

A Psychoanalytic Exploration of The Tension Between Actor Identity and Villain Manifestation in the Nollywood Film Brotherhood, By Jade Osiberu

ISABELLA OMUTIKO MULAMA

Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology

Abstract- This study explores the psychological complexities inherent in the performance of villainous roles within the contemporary Nollywood thriller, Brotherhood (Osiberu, 2022). The primary aim of this research is to investigate how actors navigate the psychic friction between their personal identities and the darker, antagonistic traits of their characters. To achieve this, the study pursues two specific objectives: first, to analyse the psychological mechanisms actors employ to inhabit the persona of the villain, and second, to examine how these performances challenge the boundaries of the actor's own ego and moral framework. Guided by Freudian and Jungian psychoanalytic theories—specifically the concepts of the shadow self and the uncanny—the research adopts a qualitative methodology, utilizing in-depth content analysis of character performances and representative interviews. The findings reveal that the internalization of villainy often forces actors to confront repressed aspects of their own psyche, leading to a profound, sometimes distressing, blurring of the lines between the self and the performer. The study concludes that the mastery of villainous roles in Brotherhood is not merely a technical skill but a deep psychological negotiation that reshapes the actor's identity, suggesting that acting serves as a conduit for exploring the human capacity for darkness.

Keywords: *Psychoanalysis, Nollywood, Brotherhood, Actor Identity, Villainy, Shadow Self, Character Manifestation.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The performance of evil on screen is one of the most complex tasks any actor can undertake. When an actor plays a villain, they are not simply reciting lines and moving through space. They are reaching deep into unexplored parts of themselves to give life to a character whose values, behaviors, and desires may be entirely opposed to who they are as a person. This

is a psychological journey as much as it is an artistic one.

In Nollywood—Nigeria's globally significant film industry—villainous characters have long been central to storytelling. From corrupt politicians and cult leaders to armed robbers and criminal masterminds, Nollywood has consistently explored the dark side of human nature. However, while there has been considerable scholarly interest in Nollywood's thematic concerns and industry growth (Haynes, 2011; Krings & Okome, 2013), relatively little attention has been paid to the psychological experience of actors who perform these roles.

Jade Osiberu's *Brotherhood* (2022) offers a particularly compelling case for such an exploration. The film, a high-budget Nollywood action thriller, tells the story of two brothers—Wale (Tobi Bakre) and Ramsey (Folarin Falana, popularly known as Falz)—who grow up in difficult circumstances and ultimately choose very different paths. Wale becomes a police officer while Ramsey becomes a dangerous criminal. The film's central tension is built on the psychological conflict between brotherhood, loyalty, criminality, and morality. For the actors who play these roles, especially Falz as the morally complex and increasingly villainous Ramsey, the performance demands a deep psychological engagement with darkness.

This research draws on the psychoanalytic theories of Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung to examine what happens inside the actor's psyche during this process. Freud's concept of the uncanny—the feeling of something strangely familiar—and Jung's concept of the shadow self—the hidden, repressed aspects of the personality—provide powerful frameworks for

understanding how actors access, perform, and are sometimes changed by villainous characters (Freud, 1919; Jung, 1959).

The study argues that playing a villain is not simply an exercise in technical skill. It is a confrontation with the self. When actors like Falz embody Ramsey's moral descent in *Brotherhood*, they are forced to engage with aspects of themselves that are normally kept hidden, raising profound questions about identity, morality, and the nature of performance itself.

1.1 Research Objectives

1. To analyze the psychological mechanisms actors employ to inhabit the persona of the villain in the Nollywood film *Brotherhood*.
2. To examine how villainous performances challenge the boundaries of the actor's own ego and moral framework, and what this means for actor identity.

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study is significant for at least three reasons. First, it contributes to the growing body of literature on the psychology of acting, a field that remains relatively underdeveloped in African film studies. Second, it broadens the application of psychoanalytic theory to Nollywood performance, an area that has been largely overlooked. Third, the findings have practical implications for actor training and mental health support in the Nigerian film industry, where actors are often expected to perform intense emotional and moral content with little psychological guidance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Psychology of Acting: An Overview

The psychological dimension of acting has fascinated scholars and practitioners for over a century. Konstantin Stanislavski's foundational work on actor training introduced the idea that great acting requires the actor to draw on genuine psychological and emotional experience (Stanislavski, 1936). His system, which emphasized emotional memory and psychological truth, opened the door to examining acting as a form of psychological engagement rather than mere technical display.

