Analysis of Single-Shot and Long-Take Filmmaking: Its Evolution, Technique, Mise-en-scène, and Impact on the Viewer

Abhijit Ghosh

Abstract: The most of the narrative films feature extremely deliberate movie editing. The tale is advanced and viewers are given a feeling of time through cuts between shots. Cutaway shots provide background, and quick cuts that take place in only a fraction of a second, give the project vitality. A longer take, on the other hand, can occasionally be used to tell the story and transmit a lot of information at once, making it a crucial cinematography technique. Long-takes used to be constrained by the amount of physical film that could fit inside a camera. However, since everything is now done digitally, we can shoot as much as our multi-gigabyte storage card desires. There are several movie scenes that employ this long-take technique, but much fewer movies attempt to shoot the entire thing in a single take, and these films should be commended for taking the risk, even if they had various degrees of success. A single-shot or a long-take movie gives the illusion that time and space are continuous, just like in real life. So, as long as the filmmakers feel the need to be innovative and try to achieve something that is more difficult and fascinating for their films, innovation will remain crucial in the film industry. The one-shot technique is a rare example of a creative, innovative, and difficult technique. Using case studies, news reports and literature reviews, this study carefully observes that because the camera moves through and rewrites space in a single-shot movie, this filmmaking technique significantly contributes to the development of its mise-en-scène. It examines the effects that a single-shot or a long-take movie creates among the audience and the technical manoeuvres that define the success of it.

Keywords: Long-Take, Single-Shot, Filmmaking, Cinematography, Mise-en-scène, Film Narrative

I. INTRODUCTION

To accurately define single-shot movie technique, let's go back and begin with basic premises: A scene is a particular section of the story that is told and is made up of multiple shots when watching a movie (or a short film, a video, etc.). A narrative sequence is made up of several scenes. This is when we refer to a single-shot: when multiple scenes are portrayed in a single, uninterrupted shot without any cuts or breaks. With a change in ideas, framing, and even location, the one shot may convey more situations! Long-take is a different expression that could be confused with a single-shot. The continuous shot describes more scenes, or even more sequences, as opposed to the long-take, in which the director or operator stays for several minutes or hours on one particular aspect of the scene. One shot inside a scene, the entire scene, or even an entire movie can be included in a long-take. The rhythm of a scene and the way in which space is presented within it are changed by long-takes with camera movement. Most frequently, film directors may integrate a long-take with close-ups or shot-reverse, varying the lengths of shots within scenes. Long-takes frequently include significant camera movement and elaborate blocking, but this is not always the case. Again, the terms "long-take" and "long shot" should not be confused, as the former refers to the distance between the camera and its subject, not the duration of the shot. The length of a long-take was formerly restricted by how much film the magazine of a motion picture camera could carry, but with the arrival of digital video, the maximum possible length of a take has significantly increased. [12] The "ASL" (average shot length), a statistical measurement that divides the overall length of the film by the number of shots, can be used to scientifically examine movies. For instance, Béla Tarr's film *Werckmeister Harmonies* (2000) is 149 minutes, and made up of 39 shots. So, its ASL is 229.2 seconds. Barry Salt, a film researcher, developed the ASL in the 1970s as a way to statistically analyze the editing styles of both individual films and groups of films (for example, of the films made by a particular director or made in a particular period).[6] David Bordwell and Yuri Tsivian are only two film academics who have used ASL into their research. In a 2005 paper, Tsivian utilized the ASL as a method to analyze D. W. Griffith's *Intolerance* (1916), indicating that the film's ASL is 5.9 seconds. [1] The average shot duration in a Hollywood film during the studio era lasted between eight and eleven seconds; however, since the 1960s, faster cutting rates have caused shot lengths to average less than half of the studio era average. Long-takes often employ camera movement, sound, and mise-en-scène in place of editing to draw the audience's attention to crucial story components. In a manner similar to editing, tilting, panning, tracking, and craning can produce a number of unique compositions throughout a lengthy take without interrupting the continuous recording of space and time. In film theory, the long-take serves a variety of philosophical and aesthetic goals. The quest for realism, the pro-filmic event mark, experiential immersion in the diegetic environment, and spectatorial ambiguity have all been sifted through opposing discourses about what constitutes the long-take (Bazin, "Evolution" 23-40). [2]

Analysis of Single-Shot and Long-Take Filmmaking: Its Evolution, Technique, Mise-en-scène, and Impact on the Viewer

The severe artificiality of the image-based media, which is based on discrete periods of time, is perceptually normalized by classical montage, which supports a very specific spatial and temporal regime. Montage allows us to observe the coherence of the spatial and temporal arrangement quite literally; in this way, it reveals the diegetic "whole," which is typically concealed from view. The long-take, on the other hand, manifests as an example of what Kristin Thompson has referred to as "excess" ("Cinematic Excess" 513-24) in its opposition to the perceptual harmony of classical montage. [3] The shot with a noticeable duration goes beyond montage's perceptual orientation but also shows a stronger, maybe more transgressive mark of excess by refusing to follow a standardized sightseer regime.

The lengthy take is frequently a freedom from the constricting spatial and temporal framework of convention, and this is undoubtedly true for filmmaker Cuarón and cinematographer Lubezki. The more strongly Cuarón and Lubezki thereafter stray from a classical montage aesthetic, the more they delve into the montage regime of modern Hollywood studio cinema.

