CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The cinema,¹ as we know it today, is one of the most important and powerful social institutions of our time. So much so that it has come to occupy a unique place in our everyday social life. For almost a century of its existence of work, hope, despair, self-sacrifice and crookedness — a veritable whirlpool of all that is best and worst in human nature — have gone to the making of the film of today. Its birth was a flickering hardly noticed. Its future is still in the realms of the unknown especially in the wake of rapidly changing communications systems. Nonetheless, the very fact that what is shown and viewed maximum via these rapidly changing communications systems is nothing but films or film based programmes and simultaneously its influences on people of wide and varied cultures throughout the whole world, it becomes a little difficult indeed to dogmatise as to its real significance.

Citing India’s example, Satish Bahadur points out that

...values of film determine the visual style of other forms of popular visual communication: calendar pictures, magazine illustrations, hoardings, posters and advertisements, schemes of interior decoration. Even the traditional iconography of statues and pictures for religious worship has accepted the values of the film; the conventional Durga image for the Bengali Puja festival is looking

¹ Throughout this thesis, the words cinema and film have been used interchangeably.
more and more like Suchitra Sen! Visual \textit{Kitsch} has come full circle — Raja Ravi Varma contributed his painting imagery to Phalke at the beginning of Indian film, Indian film is now contributing its imagery to popular Indian painting. The one single dominant musical sound in urban India is film song. All popular music now is imitative of film song or, is film song, even traditional forms like \textit{Bhajan} and \textit{Kirtan}. Popular theatre is replete with film-like situations, dialogue and decor. A strongly traditional form like Indian classical dance is, in most public performances, eroded by the values of film dance. The structure of fiction in popular magazines is based on straight film-like situations; they are stories ready for filming. A new medium like television entertainment programmes are films, or modelled after film. Indian film is the apex of all popular expression in India.$^2$

The cinema as an institution has come to occupy an important place in our everyday social life primarily because of the recent increase in leisure. Unlike ancient times, when leisure was considered to be the privilege of a few people, it has now become the right of all. This recent increase in leisure is due to certain social, economic and political changes brought about by urbanization, industrialization, modernization and secularization such as the adoption of the constitutional democracy, reduction in the working hours, increase in wages, spread of compulsory primary education and development in communications. The popularity of the cinema is all the more because press can help only those who have attained a certain standard of proficiency in the language and radio requires some initial investment and costs for maintenance. In a big

\footnote{Satish Bahadur, "The Context of Indian Film Culture", \textit{Film Appreciation Study Material}, Series No. 2, National Film Archives of India, Pune, 1978, p. 6.}
city the average person is either poor or belongs to middle class. For them the cinema provides comparatively the cheapest, readily available and easily understood source of entertainment, giving some relief from the daily anxieties of life by lifting them for some time to a make-believe or an imaginary world. For instance, with the influx of videos, a cassette is now available on hire for just Rs. 10/- or even less and the whole family can see their favourite stars acting out a melodrama right inside their drawing room. Though the economic motives seem to have further commercialised this leisure as it helps in most cases, in toning up the deficiencies of real life, as the persons find a sort of self-identification or imaginary realization in the cinema losing their self-consciousness at least during the show. In a way, one may say that the cinema thus substitutes for the bonds of the primary relationship and social security once assured and offered to him by the family and the community.

In India, the importance and impact of the cinema is all the more. Indian people are not very fond of social gatherings and club life, mainly because majority of the people are poor and cannot afford all this. The musical gatherings, poetic symposiums, theatre, concerts, live shows of renowned singers usually held in five star hotels forms an integral part of a high life but remain too costly for an average man, as a result they do not attract a large number of people. Films being cheap and within easy reach of everyone thus commands a better patronage whether one goes to view them in the cinema hall or views them on video, cable television etcetera.

