



Boycott Trend in Bollywood Films: A Critical Analysis of Audience Perceptions in India

Shalini Kumari

Research Scholar, Department of Culture and Media Studies, Central University of Rajasthan,
kumarishalini579@gmail.com

Nicholas Lakra

Assistant Professor, Department of Culture and Media Studies, Central University of Rajasthan,
lakra.nicholas@curaj.ac.in

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 28-04-2025

Published: 10-05-2025

Keywords:

Bollywood, Film boycotts, audience perceptions, Actors Controversy, Reception theory, Cultivation theory

ABSTRACT

Bollywood, the Indian film industry, has long influenced national identity and youth culture. However, in recent years, there has been an increase in audience-led boycotts of Bollywood films, frequently motivated by political, religious, or ideological reasons. This study critically examines audience perceptions of such boycotts, focusing on whether film content, actor behavior, or socio-cultural sensitivities influence public responses. The study used a qualitative research approach, combining content analysis of four Hindi films -*PK*, *Laal Singh Chaddha*, *Raksha Bandhan*, and *Samrat Prithviraj* with audience data gathered through open-ended questionnaires. The approach is based on Reception Theory, which highlights how viewers interpret media based on cultural and ideological positions, and Cultivation Theory, which explains how repeated media exposure influences long-term beliefs. The findings show that boycotts are not only based on cinematic quality. While some viewers are concerned about the plot or the performance, others are more impacted by perceived religious insensitivity, cultural insult, or previous conflicts surrounding actors. Responses varied by age and educational background, indicating different interpretations and sensitivities. The study underlines the need for culturally sensitive storytelling and stronger connection among



filmmakers and spectators, encouraging a more inclusive and responsive cinematic environment in India.

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15412708>

Introduction

India is a diverse country with different cultural practices, traditions, norms, and values. Cinema plays an important role in visualizing the cultural richness of India. Visual communication, cinema is considered a mirror of society that reflects what is happening in the country. Since the early 1900s, the Indian film industry, often known as Bollywood, has significantly developed Indian culture. Over time, Bollywood has become a worldwide entity. Its film productions have spread the country's cultural richness to the world.

Bollywood is renowned for its song-and-dance routines, enormous sets, and accurate depictions of Indian culture. Since 1900, Indian cinema has evolved from a source of entertainment to a source of social change (Saxena & Dhrangadharia, 2023). Films are made on some serious issues like mental health, the dowry system, and religions in order to educate the masses. This shift has made us sometimes proud and sometimes unacceptable because it presents the issue insensitively. The Indian film industry has also significantly contributed to the country's economy by bringing billions of dollars annually and employing thousands of people (Vasudevan, 2011). However, Bollywood contributes significantly to the nation's development; audiences have become more critical of the content of the films, actors, and the film industry.

When the whole country was trying to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic, the death of actor Sushant Singh Rajput in June 2020 sparked the boycott trend. Initially, the death was reported as a suicide case by the police. At the same time, some supporters claimed that the boycott was due to nepotism and discriminatory practices in the film industry, which intensified the movement to boycott Bollywood (Menon, 2020). Following his death, many prominent Bollywood personalities were accused of promoting nepotism and discriminating against outsiders in the industry. These allegations have been supported by various social media campaigns like #JusticeForSSR exposed the industry elite favoritism and political agenda



Organizations such as the Indian Cultural Foundation and Bharat Nationalist Group have criticized Bollywood for promoting a liberal and secular worldview that diverges from their traditionalist beliefs (Subramanian, 2022). Consequently, specific segments of the population, including conservative political groups and nationalist activists, have boycotted movies and celebrities they perceive as supporting what they consider to be an "anti-national" cause. However, nepotism was not the only reason for boycotting Bollywood. There are many other reasons for the boycott trend (Bhat,2022).

Therefore, this research aims to critically investigate audience perception on the films in order to find the reasons for boycotting trend in India. The in-depth investigation under this title focuses on four main objectives:

- 1) To investigate whether the audience boycotts films because of dissatisfaction in the content of storytelling
- 2) To explore whether they view the films with the spectacles of culture and religion
- 3) It examines if the boycott of the films is determined by the audience selection of the actor, nepotism, and the portrayal of the characters.
- 4) To assess whether the statement or comment made by the actors in public domain affects audience perception on the films.