In recent years, the one-shot movie has significantly gained in popularity. The practice of actors and crew playing a film through without any edits is becoming more and more frequent, whether it's in the service of a quietly historical adventure *Russian Ark* or a heart-pounding crime thriller *Victoria*. Without a doubt, the development of digital video technology is to blame for this trend. With certain digital tools, the length of a take or shot can be virtually endless. When directors utilized celluloid, they were only able to get shots that were as long as a single spool of film, which might be up to 10 minutes. Despite this technical constraint, British master director Alfred Hitchcock created his own one-shot movie *Rope* (1948). The film *Rope* is frequently regarded as Hitchcock's greatest avant-garde work. It is made up of 10 lengthy takes that each last nearly the same amount of time as a film spool (11 if the opening titles scene is counted). Hitchcock used a technique of hidden cuts between them to give the appearance of a single uninterrupted shot, which has since been adopted in recent faux-one-shot films *Birdman* and *1917*. If a viewer knows what to look for, they can easily spot the hidden cuts in Hitchcock's film because they aren't as expertly concealed as they are in those later masterpieces. A subject is frequently filmed so closely that a brief shadow briefly fills the frame. The camera would cut amid this full darkness. After switching spools and starting the subsequent take in the dark, the crew would quickly move away from the nearby subject to resume the scene. The cuts themselves are completely undetectable, despite the somewhat odd impact of being so near to characters and things. In contrast to *1917* by Roger Deakins (Cinematographer) and *Extraction* by Thomas Sigel (Cinematographer), which were built from short takes that were precisely patched together to give the impression of one continuous take, *Children of Men* was shot by Emmanuel Lubezki (Cinematographer) and features "actual" long-takes (a few minutes each). By tricking the audience into believing they are witnessing the drama in "real time," this approach improves the flow and raises the level of tension. Furthermore, the shot needs to be carefully planned in order to execute the one-take technique effectively.

So, a one-take scene, also known as a single-take/shot scene, is a long onscreen sequence shot in a single take or numerous takes patched together to give the impression of being shot in a continuous long-take.

II. THE EVOLUTION

André Bazin (1918-1958), the first cinema critic to advocate the long-take, would likely have found the possibility of digital video to achieve prolonged shot durations appealing. He praised the cinema's photographic qualities and the film camera's singular capacity to capture continuous space and time, showing the realism of the scene in front of the camera. Bazin contended that despite his recognition that film could never fully replicate reality, aesthetic and technological advancements may bring the medium closer to that end. He was especially interested in the power of long-takes with camera movement, deep space staging, and deep focus cinematography to preserve the spatial and chronological coherence of recorded events and keep the most important action within the frame ambiguous. As a result, Bazin praised the works of filmmakers like William Wyler (1902-1981) and Jean Renoir (1894-1979), who frequently employed long-takes in an effort to represent the spontaneity, ambiguity, and distinctiveness of reality as it develops through time. [4] A nearly two-minute long continuous shot in *Citizen Kane* a 1941 by Orson Welles, effectively transitions from a little boy playing in the snow to the sober adult environment inside his home. The youngster is still framed within the glass, frolicking innocently in the snow, as the sequence that follows entails paper signing and legal discussion surrounding adoption. The poetry underlying this is profound and clear-cut, but it is the shot's duration that drives home the point in a poignant unravelling of impersonal calm. Cuts would have suggested a chance to reconsider, but this single rolling take illustrates how catastrophe can unfold so naturally in real life.

La Grande Illusion, a 1937 film by Jean Renoir, provides another noteworthy earlier example. Renoir substitutes a long shot for a narrative in this World War I epic. The story of every movie is supposedly delivered through the camera's lens, yet Renoir masterfully manipulates that lens like a painter's brush, picking up on delicate nuances that defy their subtlety to capture the essential essence of the situation. By keeping the camera moving, he catches a POV perspective that adds humanity to the action in such a way that the emotion that briefly appears on the face that the camera has approached and expertly framed becomes the core of the narrative. There are references to Bunraku, Kabuki, and Noh theatre in Kenji Mizoguchi's films *Osaka Elegy* (1936), *The Story of the Last Chrysanthemum* (1939), *The 47 Ronin, Parts 1 and 2* (1941-1942), and *Ugetsu* (1953), as well as examples of their techniques being blended into his directing strategies. His love of theatre is widely established, and all of these films incorporate theatrical performance excerpts that tie thematically to the films in which they appear while also informing their action.

Even in non-theatrical contexts, Mizoguchi's use of music, performance techniques, camera angles and movement, set design, and figure placement inside the frame show the influence of Japanese theatre. Mizoguchi's work is well-known for its long-takes and mise-en-scène. [5] The long-take can be regarded to have originated in the theatre.

The first film to use the continuous shot in a full feature format was Alfred Hitchcock's *Rope* (1948). It attempted to, at least. The 10-minute film rolls that were available for 35mm cameras at the time made it difficult to capture the entire feature without using cuts and filmmaking magic. Hitchcock and the film's cinematographers, Joseph A. Valentine and William V. Skall, concealed the cuts using dolly shots that focused on featureless surfaces, with the next take zooming out from the same position. Having said that, the entire film is only 10 shots long, which is astounding even by today's technology standards. *Rope* was shot in real time because director Alfred Hitchcock wanted to capture the claustrophobia of the drama it was based on. Of course, the notion also resulted from the director's desire to advance the cinematic art form. Up until that point, the majority of movies were composed of hundreds of shots, each lasting between five and 15 seconds. *Rope*, which was essentially the antithesis of this approach, opened the door for later filmmakers to use longer, uninterrupted takes. *Rope* isn't regarded as one of Hitchcock's better works, with many critics rejecting it as a failed experiment. At the same time, the movie will be remembered for its unique use of recording and editing techniques, which makes it an essential entry in the director's oeuvre.