In the words of Pradip Krishen,

....anyone who is inclined to examine the relation between popular cinema and society has at some point to contend with the fact that the movies are not
usually intended to be important or significant — they are made, quite simply, for money and entertainment. Does this mean that they are trash, the merely trivial excrescence of a culture industry? Funnily enough, even the worst critics of popular cinema are usually willing to grant sometimes unconsciously, that the movies are important — if for no other reason than that they are capable of influencing their audiences. This is the implicit assumption behind censorship and the cinema ratings — they stem from a practical concern that the cinema can teach the wrong values or influence behaviour by setting a bad example. In other ways too, attention is often drawn to the social pathology of the movies: their potential for causing psychological damage; the social consequences of the consumption of ‘trash’; the political functions of an escapist mass-entertainment which distracts the poor from the real causes of their misery; the effects of the dissemination of subliminal meanings and values that are concealed in the entertainment package.\footnote{Pradip Krishen, “Introduction,” Indian Popular Cinema, Myth, Meaning and Metaphor, \textit{India International Centre Quarterly}, Volume 8, No. 1, 1981, Special Issue, p. 3.}

The functionalist viewpoint is that cinema probably exists to meet a need in the community. One of the first modern social scientists to make a systematic study of cinema, H. Powdermaker, was an anthropologist who justified her study of motion pictures from a functionalist point of view. According to her,

*.\ldots\text{ we define an institution as an organised system of human activities which meets a basic human need. Our frame of reference is both functional and historical. Any study of its functioning will reveal the complex manner in which one institution is intertwined with others, influencing and being influenced by}.
them. In other words, we arrive at an understanding of an institution not by studying it as if it were a separate phenomenon but in terms of its interrelationships with society as a whole.⁴

Each of the above views puts altogether a different perspective on the nature and function of cinema. It is, however, to be noted that there are theories to suit every taste, every posture of social concern. In India particularly, it is to be seen that any discussion on cinema is either dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration or tends to be looked at as a monitor of morality, a technique by which the moral order underlying the social structure can be identified in contrast with its opposite — immorality, disorder. This is despite the fact that we make the largest number of films in the world, roughly, 900 films each year that are watched by an average of approximately 12.5 million people everyday. These figures too fail to express the extent of cinema's dominance as a channel for the transmission of popular culture. This is because both our urban and rural environments are splattered all over with its signs and filled with the aura of its evergreen popular songs. Its tastes and values spill out to define the very texture of contemporary mass audience and middle-class culture. Inspite of all its prominence as an important social phenomenon, it is to be noted, that the discussion about cinema has seldom taken the form of serious consideration. There is, therefore, an imperative need to study the average Indian cinema in its proper perspective, if at all one wants to enquire about the relation between cinema and society.

---

In doing so, it leads one to ask several important questions in the manner posed by Pradip Krishen in an introductory article on *Indian Popular Cinema, Myth, Meaning and Metaphor*, such as what are the reasons behind the tremendous success of the Indian cinema? Is it the result of widespread social acceptance of its product? Or is public taste manoeuvred and determined by the makers of these films? Do films really influence their audience? If so, how? Is the role of cinema confined only to entertainment? Or does it also communicate meaning and significance through its plot and narrative? These and some other questions will help us to find the relation between cinema and society. This is because cinema, in telling stories, in portraying characters and events, is an attempt to make symbolic sense of the world. Its symbols and archetypes are drawn from society. They are the classifications, interpretations and inconsistencies that society imposes on the individual understanding of the world. To this extent, a study of cinema — more so, that kind of cinema which is widely accepted, understood and enjoyed — is a means of gaining access to the organizing principles and assumptions with which a particular society attempts to order and conceptualize its experience.5

The present work tries to be about the sociology of cinema with special reference to Delhi, for it views the cinema as a social phenomenon — one social institution among many and the structural-functional impact it has on society as an institution among other existing institutions. This is because like any other social institution, as I.C. Jarvie puts it, the cinema has a pre-history, a history, and a structure.6 One could, however, add to


this the functional aspect also because cinema apart from having a pre-history, a history, a structure, also has a function in society. Though, unlike some institutions it was not devised or brought into existence by any one individual or group with plans or visions. As experiments were carried on by many persons on the same lines in different countries and sometimes in the same country. Still less the investors had no idea whatsoever at that time about the commercial future of their achievements and the profound effects it was to have on society, communication and world culture.