Theoretical Framework

This study relies on in two fundamental theoretical approaches: Reception Theory and Cultivation Theory, both of which give critical insight into how audiences understand, respond to, and are impacted by cinema content and media narratives.

Reception Theory

Stuart Hall's Reception Theory (1980) stresses that the audience has an active part in media interpretation. While media creators encode material with intended meanings, viewers decode messages using their cultural background, beliefs, and social context. Hall describes three forms of readings: dominant, negotiated, and oppositional. This theory is applicable to the current study because it explains why some viewers embrace a film's message while others reject it owing to perceived religious insensitivity, ideological prejudice, or cultural dissonance (Hall, 1980).



Cultivation Theory

George Gerbner's Cultivation Theory (1976) posits that long-term exposure to media material might influence an individual's ideas of reality. Media, particularly films, significantly promote specific worldviews, social norms, and cultural expectations. It also clarifies why departures from these accepted narratives may elicit discomfort, backlash, or rejection (Gerbner & Gross, 1976).

Together, these theories give a complete perspective to explain how viewers see Bollywood films, analyze its content, and engage in collective activities like as boycotts.

Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative research design, combining content analysis of the selected films with audience perception data collected through open-ended questionnaires.

Film Selection and Content Analysis

The four Hindi films, *PK*, *Raksha Bandhan*, *Laal Singh Chaddha*, and *Samrat Prithviraj*, were selected by using purposive sampling. These movies were selected because of popular demands for their boycott during their premiere. The content analysis focused on the following units of analysis:

- Key scenes and Dialogues
- Character's role and arc
- Narrative structure
- Representation of cultural and religious symbols.

The selected films are:

- *PK* (2014), directed by Rajkumar Hirani, critiques superstition and religious orthodoxy through satire (Hirani, 2014).
- *Raksha Bandhan* (2022), directed by Aanand L. Rai, addresses dowry and familial obligations from a patriarchal viewpoint (Khurana, 2022).
- *Laal Singh Chaddha* (2022), directed by Advait Chandan, follows a man with a disability through major Indian historical moments, reflecting the nation's social evolution (Chandan, 2022).



- *Samrat Prithviraj* (2022), directed by Chandra Prakash Dwivedi, dramatizes the life of the historical king based on traditional texts (Dwivedi, 2022).

Audience Perception Survey

The second component of the study selected by means of purposive sampling, 50 young respondents aged 18 to 31 participated in a qualitative survey. Data were gathered using open-ended questionnaires sent via email. Young viewers were sought for because of their great involvement with digital media and movies.

The questionnaire asked participants about their impressions of the following important spheres:

- Reasons for boycotting specific films
- Perceived Influence narrative, storytelling, and script
- Views on religious or cultural depictions in films
- Opinion on the actor and their role
- The impact of the controversial comments of Actors

Using thematic analysis, responses were examined to let feelings and repeating trends show themselves from the data. Young audiences' strong participation in digital media and high film viewing rates support their emphasis. Although the study offers interesting viewpoints, its generalizability is restricted by the small, non-random sample size and the absence of representation from rural areas and older age groups.

Limitations of Study

This study has certain drawbacks. First, its generalizability is hampered by the tiny, non-random sample size of 50 participants, which may not represent the views of the larger public. Second, reactions are fundamentally subjective and may reflect personal biases formed by media exposure or opinions.

Third, the study exclusively evaluates public impressions, excluding perspectives from industry stakeholders such as directors and producers, which may have provided a more comprehensive insight.

Fourth, the study is limited to Bollywood and may not apply to other regional or worldwide cinemas.

Finally, rather than doing extensive case-by-case assessments of each film, the research examines reoccurring audience-driven themes and patterns.



Analysis and Discussion

In today's world, cinema boycotts have evolved into a form of mass protest, choosing not to see specific films as a way to voice their dissatisfaction. Particularly in Bollywood, where movies like *PK*, *Laal Singh Chaddha*, *Raksha Bandhan*, and *Samrat Prithviraj* saw audience boycotts that have drawn a lot of attention. The boycott movement has spurred continuing disputes over whether such reactions arise from film content, ideological disagreements, or larger socio-cultural problems. This research paper aimed to analyze the audience's perception on the boycott trend of Indian film industry. This section will analyze the findings by aligning with the objectives, includes both content analysis of the selected films and audience response. The discussion presented under the four core thematic areas.