Béla Tarr's 1982 adaptation of *Macbeth* was the first attempt at an actual one-shot film. *Macbeth* technically consists of two shots, however the first is barely five minutes long and takes place before the opening title sequence. Meanwhile, the second shot encompasses the rest of the film. *Macbeth* is shot in a docudrama style, with the camera largely focusing on the actors' faces to emphasise the characters' sentiments, emotions, and utterances. The film is less concerned with the events of William Shakespeare's classic story and more concerned with reducing it to its bare bones for a more intimate encounter. The one-shot technique is used to great creative effect here, creating a sense of heightened emotion.

The second-to-last movie by Russian master Andrei Tarkovsky, *Nostalghia* (1983) is the tale of a Russian poet taking a tour through Italy with his guide and translator as his only company. He eventually meets a deranged old man who imprisoned his own family for seven years, claiming he was protecting them from the maladies of the world. In the best Tarkovsky tradition, the film is an existential drama in which the poet struggles with his affections for his translator, misses his native land and his wife, and develops an odd affinity with the crazed old guy. In this extended ten-minute take, the protagonist challenges a local superstition by attempting to carry a candle through a dried-up mineral pool while keeping it lit until he reaches the other side. The scene's success is largely due to its sound design: heavy breathing, dripping water, and the soft splash of cautious feet on shallow water. Tarkovsky makes us feel his character's every preliminary step forward, and he creates tension by focusing on the trembling hands carrying the candle and the tense expression on actor Oleg Yankovskiy's face at times. It's a lovely (and

slightly horrifying) visual concretization of the character's perspective on life, this convoluted, perilous trip in which we're always striving to preserve what's dear to us as best we can. Following *Macbeth*, a number of movies were made that appeared to be one long continuous shot, but Aleksandr Sokurov's *Russian Ark* won praise from critics in 2002 for doing it accurately. The film's uninterrupted 90-minute shot, which spans more than 1.5 kilometres and was totally captured with an HD Steadicam, dramatizes more than 300 years of Russian history. The film has almost 1,000 performers and extras, yet bringing *Russian Ark* to life was a difficult challenge for the cast and crew. Sokurov did not want the film shot in this manner for artistic reasons; he was simply bored of editing. However, the production needed months of rehearsal and one day of rigorous shooting, so perhaps the workload would have been lighter if the film had been shot more conventionally. *Russian Ark* unfolds like a dreamy journey through time, and the film's ability to condense so much history into a single breath is nothing short of incredible. Having said that, *Russian Ark* created history by becoming the first film to properly apply the one-shot technique for more than 90 minutes. That alone is enough just to give it excellent marks. [10]

Children of Men (2006) director Alfonso Cuaron allegedly created extended takes that can last up to 6 minutes, 20 seconds. The movie's lengthy takes are nothing less than cutting-edge technological marvels. Scenes like the coffee shop bombing, the automobile ambush, the birth, and the siege of Bexhill look to be one continuous film because of post-production editing and complex camera riggings. The car ambush sequence was by far the most complicated. In order to accommodate the intricate camera setup and the continuous shooting from a wide range of angles, the automobile itself did not have a roof. Many believed the shot to be absurd and impossible to undertake, but the shot was made and the intended result was attained. The lengthy take in this sequence gives the idea that everything is happening in real time, drawing viewers into the climax of the first half of the movie. The scene also begins to have a documentary air, as if the camera just so happened to be there when the activity was taking place. The long-take was abandoned because of Cuaron's unconventional style.

Brian De Palma is no stranger to long, uninterrupted shots, but his longest and most impressive one is likely to be in *Snake Eyes*, his 1998 detective drama set in an important boxing bout at an Atlantic City casino. *Snake Eyes* is a divisive film, led by Nicolas Cage in a typically hyper-energized performance, but everyone was struck with De Palma's use of a 13-minute tracking shot to show us what's going on in the battle before all hell breaks loose. The tracking shot, which combines tiny clues for the murder mystery that follows with an immersion of the spectator in the milieu of the casino, has four or five concealed cuts, yet it still feels like a mini-marathon. It's odd that not many detective/murder mystery films after *Snake Eyes* employed one uninterrupted take to the same effect.

Analysis of Single-Shot and Long-Take Filmmaking: Its Evolution, Technique, Mise-en-scène, and Impact on the Viewer

Though the method was frequently employed in movies, only a few directors have embraced it as much as Steven Spielberg. In fact, Spielberg has employed it so frequently and successfully that he has come to be known as "The Spielberg Oner." The genius of Spielberg's camera placement is that the scenario is always given significant respect. Since we are used to seeing cuts, it can be startling in some other scenes in movies. As a result, when they aren't noticeable, it reveals the director's hand and comes out as gimmicky. In essence, when it falls short, it appears to be an effort to be remarkable rather than impactful, which pulls the spectator out of the situation. Spielberg's goal with the shot, however, is to make the camera "invisible." Nowhere is this more evident than in the landing scene at Omaha Beach in *Saving Private Ryan* (1998). There are many cuts to capture the case and grasp the magnitude of the action, but there are also extended takes that convey the genuine tragedy of combat on the battlefield. These long takes are on the shorter side of the spectrum, which is why they have their own category, but they linger long enough to let despair settle in and erase any of the 'glorious' qualities that may occasionally besiege war pictures. In the opening scene of *The Player* (1992), Robert Altman presents all of the main characters to the audience. The scene, which was filmed 15 times over the course of a half-day, serves as the backdrop for Altman's biting Hollywood satire. The film is filled with knowledgeable wheeler-dealers who invariably pursue the wrong next big thing. In this scene's outset, everyone tries and fails to stay informed or in the know while tripping over one another. This sequence didn't have a script in real life; all of the dialogue, including the discussion of several real-life cinematic tracking shots, was improvised. The opening sequence of Mike Figgis' drama, *Timecode* (2000), which is similar to *The Player's*, likewise uses spontaneous speech and was 15 times shot. *Timecode* is a split-screen video that was captured simultaneously on four distinct VHS cameras and tells the experiences of four individual Los Angeles residents who cross paths during a filming. The soundtrack of the movie informs viewers which of the four stories is most crucial at any particular moment. Filming for the movie's theatrical release took around 90 minutes.