But then, like all social institutions, as Jarvie expresses it succinctly, the cinema too has its unintended as well as its intended consequences. The profits were sought and intended in order to earn a living, the star-system was quite unintended, but grew despite the stiff resistance of the producers, so much so that stars today define the very existence of film industry along with the producer-distributor-exhibitor monopoly as films are sold on star names. Some of the unintended consequences were welcome, others were not. The pursuit of the profit motive lead to cut-throat competition which the producers attempted to resolve by bringing in the box-office "formula" comprising of one or two major stars (at present the trend being half a dozen or more stars), at least nine to ten songs, and a few dances thereby appealing to the lowest common denominator in public taste. The sensational expansion whereby a weekly trip to the cinema became a world-wide pastime was fostered by the same producers, who soon so took it for granted, that they were quite dismayed when their existence came to be threatened7 in the early eighties by the invasion of the colour television and later by the diffusion of videos in the country.

7. Jarvie, ibid., p. 5.
The cinema as an social institution, thus came into existence as soon as it was discovered, and in no time it reached the entire world. It is one of the major social institutions of our society, an industry, a business and one of the liveliest art forms of our age. To the extent that it is almost impossible to draw clear distinctions between a social problem, an economic problem and an artistic one. All these are inextricably linked together just as different parts of the society are. And because it brings to its product all the combined strength of art, economics and society, it represents a vital power of social significance.

Review of Literature on Sociology of Cinema

A review of literature on world cinema shows that while books abound on its history, technique and method, economic aspects and its art, its social dimensions have very rarely been explored. It is, however, difficult to explain this negligence but on close and careful analysis one notices a number of things perhaps contribute to this gloomy aspect. I.C. Jarvie has tried to summarise these in the following four points:

i) misconceptions about what sociology is and what sociological studies should consist of;

ii) a general lack of descriptive sociology of the main institutions of our society;

iii) the vulgar associations attached to the cinema, partly because of its very newness and popularity; and

iv) the feeling that what little there is to be said on the subject of the sociology of the cinema is trite and/or well known. 8

8. Jarvie, ibid., p. 5-6.
Adopting Jarvie's above frame of reference, it is to be seen with regard to the first point that the general misconceptions on the part of some people from other social disciplines as to what sociology is and what sociological studies should consist of, which were quite widespread in the beginning, have now come to influence the film writers also. For they often confuse it with social science and social work. This perhaps explains why the study of sociological aspects of the cinema has hitherto come to mean topics like film and crime, film and violence, film and adolescence etcetera, i.e., socially significant aspects of the cinema. Further, film writers have tended to confuse sociology with social psychology. Judging by the available published literature, both Western and Indian, which claims to be about the sociology of the cinema, 'the sociology of the cinema' has come to mean (not the sociology, but) the psychology (not of the cinema but) of the audiences in the cinema, their responses, etcetera. Thus the topics discussed most frequently in the literature continue to be such as the degree of identification of the audience with film stars and characters; the frequency of cinemagoing and its relation to intelligence; the degree of influence of films on children's particular age-group; and so on. J.P. Mayer's two books *Sociology of Film Studies and Documents* (1945) and *British Cinemas and their Audiences* (1948) are examples of this kind of literature.