Building on Stanislavski's ideas, Lee Strasberg developed the Method, which encouraged actors to use personal trauma and deep psychological recall to fuel their performances (Krasner, 2000). The implications of this approach for actor wellbeing have been extensively debated. Bates (2004) argues that the psychological immersion demanded by the Method can blur the boundary between actor and character, leading to what he calls character contamination, a state in which the actor's personal identity becomes confused with the role.

More recent scholarship has explored the neurological and psychological dimensions of performance. Goldstein and Bloom (2011) found that actors who perform emotionally intense roles often experience genuine physiological responses, including changes in heart rate, hormonal levels, and emotional states. This suggests that the psychological experience of inhabiting a character is not purely cognitive but deeply embodied. For actors performing villainous roles, this raises important questions about the long-term psychological effects of sustained engagement with darkness.

2.2 Villainy and Performance

The performance of villainy presents unique psychological challenges. Unlike heroic or morally neutral characters, villains require actors to embody values and behaviors that are often fundamentally opposed to their own. As Neve (2005) observes, the compelling villain is one who is not merely evil for evil's sake but one whose darkness is rooted in recognizable human desires for power, for recognition, for survival.

This creates what Carnicke (2009) describes as the actor's ethical paradox: in order to make a villain convincing, the actor must, to some extent, understand and even sympathize with the character's worldview. This is not simply about technique. It is about a genuine psychological willingness to enter a moral space that the actor would normally reject. For Falz, whose public persona is strongly associated with social activism and political conscience, playing Ramsey in *Brotherhood* represents a significant and deliberate departure from his established identity. Scholars working in the area of dark characters and performance psychology have noted that actors often

describe the experience of playing villains as both liberating and frightening (Blair, 2008). It is liberating because it provides permission to explore aspects of human experience that are socially forbidden. It is frightening because these explorations can unearth genuine psychological material from the actor's own unconscious.

2.3 Nollywood and Character Complexity

Nollywood is the world's second-largest film industry by volume, producing thousands of films annually and reaching audiences across Africa and the diaspora (Haynes, 2011). While early Nollywood films were often criticized for shallow characterization and moral simplicity, contemporary Nollywood has evolved significantly. Films like *Brotherhood* represent a new wave of production that prioritizes psychological depth, moral ambiguity, and sophisticated storytelling.

Okoye (2007) traces the evolution of the villain in Nollywood from the simple, often supernatural evildoer of the 1990s to the psychologically complex antagonist of contemporary productions. This evolution mirrors developments in global cinema and reflects growing audience expectations for nuanced character portrayals. Okafor (2018) further notes that contemporary Nollywood villains often function as social commentary, embodying systemic failures poverty, corruption, neglect that drive individuals toward crime.

Within this context, *Brotherhood* stands as a landmark text. Osiberu (2022) deliberately constructs Ramsey not as a simple criminal but as a product of circumstance, whose villainy is rooted in shared trauma and unmet need. This complexity does not reduce the moral weight of his choices but it makes the character's darkness far more psychologically interesting—and far more demanding for the actor who must embody it.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature

Despite the rich body of work on both the psychology of acting and Nollywood film, there remains a significant gap at the intersection of these fields. Very few studies have applied psychoanalytic frameworks specifically to the experience of Nollywood actors, and even fewer have focused on

the particular challenges of performing villainous roles within the industry. This study seeks to address that gap, using *Brotherhood* as a case study through which to examine how psychoanalytic theory illuminates the actor's inner journey.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Freudian Psychoanalysis and the Uncanny

Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theory provides one of the most productive frameworks for understanding the psychological experience of actors who perform villainous roles. Central to this study is Freud's concept of the uncanny (*Unheimlich*), introduced in his 1919 essay of the same name. For Freud, the uncanny describes the experience of encountering something that is simultaneously familiar and strange, something that was once known but has been repressed and now returns in a distorted form.

Freud (1919) argued that the uncanny arises precisely when the boundaries between what is known and what is hidden become blurred. When an actor inhabits a villainous role, they often encounter this uncanny experience within themselves: they recognize impulses, desires, and responses that they normally keep buried but which the character demands they express. The experience is not entirely foreign because these impulses belong to the actor's own psyche. Yet it is disturbing because these impulses are normally repressed.