Hunger (2008) stands out because of the intimacy of its extended shot, which features Michael Fassbender's Bobby Sands and Liam Cunningham's Father Moran conversing at a table while being observed by Steve McQueen's unblinking and immobile camera for 16 minutes and 30 seconds. That is all that takes place. The genius of McQueen's stylistic decision in this instance is that it centres the audience's attention on the actors, particularly Fassbender's unmatched performance, creating the illusion of a mini-stage play in the midst of a film in which the images and powerful performances speak louder than the words. Fassbender gives what is still his best performance as Irish republican Bobby Sands, inspiring a group of prisoners in a Northern Irish prison to go on a hunger strike and upset the established power structure. Like everything else in Hunger, watching him amuse this priest while he and his soldiers are starving to death is heart-breaking, and McQueen's resolve to just watch it happen makes it worse.

In the movie *Gravity* (2013) the long shot that Cuarón uses to introduce his story of space survival is very amazing, and it helped Emmanuel Lubezki win his first Oscar. We watch as astronauts Ryan Stone (Sandra Bullock) and Matt Kowalski (George Clooney) work on their spacecraft for 17 minutes before tragedy strikes and leaves them stranded in orbit. The most impressive feat in the uninterrupted shot is how it highlights the film's excellence in the special effects department, transporting us to that hostile environment while still keeping the safe, familiar Earth just in sight. An amazing character introduction that transitions into an exciting action scene. This is the ideal illustration of how a lengthy, uninterrupted take may advance the plot rather than serving just another cinematic trick. It never truly leaves the viewer's memory over the remaining hour and a half of the film, serving as a stark reminder that space is filled with risks and unpredictability. And that's essential if the audience is to truly experience the suspenseful, excruciating feeling of Cuarón's film. Both the Uruguayan movie *La Casa Muda* and its American version *Silent House* (2010), starring Elizabeth Olsen, assert that they were shot in a single, uninterrupted take to capture the impact of a lady exploring a haunted house in real time. The stories are allegedly based on true incidents. Since the original was produced on a tight budget with a digital camera that could only record for a maximum of 15 minutes at a time, it is likely that both films have been edited. The one-shot method is masterfully executed by Sebastian Schipper's *Victoria* (2015), and it serves as the driving force of the film's plot. The plot revolves around a woman and a group of men whose night spirals out of control as they commit a bank robbery, ending in a nightmare ride for both the characters and the viewer. Schipper and his cinematographer Sturla Brandt Grøvlen shot the finished film between 4:30 and 7:00 a.m. However, it took three distinct efforts to complete the picture since the cast initially failed to find the appropriate tonal notes, which is always a risk when making films in this manner - there is virtually no room for error. Having said that, they eventually found the correct emotional balance, and the improvised conversation combined with the real-time technique allows for an authentic viewing experience. *Victoria* is the closest most of us will get to experience a robbery without actually taking part in one. [13]

Similarly, the 2018 Scandinavian films *Utøya: July 22* and *Blind Spot* use the method to make spectators feel as if they are eyewitnesses to unbelievable events. The one-shot approach is used to eerie effect in *Utøya*, which is based on the 2011 Norwegian white supremacist terrorist attack. It helps create for a realistic re-enactment of a real-life horror story. In this scenario, the one-shot tool, combined with the amateur actors, gives the film the feel of a documentary. Although *Blind Spot*, which follows a family as catastrophe strikes them, isn't based on a true tale, it has *Utøya's* goal of putting the audience in the protagonists' shoes as they navigate a dangerous circumstance. The one-shot strategy provides no relief from the sadness and anxiety on display. Furthermore, *Blind Spot* is steadfast in its devotion to evoking dread, which is strengthened by its adherence to the single take method. [13]

The Look of Performance, a digital film shot in a single 360-degree take and spanning 3 hours, 33 minutes, and 8 seconds, was created in 2012 by the art collective The Hut Project. The final presented work had a running time of 7 hours, 6 minutes, and 17 seconds because the movie was shot at 50 frames per second.

Woody Harrelson shot and live-screened the film *Lost in London* in 2017. It was the first time a film was broadcasted live into theatres; it was also, for the most part, the last time. Nobody has followed Woody Harrelson's bravery in taking the road less travelled. The fundamental reason for this is not because of the obvious obstacles or the never-ending licencing hassles and tribulations, but because the film itself failed to ignite the imaginations of production firms. The live project was a difficult endeavour, and with mixed reviews for *Lost in London*, the question of whether it was worthwhile has stifled additional attempts.