If at all one is inclined to examine issues of economic and sociological nature such as the financial, industrial and social structure of the film industry, its basis of engaging people to work, the role the institution of cinemagoing plays in the social structure of any society, the typical kinds of society and culture cinema tries to portray on the screen, the reason why popular films have appeal and others do not, one will find very scant information in the works of Mayer. Similarly, one will find less of information in the

Two works which seem to have followed this approach to some extent are that of Leo Rosten's *Hollywood: The Movie Colony, the Movie Makers* (1941) and H. Powdermaker's *Hollywood: The Dream Factory* (1950) as they provide interesting sociological peep into the life in Hollywood in the 1940s. Several other studies have used the production case study as a means of grasping the social factors in film making: Lillian Ross's *Picture* (1952), Donald Knox's *The Magic Factory: How MGM Made "An American in Paris"* (1973), and Dore Schary's *Case Study of a Movie* (1950), among others. No doubt, all of these works are sociological in orientation but then they are more useful to the film historian as raw materials from which more general theories of social interaction in film production might be developed. They offer a picture "in the present tense" of some aspects of Hollywood as a social system or of the role played by participants in the making of a film, but the studies are much less useful in explaining how the organizational structure of the studio developed and changed.

This is equally true of Panna Shah's book on *The Indian Film* (1950) written as a doctoral thesis in sociology. Apart from some sociological emphasis but not much structural analysis the book more or less deals with the history of the Indian film in detail.
Similarly, Erik Barnouw and S. Krishnaswamy's book *Indian Film* (1963) is a highly informative work as it gives a sociologically angled account of the history of film making in India, and its contemporary situation. It gives in detail the extended family basis of much production, and the extreme popularity of stars and song-writers. But it does not essay deeper structural explanations of these phenomena themselves, although the material is perhaps present. Such content analysis which have been published in important sociological bulletin, periodicals and journals and at times in newspapers, as those of A. Jindal (1960), D.B. Jones (1942, 1950), D. Riesman (1956), S. Bahadur and J.N. Rao (1954), are either fragmentary or very lightly explored as though films existed in a sociological vacuum.

The development of 'sociologically oriented' criticism which first began in Britain in the twenties in journals like *Close Up* and later in *Sequence and Sight and Sound* and which infiltrated into other parts of the world ever since the cinema became a subject of minute intellectual interest failed to be 'sociologically oriented' as its contents were mainly aesthetic, leaving only a sort of journalistic impression. This is because the questions and issues raised by them were not systematic nor sociological enough. In order to render deeper social insight into them and make it more sociological, they need to be reformulated so as to take into account: the interplay between the cinema and the society — the social situations — it serves/portrays/attacks; the structural impact it has on society and vice versa. Perhaps Lewis Jacob's classic history book *The Rise of the American Film* (1939) was primarily an attempt to set the cinema in the social context of the American society.
The relationship between film and society, however, also seems to be reflected in S. Kracauer's book *From Caligari to Hitler* (1947). In this book, Kracauer examines the German films made between the end of World War I and the rise of Hitler and argues that films provide as a matter of fact exact reflections of the inner workings of a society at a given point in the past — a notion that has formed the basis for numerous books, theses, and scholarly and popular articles. ⁹

Subsequently, in the fifties and sixties film journals like *Film Culture* and *Film Quarterly* tried to focus their issues on socio-political debates.

According to Jarvie,

...the approach held in general in these works has been that of treating films as though they were statements about or reflections of, the society they portray statements, that is, of an attitude or a point of view towards, criticism or evaluation of, what they portray. ¹⁰

Two works which, however, have been able to come up to the level of perfection are that of I.C. Jarvie's *Towards a Sociology of the Cinema* (1970) and R. D. Jain's *The Economic Aspects of the Film Industry* (1961). The latter work, however, is from an economic perspective but still it takes pain to go into many of the sociological issues and thereby provide useful information on cinema and society.