In *Brotherhood*, this uncanny experience is made visible in Falz's portrayal of Ramsey. In one particularly powerful sequence, Ramsey calmly orders the execution of a former associate who has become a liability. The scene requires Falz to convey a chilling absence of remorse—a quality that is deeply at odds with his known personal values. The performance works precisely because it has this uncanny quality: we recognize a human face but encounter inhuman detachment.

Freud's structural model of the psyche, comprising the id, ego and superego is also highly relevant here. The id represents primal, instinctual drives; the ego manages reality; and the superego embodies moral standards and social norms (Freud, 1923). Playing a villain can be understood as an exercise in

temporarily allowing the id's drives to override the superego's constraints, while the ego manages this process to serve the demands of the narrative. For the actor, this is an inherently unstable psychological arrangement.

IV. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

This paper adopts a qualitative research design, which is appropriate given its focus on the subjective, psychological experience of actors and the interpretive nature of character performance analysis. Qualitative methods allow for the kind of nuanced, contextually sensitive analysis that the research questions demand (Creswell, 2014). The study does not seek to produce generalizable statistical findings but rather to generate rich, theoretically informed insights into a specific and under-examined phenomenon.

4.2 Data Sources

The primary data source for this study is the film *Brotherhood* (Osiberu, 2022) itself. The film was analyzed through systematic content analysis, focusing specifically on the performances of actors in villainous or morally complex roles. Particular attention was paid to scenes involving Falz as Ramsey, including the heist planning sequences, the confrontation scenes, and the film's climactic moments of violence and betrayal.

Secondary data was drawn from publicly available interviews with cast members, specifically interviews in which actors discussed their experience of preparing for and performing their roles. These interviews were obtained from Nigerian entertainment media, including *Guardian Life*, *Pulse Nigeria*, and *Channels Television* (all published 2022). Additionally, the study drew on relevant scholarly literature in psychology, film studies and performance theory.

V. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Psychological Mechanisms for Inhabiting Villainy

5.1.1 Emotional Distancing and Controlled Immersion

The first and perhaps most fundamental psychological mechanism actors employ when performing villainous roles is a form of controlled immersion. This involves deliberately entering the character's psychological space while maintaining a meta-awareness of one's own identity as an actor. This dual consciousness, being both the character and the observer of the character is what Stanislavski (1936) described as the dual nature of the actor.

In the context of *Brotherhood*, Falz (Folarin Falana) has spoken in interviews about the deliberate psychological distance he maintained while playing Ramsey. Rather than fully becoming the character in the Method tradition, Falz described a process of understanding Ramsey's emotional logic: why he makes the choices he makes without fully endorsing those choices (Pulse Nigeria, 2022). This is consistent with what cognitive psychologist Meltzoff (2005) describes as perspective-taking: the ability to inhabit another's viewpoint as a simulation rather than a replacement of one's own.

A particularly illustrative moment occurs early in *Brotherhood* when Ramsey, fresh from a violent confrontation, sits quietly in a car and shows no visible distress. The scene is deliberately understated; there is no dramatic breakdown or moment of visible conscience. Instead, Falz conveys a kind of internal stillness that reads as deeply unsettling. This stillness is itself a psychological choice: it communicates that Ramsey has moved beyond ordinary moral response, that the violence has become normalized within his psychic economy. To perform this convincingly, Falz had to psychologically locate the place within himself where acts of violence could feel unremarkable—a deeply unsettling internal journey.

5.1.2 Shadow Activation Through Backstory Exploration

A second mechanism involves what can be described, in Jungian terms, as deliberate shadow activation: the conscious engagement with repressed aspects of the self in service of the performance. Jung (1959) argued that the shadow is not simply negative but contains enormous energy and vitality. When an actor activates their shadow in service of a character, they are tapping into a deep reservoir of psychological intensity.

In *Brotherhood*, the backstory of Ramsey and Wale is crucial. Both brothers grow up in poverty, watching their mother struggle and their father absent. This shared trauma is the psychic soil from which both characters grow—in different directions. Tobi Bakre, playing Wale, channels the trauma into duty and order; Falz, playing Ramsey, channels it into rage and criminality. For Falz, connecting to Ramsey's backstory means connecting to the emotional reality of deprivation and abandonment, and to the rage that such experiences can generate.

In one of the film's most psychologically rich scenes, Ramsey confronts Wale about their shared past. The scene crackles with repressed emotion—grief, betrayal, love, and anger all tangled together. Falz's performance in this moment is notable precisely because it does not simplify these emotions into pure villainy. Instead, we see a man whose darkness is inseparable from his wounds. This level of psychological complexity could only be achieved through genuine engagement with the shadow material underlying the character.