The storyline of the autobiographical film was based on a wild night in Soho when Harrelson raced around in cabs while the police were hot on his tail. He eventually spent the night in jail. It is a strong premise, especially when given the absurd air that it actually occurred. Also promising was the cast, which included Willie Nelson, Owen Wilson, Harrelson, and Eleanor Matsuura. However, the verdict was consistently "very enjoyable, but not outstanding" in both reviews and audience responses.

Although some directors have employed the one-shot technique for more fantastical ends, it is perhaps at its best when utilised to immerse audiences in realistic stories with significant emotional stakes. In the film *Birdman* (2018) or *(The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance)*, directed by Alejandro González Inárritu and shot by Emmanuel Lubezki, Michael Keaton is depicted as taking flight while disguised as a bird. Although there are a few subtle cuts in the movie, they are few and difficult to spot. The film *Birdman* is bizarre in many respects, but Inárritu wanted the character to be drowned in that inescapable reality so that the audience had to endure these desperate three days alongside him, which is why he utilised the single continuous shot technique. In that regard, the movie is successful, and the appearance that it was shot in a single continuous take gives the movie's fantastical elements a plausible sense of reality.

With *1917* (2019), filmmaker Sam Mendes and cinematographer Roger Deakins aim to immerse viewers in the trenches with the soldiers, following in their footsteps to create maximum tension. This film is another contribution to the one-shot canon, demonstrating how the technique has been used to create very different and visceral films. In order to achieve the *1917* one shot appearance, film editor, Lee Smith, mainly relied on the blocking and camera movement of a scene. Hidden match cuts that were made subtly were crucial to the creation of *1917*. This might occur when characters move across the field of view, when the camera moves past a foreground object, or when the frame is completely dark. At these moments, Smith combined a number of lengthy takes to give the scene the film's unified *1917* one shot appearance.

A television example can be found in the first season of HBO's *True Detective (2014)*. In the fourth episode, *Who Goes There*, protagonist Detective Rustin Cohle (played by Matthew McConaughey) goes undercover as a member of a biker gang that has decided to boldly raid a drug den in a dangerous neighbourhood. The scene opens with the bikers arriving at the drug den, McConaughey's character reluctantly accompanying them. The six-minute film moves past numerous residences, several streets, and over a fence as shouting criminals, motorcycles, and cops come on the scene and fire bullets. McConaughey initially aids the motorcycle gang before turning on them to kidnap the leader, dragging him along for more over half of the continuous shot. The John Wick film series is noted for its lengthy take battle scenes. This was due to the budgetary constraints of using only a single high-end camera for all of the filming, which required close choreography with the various extras involved in the fights, including having to run behind the camera after being one of the first fallen attackers in order to come in as a new attacker.

In 2010, artist engineer Jeff Lieberman collaborated with Eric Gunther to co-direct a 4-minute music video starring the indie band *OK Go* performing their song *End Love*. The video was taken in a single continuous take with three cameras over the course of 18 hours, from before nightfall to 11 a.m. the next day. The movie was sped up to 170,000 times using time lapse techniques, with some brief slow-motion sequences taken at 1500 frames per second.

There's an argument to be made that some films overuse this single-shot technique to show off, but the best instances create immersive experiences that appear to unfold in real time. If someone want to call one-shot movies a gimmick, they can be an effective one.

III. THE TECHNIQUE

I have listed some procedures in the production and post-production phases of filmmaking that are crucial for the proper execution of this specific cinematographic technique to film a good one-shot:

Stitching Points or Ghost Cuts: Ghost cuts or stitching points are a technique used to connect multiple shots to create the illusion of a single one and maintaining an ongoing appearance. Many films have used this method, including Alfred Hitchcock's *Rope* and Sam Mendes' more recent *1917*. [9] Certain actions taken during the shooting phase enable the trimming and linking of two scenes in post-production. A character moving very close to the camera, changing locations to a significantly darker or lighter surroundings, very unsteady and perplexing images, such as in a crowd, or body-crossing in which a cut is concealed when a performer blocks the camera are a few instances.

Internal Editing: Several scenes are shown in one shot. This eventually results in a series of circumstances, conversations, or settings. Internal editing, which is done immediately from the camera, is employed in this situation. There are several instances and various modes. This can be accomplished, among other things, using machine movements or shifting the focus amongst the various subjects. Internal editing can occasionally be done in lengthy takes.

Motion Blur: The intention is to make the actor more difficult to distinguish from the stunt double.

When applied, vigorous camera motions will be effective. This method is used primarily in fight scenes and enables the presentation of combat continuity even when an actor and a stunt double are replaced.

Camera Mobility: A key component of the one-take method is mobility. Smaller form factor cameras make the process substantially easier. For instance, Roger Deakins was able to realize his goal for one-take cinematography with the help of the ARRI Mini LF that was utilized in *1917*. Using Techno Crane, changing the camera's mode to handheld, and then unplugging it, or moving the camera from a shoulder rig and attaching it all at once to a wire rig or employing a drone, the *1917* one take look was made possible in large part because to the camera's portability. [7]

Rehearsal: Before any sets were constructed, the *1917* crew began four months of intense rehearsals to fine-tune the actors' blocking and camera movements. Because single-shot coverage was used in *1917* cinematography, sets had to be the exact length and size for action to occur without stops or edits. During these rehearsals, the art department was able to decide how long the bunkers would be and how the sets would be structured to accommodate the movement of the actors and camera. With so many moving parts in *1917*, rehearsal was essential. Once the practices were perfected, the art department could begin constructing the film's multiple sets.