---


In this context, Aruna Vasudev's work — *Liberty and Licence in the Indian Cinema* (1978), *New Indian Cinema* (1986), *Cinemaya*, the Asian Film Magazine edited and published by her and *Indian Cinema Super Bazaar* (1983) coedited with Philippe Lenglet deserve special mention. This is because though none of the above works have been written from sociological point of view, one finds a streak of sociological slant in all of them. For instance in the former book, the author makes her observations on the rise and development of censorship which seem to emerge from an understanding of the motivations of the powers that imposed it, and the political, economic and socio-cultural climate in which its policies were formed. Similarly, *New Indian Cinema* gives an objective, comprehensive and analytical overview about the other cinema in India, the sociological factors that led to a new consciousness about its potential, the directors who conceived of an alternate dream of form and the sociological conditions that made it possible to realise that vision. With the perception and the dispassionate care of the critic she tries to bring the full drama of this vital medium alive, its searchings and conflicts, its shapes and trends, its actors and technicians.

Writings on cinema during the seventies and eighties, both in the West and India, seem to have moved towards the view that film is a kind of 'language' elements of which can be traced back to Eisenstein school of thought. This is the view which forms part of what is known as *semiology* or *semiotics*.

Semiology has been defined as a science which studies sign-systems such as languages, codes, signals, etcetera. In practice, however, it restricts itself to non-linguistic
sign-systems only. Semiology was first conceived by Ferdinand de Saussure as a study of the life of signs in society. Similarly, the American philosopher C.S. Peirce was also interested in what he called semiotics, a study of signs which leads to an understanding of their nature, especially as these are used by the scientist.11

Today the terms 'semiology' and 'semiotics' are used interchangeably; the Europeans preferring the former and the Anglo Saxons the latter. Semiology has been growing into a fairly vast and complex discipline, and has made substantial contributions to a study of systems of communication which use non-linguistic signs. Studies have also been made of myths, rites, ceremonies, and of the modes of communication in the arts and literature. Although semiology as a discipline has a Parisian association, it has begun to invade the thinking of intellectuals all over the world and has thus generated a good deal of excitement. The success of Claude Levi-Strauss in anthropology and of Roland Barthes in social and literary criticism have resulted in new semiological studies of several kinds of 'languages': Freudianism, advertising and film. As far as film is concerned, the seminal work of Christian Metz titled Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema (1974), Peter Wollen's work Signs and Meaning in the Cinema (1972) and Roland Barthes's Image - Music - Text (1977) accounts for a distinctively new and fresh approach.12

Following in their footsteps has been Kishore Valicha's work The Moving Image: A Study of Indian Cinema (1988) which though again is not a sociological attempt is

nevertheless a desirable addition to a somewhat limited stock of serious film studies in India and takes into consideration many questions related to the relationship between the cinema and society. Taking his direction from Andre Bazin, Valicha points out that ....the main concepts with which cinema can be dealt with today are inextricably linked to theoretical approaches to film as these have grown in the West — mainly in Russia, in France, in Italy and in the United States. Most innovations have also been tried out in these countries. Serious efforts have been made to extend the boundaries of cinema to perceive its form and meaning and to define its goals and purposes. Of particular interest is the development of semiotics or semiology which has begun to seriously alter ways of perception and analysis of film.13

He further goes on to elaborate that since cinema is closely related to the different life-styles and beliefs that define human society, its patterns of meaning cannot be understood except in the context of a social and historical consciousness which seems to permeate its forms. The key to cinema lies in culture. The components of meaning in cinematic articulation are inseparable from various social, intellectual and cultural developments. Furthermore, when dealing with the cinema of a particular society, it is necessary to relate it to certain thematic concerns (or myths) that are part of the cultural context of that society. These often go back in time to an ancient past. Certain cultural and artistic forms in cinematic representation make sense only in the light of these contexts.

He continues that being mainly a technological art, the development of cinema is closely related to the growth of science and technology and to the emergence of modernity. Many cinematic forms cannot be understood without a knowledge of the semiological patterns of meaning in science and technology — for science and technology are in cultural phenomena and the abstract themselves significant elements in modern cinema arise out of values that directly and indirectly emerge out of the spread of science and technology.¹⁴

Keeping both the semiological and cultural aspects of cinema in view, his work makes a serious effort in studying the Indian cinema. It is an attempt to make sense of cinema in India, to decode various signs that are used in it and to perceive its cultural meaning as with the passage of time cinema has developed its own codes, symbols and metaphors derived from the cultural roots of the film makers and the audiences.