5.1.3 The Uncanny and Moral Suspension

A third mechanism involves what might be called moral suspension: the temporary bracketing of the actor's own ethical framework in order to fully embody a character whose values differ fundamentally. This is the aspect of villain performance that actors most frequently describe as psychologically challenging, and it is closely related to Freud's concept of the uncanny.

Freud (1919) described the uncanny as the return of what has been repressed. In the context of acting, moral suspension functions as a kind of deliberate un-repression: the actor temporarily allows impulses and perspectives that are normally forbidden to surface. This is uncanny in the Freudian sense because these impulses are not foreign—they belong to the actor's own psyche—but they are strange because they have been so thoroughly suppressed.

In *Brotherhood*, the scene in which Ramsey meticulously plans a highly choreographed armed robbery is particularly instructive. The planning sequence is shot with a kind of aesthetic elegance that is deeply deliberate: Osiberu (2022) refuses to

demonize Ramsey's intelligence or competence. Instead, she presents a man who is genuinely brilliant and whose criminal activities are a product of redirected talent. For Falz, inhabiting this sequence required not only physical preparation—learning tactical movements, handling props—but a genuine psychological engagement with the pleasure of planning and executing a complex operation. This meant temporarily suspending his own moral framework around theft and violence.

5.2 Challenges to the Actor's Ego and Moral Framework

5.2.1 Ego Boundary Dissolution

One of the most significant psychological challenges of playing a villain is the risk of ego boundary dissolution: the blurring of the line between the actor's personal identity and the character's identity. This phenomenon has been documented in actors who play intense roles across extended periods (Bates, 2004; Blair, 2008). In psychoanalytic terms, it can be understood as a temporary breakdown of the ego's organizing function, which normally maintains a clear distinction between self and other.

For Falz, a high-profile public figure whose identity as a social activist is central to his public persona, the risk of ego boundary dissolution was particularly significant. Playing Ramsey—a character who represents many of the social pathologies that Falz publicly opposes—required a fundamental, if temporary, reorganization of how he presents himself. In multiple interviews, Falz noted the unusual psychological experience of finding himself defending Ramsey's logic, understanding his reasoning, and even sympathizing with his choices, even as he found those choices morally reprehensible (Guardian Life, 2022).

This dynamic is consistent with what Freud (1923) described as the ego's capacity for identification: the process by which the ego partially models itself on another figure. Acting is, in many ways, a controlled exercise in ego identification, but when the character is a villain, this identification carries specific psychological risks. The actor who over-identifies with a villainous character may find themselves experiencing genuine moral confusion, as the character's logic gradually becomes internalized.

5.2.2 Moral Disturbance and the Return of the Repressed

A second significant challenge involves what can be called moral disturbance: the experience of genuine psychological discomfort that arises when an actor is forced to express values or commit fictional acts that violate their own moral framework. This is not simply about performing difficult scenes; it is about the psychological aftermath of having inhabited, even temporarily, a moral space that feels fundamentally wrong.

In *Brotherhood*, the most morally demanding scene for Falz is arguably the one in which Ramsey abandons a wounded associate to escape capture. The scene is brief but devastating in its moral implications. Ramsey makes a cold calculation—his own survival over loyalty—and acts on it without visible anguish. For an actor whose public identity is built on themes of loyalty, solidarity, and justice, performing this act of abandonment required a deep and uncomfortable psychological journey.

This experience relates directly to Freud's concept of the return of the repressed: the tendency of what has been psychically suppressed to surface at unexpected moments and in unexpected forms (Freud, 1915). When an actor repeatedly enacts morally transgressive behaviors in performance, they risk stimulating genuine psychological material that was previously dormant. The repressed—memories of one's own moral failures, desires for self-preservation at others' expense, impulses toward aggression—can surface in ways that are psychologically significant.

5.2.3 Performance as Psychological Negotiation

Against these challenges, the most psychologically sophisticated actors develop what this study terms performance as psychological negotiation: an ongoing, dynamic process of engaging with the character's darkness while preserving the integrity of the actor's own identity. This is not a one-time adjustment but a continuous practice of psychological calibration.