1) Quality content, storytelling, script

Good content, storytelling, and storyline are the foundation of any successful Bollywood film. These elements shape the audience's experience and leave a lasting impression on them. Lack of quality content means a shortcoming in the content related to storytelling and scripting. It is important to know if the audience is boycotting the films because of the quality of their content. This research aims to understand whether the audience is boycotting this film due to a lack of quality content.

PK film challenges cultural norms and religious beliefs, particularly Hinduism. The scene questions the sincerity of religious rituals, highlighting societal influences on individual faith. The dialogue *Joh darr gaya so mandir gaya* (The scared one, he goes to the temple) means visiting temples out of fear or for personal gain. Another scene depicts *PK* being slapped for challenging religious logic, illustrating how religion can induce both fear and detachment from reality. The film prompts critical thinking about faith, superstition, and societal norms (Hirani, 2014).

Laal Singh Chaddha is the Hindi adaptation of "Forrest Gump," maintaining its spirit and philosophies while modifying elements for its audience (Tilak, 2022). *Golgappas* replace chocolates, and Laal Singh wins races instead of playing baseball. The film explores significant historical events like the Kargil War and Babri demolition, affecting Laal's journey (Ghosh, 2022). However, a problematic scene depicts Laal with mental disabilities enlisting in the Army, undermining its credibility (Laal Singh Chadda 2022).



The movie *Raksha Bandhan* presents a painful and stereotypical portrayal of women, emphasizing their dependency on men for decision-making and marriage. Lala Kedarnath, played by Akshay Kumar, is a desperate groom hunter for his sisters, reinforcing regressive stereotypes. The film lacks depth in addressing social issues like dowries and focuses solely on the brother's perspective, disregarding the women's experiences, and even humor falls flat. Akshay Kumar's dominance in every scene diminishes the female characters to mere props, highlighting the film's shallow and misogynistic narrative (Ghosh, 2022). *Samrat Prithviraj* endeavors to revitalize cultural nationalism but falls short, failing to provide any real insight into the minds of Prithviraj and Ghori or recreate the spectacular poetry of war and valor on screen. The conflict between Mohammad Ghori and Prithviraj Chauhan is portrayed as more of a personal feud than a clash of civilizations (Sharma, 2022). While religious themes are presented, they are not explored deeply, and the devastation of the Somnath Temple is mentioned but not delved into. Despite the film's use of the word "dharma", it attempts to depict Prithviraj as a righteous monarch, and thus it ultimately reduces history to a basic, simple choice (Narmada, 2022). The portrayal of characters lacks depth, and the film fails to provide any real insight into the complexities of the period (Pandey, 2022).

A questionnaire: "Do you think that these films were boycotted because they lack quality content?" was used to gather qualitative data from the respondents. The findings show a wide range of opinions about the quality of the content of the selected films. Many respondents, who belong to the younger age group (18-21), with a lower educational background, said that the boycotted movies lacked high-quality content. They had real issues with the overall story, storytelling, and execution. They have weak narrative coherence, and they disconnect with the viewer (and the existence of inaccurate or deceptive content). They said shortcomings were apparent in the films, such as *Laal Singh Chaddha*, *Raksha Bandhan*, and *Samrat Prithviraj*. One respondent noted, "*Laal Singh Chaddha* looked more like a series of forced scenes than a real story. I could not connect with the character or the message. The respondents highlighted that the perceived absence of quality content primarily caused audience unhappiness.

They also pointed out that political factors were behind the boycotts; on the other hand, the respondents who belonged to the higher age group (26-31), and who had a higher educational background, stressed that political agendas or cultural sensitivities led the boycotts rather than the quality of the content. They



argued that a movie like *PK* was targeted because of its provocative topics, despite the film featuring good content. One respondent stated, "*People targeted PK not because it was a bad film, but because it dared to question religious dogma.*" These interpretations reflect a critical decoding of material, where the message is comprehended but rejected owing to personal or ideological beliefs.

The respondents of the 22-25 age group expressed more **nuanced negotiation of meaning**. They believe the criticism is exaggerated and attribute the boycotts to larger socio-political forces rather than actual story or scripting issues. This highlights how a complex interaction of factors, such as artistic value, external influence, and societal norms, shapes audience judgments of film quality.