A somewhat similar view has been expressed by Paul Monaco in his book *Cinema and Society* (1976). But here again Paul Monaco foregrounds the psychological aspects of film history in his study of German and French films of the 1920s. "Movies", he says, "find their relationship to society in oblique symbolism. The most fruitful source of insight into an individual's latent concern is the dream." Extrapolating from Freudian dream theory, Monaco sets out to demonstrate that the most popular films of the two countries reveal differences between their "group minds".¹⁵


Likewise, India International Centre Quarterly brought about a special issue on *Indian Popular Cinema, Myth, Meaning and Metaphor* (1981) which has articles written on cinema by sociologists like Veena Das and Sanjay Kak; psychoanalyst like Sudhir Kakar; historian like Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty; ethnographer like Komal Kothari; film makers like Pradip Krishen and Siddhartha Basu and other academicians like Ashis Nandy. Though it has writers drawn from various disciplines it takes special care to go into many of the sociological nuances in articles written by people mentioned above.

Probably taking a cue from the above, recently there has been a splurge of film journals in India. However, among them Deep Focus, a Film Quarterly, is an attempt to provide a platform for articles of various hues – whatever be their bias – sociological, psychological or aesthetic. In the ultimate analysis its attempt is not to hold the viewpoints of individual contributors but the possibility of a certain tendency developing over a period of time which may lead towards the emergence of a new form which would be totally Indian, contemporary and dynamic.

and narrative modes; and finally, the question of audiences, new modes of exhibition and the effect of new media technologies. 16

This apart a few studies have been conducted on prominent film makers. In India, some of the prominent film makers studied are V. Shantaram, Guru Dutt, Raj Kapoor, Satyajit Ray, Mrinal Sen, Ritwik Ghatak. In these studies apart from sketching out the profile of the film makers, an attempt has also been made to study their films.

It may be seen that while several studies have been carried from sociological perspective, no study has been undertaken as yet on the sociology of cinema itself. Though a number of foreign studies have been conducted in the sociology of cinema they have remained to be socio-culture specific endeavours because of their distinct character and hence not useful though important from methodological point of view.

With reference to the second point in general there has been astonishingly very little detailed study of the major institutions of our society from the sociological point of view. Much of what does exist in the sociology of institutions, in the words of Jarvie, is post war, and even more recent. This is because sociologists tended to concentrate on social groups, family, marriage, kinship, religion, social stratification such as caste, class, status, power, etcetera for a long time, leaving the field of industrial sociology totally neglected for quite sometime. Despite several important studies now made in this area, one still finds that some important aspects of it such as the theatre which has come to

include dance and drama, or for that matter the music industry have yet had its sociological outlines even casually spelled out.

Added to this neglect is the fact that among the mass media, cinema is neglected as against television for there seems to be more literature on the sociology of television than or the sociology of the cinema. Infact almost everything under the heading "mass media" by a sociologist or social psychologist is about television and more recently on video, with passing references to radio, newspapers, and films, in that order. The explanation for such a situation, according to David Riesman,\(^1\) is that the effects of radio and television needed to be demonstrated to the advertisers. On behalf of the sociologists it needs to be said that they perhaps face special difficulties in outlining the social structure of cinema as compared with that of television and radio. This is because there is this extreme difficulty of access to facts about the film industry, which apart from being affluent, glamorous, secretive and closed to outsiders is also looked down upon by the majority of the people as compared to that of radio and television. All this makes sociological research all the more difficult. In India, particularly, its climate is a destroyer of film and paper, and much material has, in the course of years, turned to jelly or powder.