Computer Graphics: Since the majority of single-shot movies are fully shot with handheld cameras or a Steadicam, editing and visual effects are required to smooth out the transitions between the different shots. In *Birdman* VFX were utilized to stretch one shot to go to the next in order to bridge the gaps between various situations. In some circumstances, CG (Computer Graphics) was utilized to construct CG backdrops, doorways, or windows; in other cases, VFX entailed painting objects outside of a frame.

Long-takes have taken on a crucial role in the filmic vocabulary in the modern practice of filmmaking. They are agonizingly difficult to execute. They can therefore provide the narrative depth and meaning when used properly and with strong artistic judgement. Long-takes provide the director the opportunity to incorporate a particular aesthetic component into the scene that fits with the overall subject of the movie. They give the filmmaker the chance to demonstrate how far they can push the boundaries of filmmaking, giving the director a sense of control and assurance that probably extends beyond the take. Long-takes give a scenario a specific level of continuity that edits might not be able to deliver. Additionally, they provide the audience a heightened sense of scale, drama, tension, and proximity. There is no time limit in existence for a shot to become a long-take. It might range from one minute to fifteen minutes or more in length. This is why a long-take is also referred to as a sequence shot.

IV. MISE-EN-SCENE

In a film, mise-en-scène is what we see; editing is what we don't. These are simple definitions, but they underline two key points: the fundamental building elements of a film - the shot and the cut, and the subtleties of each that allow a film to attain texture and resonance. Mise-en-scène is concerned with the shot, but keep in mind that editing, putting two images together affects not just how a film's narrative is constructed, but also how the shots are afterwards understood by viewers. The way shots are put together and how they contribute to visual coherence between cuts from shot to shot create the mise-en-scène. It encompasses all the visible components that make up a shot in front of the camera: Lighting, the use of black and white or color, where the characters are placed in the scene, the design of the elements within the shot (part of the production design process), where the camera is placed in relation to the characters in the set, how the camera and/or actors are moved, and the composition of the shot as a whole, how it is framed and what is in the frame are all important factors. Even the music itself could be categorized as mise-en-scene. At its best, music enriches the shot's visual and narrative structure, even when it cannot be seen. Cinematic mise-en-scène refers to the process by which filmmakers, in collaboration with their cinematographers and production designers, articulate - indeed, create the spatial elements and coordinates in the shot and are able to build clearly defined, cogent, fictitious worlds. A film's composition and spatial articulation have just as much narrative weight and significance as the words spoken by its characters. Thus, mise-en-scène is a crucial component of a movie's story, but it also has the power to convey information about individuals and events that cannot be expressed through dialogue. [8]

The moving camera plays a significant role in the production of mise-en-scène in long-take or single-shot movies because it expands, traverses, and redefines space. Characters can be followed or preceded by the camera, and their strength can be increased or decreased. Making space complete is something that cutting cannot do. The masters of the moving camera were Stanley Kubrick (1928-1999) and Orson Welles (1915-1985). In both Welles' *Touch of Evil* (1958) and his 1962 rendition of Kafka's *The Trial*, his camera snaked and intimated itself, allowing nothing to escape the viewer's sight while simultaneously creating perplexing, seemingly disconnected locations. Both Welles and Kubrick envisioned labyrinthine settings, both literally and conceptually. In Kubrick's *The Shining* (1980), the camera weaves its way through the hedge maze, trapping Jack and causing him to freeze. Both of these directors used movement to create a mise-en-scène of total entrapment in their films, engulfing their protagonists in the world the camera builds for them. Along with the moving camera, the long-take is a crucial component of set design. The contrast between shot and cut is most visible when a director lets a scene to play out unedited, with actors acting and spectators watching. The long-take can be utilized for sheer technical brilliance, like in Martin Scorsese's *Good Fellas* (1990) Copacabana sequence, when the camera glides with the actors down the stairs, through the kitchen, and into the club, with all types of action and discussion occurring along the way. It can be deadly serious, like in Kubrick's *Paths of Glory* (1957) or the astonishing movement with the jogging astronaut in the spaceship's spinning hall in *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968). Neither of these passages is particularly long, but the track through the trenches is consistent, with views of Col.

9

Dax's earnest face going through the line of soldiers and his vision of them intercutting. However, these and other moving-camera long-takes are characterized by intensity and energy, visual manifestations of their character's goal and final failure, not to mention their director's imagination.

V. THE IMPACT ON THE VIEWER

We are all aware with Orson Welles' 1958 film *Touch of Evil*, which begins with a 3:30 minute long continuous take across the streets of Tijuana's border and follows a murder mystery on the California-Mexico border. The sequence is famous because it uses a long shot to follow vehicles and people as they approach the border. As we watch, we can't help but feel uneasy since we see everything from wide shots of the entire street to fleeting shadows as the camera follows a couple turning a corner. Long-takes are far more dynamic, fascinating, and realistic than a standard shot because they use a continuous, uninterrupted, and unedited shot of a scenario that typically lasts much longer than a conventional shot. For this reason, several of the best directors in the world have used long-takes. But executing a continuous take is challenging because it requires that every aspect of a production crew, costumes, lighting, sets, extras, props, and design, work seamlessly together as the camera moves. It is quite difficult to realize the reality of the situation we are in. The borders of that moment become clearer in our memories after a certain amount of time has elapsed. As a result, a long-take in which the acting, camera movements, mise en scene, and many other elements are flawlessly constructed can properly depict the ambiguity of reality. Since the long-take eliminates the ability to control time and editing, the relationship of these scenes to reality is always debated. Long-takes can provide a strong sense of speed by circling and following the characters, but they can also be used to emphasize the sullenness of the routine in slow film. [11]

