentalna stylistyka pochatku KhKhI st. Suchasne mystetstvo, 2004. 2004 (1). S. 247-254. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/S\\_myst\\_2004\\_1\\_20](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/S_myst_2004_1_20)
11. Kondratieva M. Inshe dokumentalne kino. Khudozhnia kultura. Aktualni problemy, 2012 (8). S. 143-147.
12. Myslavskiy V. Zakhidnyi kinematohraf: kontseptualno-terminolohichni slovnyk : nauk.-dovidk. vyd. Kharkiv : Tochka, 2024.
13. Milcheva K. Dokumentalne kino kriz pryizmu televiziinoi zhurnalistyky. «Moloda nauka-2015» : Zb. nauk. pr. stud., aspirantiv i molodykh uchenykh: u 5 t. Zaporizhzhia : ZNU, 2015. T. 5. S.78-83.
14. Mishchenko M. Dokumentalni kinematohraf Ukrainy: mizh istorychnoiu rekonstruktsiieiu ta filosofskym osmyslenniam. Visnyk KhNU im. V. N. Karazyna. Serii: Filosofiia. Filosofski perypetii, 2014. 1116 (50). S. 47-51. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKhIFLO\\_2014\\_1116\\_50\\_9](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VKhIFLO_2014_1116_50_9)
15. Sviato R. «Kontakt»: ukraintsi ta dokumentalne kino. Kino-Teatr. 2007. № 4. S. 44-46. <https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/29499>
16. Fedoniuk S. Dokumentalni aktyvizm yak vzaiemodiia mystetstva i hromadianskoho suspilstva. Dukhovna kultura Ukrainy pered vyklykamy chasu : tezy dop. uchasnykiv IV Vseukr. nauk.-prakt. konf. (m. Kharkiv, 14 trav. 2021 r.) Nats. yuryd. un-t im. Ya. Mudroho, kaf. kulturolohii. Kharkiv : Pravo, 2021. S. 133-135.
17. Chorna K. Vynyknennia novykh zhanrov vyhoven, zokrema zhanru infoteinment. Visnyk Mariupol. derzh. un-tu. Serii: Filosofiia, kulturolohiia, sotsiolohiia, 2014, Vyp. 7. S. 160-166. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vmdu\\_fks\\_2014\\_7\\_25](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Vmdu_fks_2014_7_25)
18. Shershnova K. Osoblyvosti rozvytku dokumentalnoho kino Ukrainy u konteksti zhanrovoi spetsyfiky mystetstva. Nauk. visnyk Kyiv. nats. un-tu teatru, kino i telebachennia im. I.K. Karpenka-Karoho, 2014. (15). S. 112-121. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkkarogo\\_2014\\_15\\_17](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvkkarogo_2014_15_17)
19. Winton Ezra & Turnin, Svetla. Documentary Activism: The Politics of Programming, Grassroots Screening Organization and Social Movements. 2015. URL: <https://docudays.ua/eng/2015/events/docuklas/ezra-winton-ta-svetla-turnin-dokumentalny-aktyvizm/>

**УДК 791.229.2:351.858](477:1-87)(045)**

### **СУЧАСНЕ ДОКУМЕНТАЛЬНЕ КІНОВИРОБНИЦТВО В УКРАЇНІ : ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ЖАНРІВ**

**Дмитро КОНОВАЛОВ** – кандидат філософських наук,  
доцент кафедри фотомистецтва та операторської майстерності,

Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

**Софія КОНОВАЛОВА** – викладач кафедри кіно-телережисури та сценарної майстерності, Харківська  
державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

**Діана СТРИЖАК** – викладач кафедри фотомистецтва та операторської майстерності,  
Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

**Марина ЧАЙКА** – викладач кафедри фотомистецтва та операторської майстерності,  
Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

**Юлія СОЛОВЙОВА** – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри мистецтвознавства,  
Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

Розглядається формування нових жанрів у сучасному українському документальному кіно. Дослідження зосереджене на процесах жанрової гібридизації, які змінили межі між художнім та журналістським дискурсом, що призвело до появи нових документальних форм, таких як інфотейнмент, документальний активізм, мок'юментарі та науково-популярне кіно. У дослідженні застосовано системний та порівняльний підхід, який дозволив виявити ключові тенденції трансформації українського нехудожнього кіно. Структурний та типологічний методи були використані для опису особливостей формування та трансформації жанрів, тоді як метод кейс-стаді дозволив проаналізувати конкретні приклади з робіт сучасних українських кінематографістів. Зазначені методи дозволили визначити ступінь жанрової диверсифікації та виявити ключові тенденції гібридизації в сучасному українському документальному кіно.

*Ключові слова:* документознавство, документальне кіно, жанрова парадигма, гібридні жанри, інфотейнмент, документальний активізм, мок'юментарі, хроніка.

Стаття отримана 26.12.2025

Стаття прийнята 10.02.2026

Стаття опублікована 28.05.2026