The third point about the vulgar associations attached to the cinema is mainly the outcome of its permissiveness to show everything on the screen especially sex and violence. It is because of this the film people have also come to be looked down upon, as

---

coming from lower strata of society and thereby notorious, possessing no moral character at all. With the passage of time this narrow mindedness, however, seems to be improving and in majority of the cases film people have come to be associated with their screen images. But in academic circles, cinema has yet to achieve its respectability as there is still some sort of social taboo attached to cinema and most Indian universities, barring a few exceptionals, do not consider it worthwhile the need to include "cinema" as a subject of study. Even the selection of any aspect of "cinema" as a topic for thesis for higher degrees by an odd student is frowned upon, leaving a lucky few. This is the greatest misfortune as considering the importance of the subject from every point of view, never was a medium more in need of intelligent interest and guidance than is the cinema. The works of critics Andre Bazin (1967), Paul Rotha (1963), Rudolf Arnheim (1958), and John Grierson (1966) have also tried to stress the point that we must persuade people to take the film seriously.

The **fourth** and the last point, the feeling that sociology generally has little to say is easy to defend. The present study makes an attempt to do so and in this way it is little different from other sociological studies. This is because cinema being an industry, a business and an art, sociology of cinema would mean the relationship between cinema and society, the nature of interactional process between the two and the manner in which these two affect each other. As such it would treat cinema as an institutional system and thereby deal with the whole gamut of production, distribution and exhibition and how this is reflected on the people who see cinema and overall what impact does it have on the society.
The Objectives of the Study

The following are the main objectives of the study.

1. To study the relation between cinema and society.
2. To study the growth and pattern of cinema.
3. To examine the themes, values and ideologies.
4. To study the social and economic organisation of the cinema industry.
5. To study the composition of the respondents who see films in terms of their characteristics, attitudes and reactions to cinema viewing.
6. To examine the kind of impact it has on people who see cinema.
7. To study the impact of information technology on cinema.
8. To suggest new areas of research in the sociology of cinema.

These objectives are sought to be achieved through a first hand study of the situations and developments in Delhi. Apart from probing into the various aspects as enumerated above through the respondents who see films, a cross section of the people involved in the cinema industry have also been reached out to provide a reliable basis for a scientific interpretation of the existing material. The outcome has been analysed and presented in broad Chapters, so as to evolve a coherent theoretical framework.
respondents in terms of their basic characteristics, attitudes and reactions to cinema viewing; themes, values and ideologies portrayed by cinema and the kind of social impact exercised by cinema. In the end, that is Chapter 8, apart from concluding, the researcher has tried to give some useful and important suggestions on the basis of this research.

In the course of this sociological study, apart from the empirical evidence collected from the respondents and people related to cinema in one way or the other, the researcher has drawn on whatever available published information, howsoever sporadic or limited in nature. The researcher's own involvement of cinema has further helped her in this study apart from her interaction with few enlightened persons having interest in cinema.

The present study thus makes a systematic effort in highlighting the above mentioned sociological issues which are so basic and vital to the contemporary cinema situation and society and thereby provide some concrete useful information and suggestions. The study also makes a sincere effort in arousing further interest in the value of research in this field.

The researcher is, however, fully conscious of the limitations of the study in the national context. This is because the locale of the study includes all the segments of urban society, as such, its findings cannot be generalised for the country as a whole. This study may therefore be more relevant to the highly urbanised social structure. Despite the fact that the locale of the study includes all the segments of urban society, it could be
taken as representative of the Indian society as a whole because of the wide variations in social, cultural and economic conditions prevailing in various regions of the country.

Given its constraints, the present study will be exploratory in nature and would make an attempt to bring to the fore some important aspects relevant to the growth of cinema industry in the modern context and on the manner in which it is related to the urban social structure. Besides probing into the relevant issues and working out a theoretical framework for a scientific understanding of the development of cinema as a social institution, the study would indicate several new areas of research in the sociology of cinema.