After the analysis of the case studies, news reports, and literature reviews connected to single-shot movie technique, here are some explanations for why long-take or single-shot is one of the most effective film tactics and how it impacts the viewer in observing the real-time realistic experience:

Organic experience: Long-takes, first and foremost, present viewers with a distinct, authentic experience. Since the picture is continuous, the camera can move around the room or set, investigating all aspects of the scene that could be overlooked in a standard shot. This means that the camera is intensely aware of action in the background and middle area. Long-takes, as opposed to cuts, are continuous, flow, take the viewers on a journey through the plot. This makes the scenario much more dramatic because we are experiencing the complete tale, event, and experience in real-time.

Viewer's point of view: There is never a change in perspective with long-takes since one continuous shot is used; the camera will slowly and steadily move and flow into the many parts of a scene. The experience is always focused on how the camera moves and what the camera sees, taking viewers on a journey. This perspective never cuts off the audience, which delivers a far more accurate representation of a scenario. When the sixth season of *Game of Thrones' Battle of the Bastards* episode premiered, it was praised as one of the most accurate and masterful depictions of a mediaeval battle sequence in movie history. Their utilization of the long-take is one explanation for this. The long-take, which lasts 60 seconds, is a dance; horses speed by as swords are swung, spears are flung, and Snow kills as many foes as he can. Jon Snow, one of the main characters, is struck in the middle of the battle. What an authentic moment in filmmaking: for those 60 seconds, viewers were immersed in the conflict; nothing broke them off from the grim reality of combat; nothing obscured their view, reminding them that they weren't actually there. In this instance, the use of a long-take in the sequence allowed the audience to adopt the perspective of an army member and feel each movement.

Natural movement of time: Viewers are frequently left in the dark regarding the passage of time in movies. For the characters, a five-minute movie could last twenty. In order to fit their tale, filmmakers can modify the timeline by cutting back and forth between shots. This is not the case with long-takes, though. Long-takes, which consist of a single continuous shot that lasts for a significantly longer period of time than usual, provide the impression that the action is taking place in the present, with everyone aware of the passage of time. This is more fascinating than it first appears to be: by showing a scene in real time, viewers become more invested in the situation and begin to feel as though they are genuinely there because there is no hallucination to alter that sensation of belonging. Alfonso Cuarón produced some of the most amazing and well-remembered long-takes in movie history for *Children of Men*. In one such scene, five protagonists are in a car when all of a sudden, they are ambushed by a mob, leading to a chase scene with gunshots, flying motorcycles, and shattering glass. The audience spends the entire five minutes in the car with the characters, living through all the minor moments that make up the scenario, making these five minutes take a lot more effective use of film than conventional shots would be. This heightens the shock factor and suspense of the gunshots, mobs, and pursuing.

Nowadays, we see the long-take in the movies as a tension-building tactic as much as a way to allow the actors to actually work. It expects more from the public as well as the personnel working on the project. The long-take has its moments in modern film history, but blockbusters these days prefer to fast cut the action to disguise the actors' maybe dubious fighting talents, or to artificially amp up the intensity of the scene. Action is exceedingly difficult to stop, but with proper planning, it can certainly be done in a long-take. It is essential to comprehend what the filmmaker is giving up by using a lengthy take. It's also crucial to understand why a long-take is necessary. "I don't want to take the audience away from what this character is going through," for example. It is also possible that the director wishes for the audience to experience a moment in real time. The actual point is that there is no reason to do it merely for the sake of doing it. There's no need to consider whether it's better to compose a scene in camera or in the editing bay. If the director intends to run lengthy, he or she will lose control in post, limiting your ability to shape the scene after the fact... unless there is no dialogue and your editor is a master of jump cuts. A slower film does not necessarily have to be boring. To keep the spectator interested in the uncut movie, the directors use innovative use of the camera movement, blocking, tools, lighting, and crew members.

VI. CONCLUSION

Discovering a means to arrange a scene (or several scenes) without cutting has been one of the preoccupations on artists' minds since the early cinema, when cuts weren't even on a filmmaker's possibilities. Unbroken shots place a lot of pressure on the cinematographer, who must find a way to make it work and realize the director's vision of what should be seen on screen. They also present a challenge for the production, especially when the scene calls for moving a lot of extras or equipment. Actors are in some ways asked to perform as in a stage play and frequently improvise.

The major motivation for filming a single-shot film is to increase the viewer's absorption and involvement in what he sees and the activities of the filmed characters. In actuality, the actors act in real time (with no cutting, pausing, or speeding up), and we appear to accompany them through their events, as if we were their invisible trip partners. Long-takes are ultimately poetic: they twist and flow, move slowly, and present viewers with a strangely profound experience, regardless of the context. Long shots in some modern films are simply a tactic for filmmakers and cinematographers to draw attention to themselves rather than allowing the content to speak for itself. This may be true, and perhaps it is about the unbroken shot (or the appearance of one), which is still a destabilizing cinematic technique that, when done correctly, helps the audience immerse in the movie's reality.