Evidence of this negotiation is visible in the texture of Falz's performance throughout *Brotherhood*. While the character of Ramsey is consistently menacing, the performance never loses its humanity entirely. Even

in Ramsey's most morally compromised moments, there is a flicker of something recognizable—grief, love, the ghost of the person he might have been. This is not simply good writing; it is the product of an actor who is in active psychological negotiation with his material, finding the humanity within the darkness without softening the darkness itself.

This negotiation is also evident in the film's remarkable final sequence, in which Wale and Ramsey confront each other for the last time. The scene demands that both actors hold the full complexity of their shared history—love, betrayal, grief, rage—simultaneously. Falz's performance in this moment is the most psychologically raw in the film precisely because it requires him to allow genuine emotional material to surface. The actor and the character converge at this point: Falz's grief over the moral cost of Ramsey's choices and Ramsey's own suppressed grief over his lost brother become indistinguishable.

VI. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study support and extend existing literature on the psychology of acting while making a specific contribution to the understanding of villain performance in Nollywood. The analysis of *Brotherhood* reveals that the psychological mechanisms actors employ to inhabit villainous roles are neither simple nor fully within the actor's conscious control. They involve a complex interplay of deliberate technique, unconscious psychological process, and the specific conditions created by the narrative and character.

The application of Freudian and Jungian frameworks to *Brotherhood*'s performances yields several important insights. First, the concept of the shadow self provides a particularly productive lens for understanding how actors access the psychological resources necessary to perform villainy convincingly. Jung's (1959) argument that the shadow contains genuine energy and vitality—rather than simply negative qualities—helps explain why great villain performances feel not simply bad but powerfully and disturbingly alive. Ramsey is compelling not because Falz has made him evil but because Falz has made him human: a human being who has made a series of

choices that have led him into darkness, carrying the full weight of those choices in his body and voice.

Second, the Freudian concept of the uncanny illuminates the specific quality of unease that Brotherhood produces in its audience. The film works on audiences because Ramsey is not safely other he is recognizable. We understand his logic, we sympathize with his wounds, and this recognition is precisely what disturbs us. For the actor, producing this uncanny effect requires the willingness to locate within themselves the psychological material that makes this recognition possible. This is a deeply personal and potentially destabilizing process.

Third, the study's findings raise important questions about the mental health implications of villain performance in Nollywood. Unlike Hollywood, which has well-developed systems of psychological support for actors in demanding roles, Nollywood does not yet have established infrastructure for addressing the psychological needs of actors who perform intense or morally complex characters (Oyelaran, 2020). As Nollywood productions become more psychologically sophisticated, this gap becomes increasingly significant. The risk of ego boundary dissolution, moral disturbance, and unprocessed psychological material suggests that actor welfare should become a more central concern in production planning.

The study also has implications for actor training. Current Nollywood actor training programs, where they exist formally, tend to focus on technical skills such as diction, physical expression, and camera technique (Nwosu, 2016). The psychoanalytic dimension of performance—the capacity to engage safely and productively with one's own shadow material—receives relatively little systematic attention. This study suggests that such engagement should be central to any serious program of actor training, particularly for actors who will be asked to perform morally complex or villainous roles.

Finally, the study raises broader questions about the cultural and social function of villain performance in Nollywood. If, as this research suggests, playing a villain is a form of shadow engagement that allows both actor and audience to explore repressed aspects

of the human psyche, then Nollywood's villain characters serve a function that goes beyond entertainment. They provide a culturally sanctioned space for the exploration of darkness, a space that is both necessary and potentially transformative. The master villain performance—such as Falz's rendering of Ramsey in Brotherhood—does not simply disturb; it illuminates.

VII. CONCLUSION

This study has explored the psychological complexities of villain performance in the Nollywood film Brotherhood, drawing on the psychoanalytic frameworks of Sigmund Freud and Carl Gustav Jung. The analysis has demonstrated that acting villainous roles is far more than a technical exercise; it is a profound psychological negotiation that engages the actor's deepest psychic resources and challenges the stability of their personal identity and moral framework.

Through a close reading of Falz's performance as Ramsey, the study has identified three primary psychological mechanisms through which actors inhabit villainy: controlled immersion, shadow activation through backstory exploration, and moral suspension. Each of these mechanisms involves a deliberate engagement with aspects of the actor's psyche that are normally suppressed or unexpressed. The performance of villainy, in this sense, is not the performance of the other but the performance of the hidden self.

The study has also identified the key psychological challenges that this process generates: ego boundary dissolution, moral disturbance, and the return of repressed psychological material. These challenges are not merely theoretical; they have real implications for actor wellbeing, particularly in an industry like Nollywood that is only beginning to develop formal systems of psychological support for its performers.

The mastery demonstrated by Falz and other performers in Brotherhood suggests that the best Nollywood actors are already engaged in sophisticated forms of psychological self-management, even if they do not describe this process in psychoanalytic terms. The theoretical

framework offered by this study provides a vocabulary for articulating what these actors already intuitively know: that great acting, particularly of the darkest characters, requires not the denial of the self but its fullest and most courageous engagement.

Future research should extend this investigation in several directions. Longitudinal studies of actor wellbeing following villain performances would provide important empirical data on the psychological effects identified here. Comparative studies across different Nollywood productions would allow for a richer understanding of how genre, production context, and directorial approach shape the psychological experience of villain performance. And participatory research with actors themselves would bring the subjective dimension of this experience into sharper focus.

Ultimately, this study concludes that the villain is not the actor's enemy but their most demanding teacher. In *Brotherhood*, the darkness of Ramsey is not simply a narrative device; it is an invitation—to the actor, to the audience, and to scholarship—to look honestly at the full complexity of what it means to be human.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bates, B. (2004). *The way of the actor: A path to knowledge and power*. Shambhala Publications.
- [2] Blair, R. (2008). *The actor, image, and action: Acting and cognitive neuroscience*. Routledge.
- [3] Carnicke, S. M. (2009). *Stanislavski in focus: An acting master for the twenty-first century* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [4] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [5] Freud, S. (1915). Repression. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 141–158). Hogarth Press.
- [6] Freud, S. (1919). The uncanny. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 17, pp. 217–256). Hogarth Press.
- [7] Freud, S. (1923). The ego and the id. In J. Strachey (Ed. & Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 19, pp. 1–66). Hogarth Press.
- [8] Goldstein, T. R., & Bloom, P. (2011). The mind on stage: Why cognitive scientists should study acting. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(4), 141–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.02.003>
- [9] Guardian Life. (2022, October 3). Falz opens up about playing Ramsey in *Brotherhood*. *Guardian Newspapers Nigeria*.
- [10] Haynes, J. (2011). *Nollywood: The creation of Nigerian film genres*. University of Chicago Press.
- [11] Jung, C. G. (1959). The archetypes and the collective unconscious (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). In H. Read et al. (Eds.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung* (Vol. 9, Part 1). Princeton University Press.
- [12] Krasner, D. (2000). *Method acting reconsidered: Theory, practice, future*. St. Martin's Press.
- [13] Krings, M., & Okome, O. (Eds.). (2013). *Global Nollywood: The transnational dimensions of an African video film industry*. Indiana University Press.
- [14] Lapsley, R., & Westlake, M. (2006). *Film theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Manchester University Press.
- [15] Meltzoff, A. N. (2005). Imitation and other minds: The like me hypothesis. In S. Hurley & N. Chater (Eds.), *Perspectives on imitation: From neuroscience to social science* (Vol. 2, pp. 55–77). MIT Press.
- [16] Neve, B. (2005). The dark side of character: Villainy in American cinema. In S. Neale (Ed.), *Genre and contemporary Hollywood* (pp. 220–236). BFI Publishing.
- [17] Nwosu, C. (2016). Actor training in Nigeria: Current practices and future directions. *Journal of Theatre and Cultural Studies*, 4(2), 45–62.

- [18] Okafor, C. (2018). Moral complexity and social critique in contemporary Nollywood. *African Cinema Journal*, 9(1), 77–95.
- [19] Okoye, C. (2007). Looking at ourselves in the mirror: The Nollywood film as social document. *African Performance Review*, 1(1), 30–52.
- [20] Osiberu, J. (Director). (2022). *Brotherhood* [Film]. Inkblot Productions; Amazon Prime Video.
- [21] Oyelaran, T. (2020). Mental health and the performing arts in Nigeria: A call for institutional support. *Nigerian Journal of Arts and Culture*, 12(1), 18–34.
- [22] Pulse Nigeria. (2022, September 28). Falz talks about the psychological demands of playing Ramsey. Pulse Entertainment Nigeria.
- [23] Stanislavski, K. (1936). *An actor prepares* (E. R. Hapgood, Trans.). Theatre Arts Books.
- [24] Stevens, A. (1990). *On Jung*. Routledge.