Lengthy takes can be beautiful, but more importantly, long-takes that are purposefully put out (as with any intentional cinematography) can improve and deepen a story's narrative and plot. Understanding lengthy takes is crucial not only for budding filmmakers, but also for casual cinema fans and cinephiles who want to see how diverse techniques can show a filmmaker's actual talent and passion. Long rehearsals, meticulously planned camera movements, and well-executed choreography are all crucial components that must be taken care of in order to pull off a one-take successfully. Even the best-laid plans cannot guarantee that one won't make errors that necessitate starting over after resetting everything. Shooting a one-take is a difficult task, but one that is very rewarding.

The main drawback I've discovered with long-takes is that it's difficult to simply establish thematic juxtaposition the way editing can. Considering the scene in *The Godfather* where the execution of many mafia leaders is cut between their baptism and their execution. A long-take would be ineffective for accomplishing this. Long-takes are lovely, amazing, and hypnotic, although I do think they're a touch extravagant. They do, however, allow the viewer to immerse themselves in a scene and take in all of the details without being interrupted. Technology has also made it possible to use more creative methods to give the appearance that a scene was shot in a single take, as demonstrated in the movie *Gravity*, which is as dramatic as any expertly edited thriller but doesn't contain any evident cuts.

The choice of whether to use long-takes or editing is ultimately up to the director to determine what works best for their particular style of storytelling. The value of something is subjective. While the long-take's essential structure and purpose in movies have remained the same, its potential applications have grown. This growth has inspired filmmakers like Cuaron to fully exploit the long-take in Hollywood movies today. Long-takes have been a cinematography difficulty that directors have overcome since the early days of film. What will be done with the lengthy take is anyone's guess given how quickly technology is developing in the film industry.

According to the result of this research, it has been observed that filmmakers will continue to adopt advanced filmmaking techniques as new technology becomes available. It is logical to assume that as technology advances, so will filmmaking techniques and applications for existing technology. When done correctly, I believe it is an intriguing and meaningful style of photo. Perhaps, in the future, the technology will be versatile enough to be used in conditions never believed feasible previously, such as a scene including water or another awkward location. Although the method used to shoot these intricate scenes frequently includes editing and CGI (computer graphics imagery), they serve the purpose intended in the film. However, as technology advances, the scenes will become smoother and more realistic (and accurate).

In this research, the example of long-takes or single-shot movies illustrates numerous things about cinematic style in the period of Hollywood globalization. First, it implies that aesthetic standardization is not necessarily more of a concern today than it was sixty to seventy years ago, but it is also not any less of a concern. Second, since filmmakers like Alfonso Cuarón is not alone in this regard, it shows that even in the modern era of "intensified continuity," the lengthy take may and will occasionally return, just as it did during the studio era. Third, it suggests that the reasons for this resurgence are not so dissimilar to those of the bygone studio era: directors are drawn to the long-take as an assertion of aesthetic distinction; producers sometimes support such "independent" moves in the hope that they will result not only in financial returns, but also in prestige. Long-takes movies, whether past or present, within or outside of Hollywood, include both artistic and economic hazards. As a result, the long-take or the single-shot remains the rarer yet beloved technique, one that some filmmaker will surely take a bet on sooner or later.

REFERENCES

1. Yuri Tsivian, in *The Griffith Project: Vol. 9: Films Produced in 1916–1918*, Paolo Cherchi Usai (ed.), text at Cinemetrics.
2. Bazin, André. "The Evolution of the Language of Cinema." What Is Cinema? Volume 1. 23-40.
3. Thompson, K. (2004) 'The Concept of Cinematic Excess', in *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Leo Braudy & Marshall Cohen, 513-24. New York & Oxford: Oxford U.P.
4. "Bazin Andre What Is Cinema Volume 1". *p. 33 – via Internet Archive.*
5. Bordwell, David. 1983. Mizoguchi and the evolution of film language. In *Cinema and Language.*, eds. Stephen Heath, Patricia Mellencamp, 107-117. University Publications of America, AFI.
6. Salt, Barry. *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. London: Starword, 1992.
7. Deakins, Roger. *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7uwjS7d4ntA* Studiobinder. 06 July 2020.
8. Kolker, Robert. "Mise-En-Scène." 2019. *Encyclopedia.com.* <https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/mise-en-scene>.

9.   Deguzaman, Kyle. "1917 One Shot Explained — How Roger Deakins Shot a "Oner" Film." 05 July 2020. *Studiobinder.* <https://www.studiobinder.com/blog/1917-one-shot-cinematography/>

10. Fisher, Kieran and Kieran Fisher . "A Brief History of One-Shot Films." 17 December 2019. *Film School Rejects.* <https://filmschoolrejects.com/one-shot-films/>.

11. Wavefilmmakers. "The single shot, the differences of the long take, and its effects in the viewer." n.d. *Wavefilmmakers.* <https://wavefilmakers.com/the-single-shot-and-its-effects-in-the-viewer/>.

12. Wiki, Ultimate Pop Culture. "Long take." n.d. *Ultimate Pop Culture Wiki.* <https://ultimatepopculture.fandom.com/wiki/Long_take>.

13. Harrison, Ellie. "'For take two, those knuckleheads took MDMA': Inside the chaotic world of one-shot films." 02 January 2022. *Independent.* <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/features/one-shot-movies-boiling-point-victoria-b1985593.html>.

AUTHORS PROFILE

Abhijit Ghosh, is an Assistant Professor in the Department of BFA in Digital Filmmaking & VFX at Techno India University, West Bengal, India. Here he teaches the subjects of Film & Video Editing, Cinema & Film Appreciation, Cinematography and Photography to the undergraduate students. He holds a Master's degree in English and has a Post Graduate Diploma in Media Studies. His primary areas of interest in research are Film, Television and Media.