These variances in interpretation highlight how audiences do not passively absorb media but instead filter films via their own cultural, ideological, and emotional lenses. What one group considers as mediocre storytelling, another may see as daring narrative risk. Conversely, what some see as insulting, others decipher as critical realism.

Over time, exposure to established media types influences viewer expectations. When films vary from these patterns — either in content, tone, or political position — they may be rejected not simply for what they are, but for what they are not. This conditioning changes viewers' understanding of "quality," integrating aesthetic assessment into deeper cultural and ideological frameworks.

2) Perception through the spectacles of religion and culture

The study investigated whether audiences' perceptions of films were influenced by their culture and religion. Movies are like mirrors that reflect society's values, beliefs, and sensitivities. They also promote critical thinking and social change.

"The film 'PK' critically questions society standards by depicting a wide spectrum of religious beliefs and activities.' PK's emphasizes the concept that appearances can be deceptive through its investigation of religious variety, delivering a subtle comment on the complexity of faith and society (Saltz, 2014).. *PK* questions religious rituals in one scene, prompting viewers to reconsider societal norms. The movie delves into the problems with oversimplified religious doctrine and stereotypes, such as when Tapasviji incites religious tensions. Another controversial scene involves a portrayal of Lord Shiva, which

offended religious sentiments. Dialogues like *Tum bhagwan ka sandeshwahak banne ka dawa karte ho, lekin tum sirf ek chalak dhokebaaz ho, jo logon ki kamzoriyon ka shikaar karta hai*, meaning "You claim to be a messenger of God, but you are nothing but a con artist preying on people's vulnerabilities." This scene sparked the audience's anger, directly challenging symbolic systems that viewers had internalized over time.

Laal Singh Chaddha explores cultural differences through the Sikh protagonist. However, a scene where Laal dismisses Hindu rituals when he was asked by a Pakistani personnel *main namaz padhta hoon aur dua karta hoon, Laal, Tum aisa kyun nahi karte? Meri maa ne kaha ki ye sab puja-path malaria hai. Ye dange karwata hai*, meaning "I offer Namaz and pray, Laal, why don't you do the same? My mother said all this puja paath is malaria, it escalates". It was the laal response (Staff, 2022). The statement not only provokes and instigates thoughts but also elicits "enraged emotions among the followers of the Hindu religion". A participant explained, "*Religion is not to be insulted. Even if the video has a positive message, it goes too far when it assaults our values.*" These emotional responses indicate that audiences see religious representations not just as literary techniques, but also as personal affronts, especially when they contradict the belief systems they have been exposed to throughout time.

The film masterfully portrays the *Raksha Bandhan* celebration, highlighting family bonds through the ritual of tying the *Rakhi*. *Samrat Prithviraj* honors India's cultural legacy, depicting medieval India's richness and emphasizing religious tolerance in Prithviraj's speech, stating, *In hamare raajya mein har dharm ka sammaan hai. Chahe hum Sikh ho, Christian, Muslim, ya Hindu, hum sabhi is bhoome ke vanshaj hain*, meaning "Every faith is respected in our kingdom. Whether we are Sikh, Christian, Muslim, or Hindu, we are all descendants of this land". (Mitra, 2022). These components appealed to respondents who are used to seeing more positive images of Indian ancestry and religious harmony, supporting a familiar worldview.

In-depth qualitative research was conducted to assess whether these films were boycotted because they depicted religious content and symbols that hurt people's sentiments.

The findings explore a wide range of opinions on boycotting movies because of the derogatory content. The respondents of the age group 26-31 with a higher educational background expressed that people are wounded when their religious views are questioned. They are susceptible to religious matters. Their responses suggest a **dominant reading of films as threats to tradition**, mainly when symbols are used



irreverently. They opined that despite the merits of the movie's substance, boycotts of movies like *Laal Singh Chaddha* occurred due to actor Aamir Khan's previous remarks on the "growing intolerance in India". One respondent explained, *"Religion is not something to be mocked. Even if the film has a good message, it crosses a line when it targets our beliefs."*

However, the respondents, aged 22-25, expressed opposing viewpoints. According to some respondents, religious beliefs should be strong enough to be unaffected by other influences, such as movies. They contended that boycotting movies because of cultural or religious overtones was unnecessary since the purpose was to portray history uniquely rather than disparage religions. The finding shows that younger audiences with a lower educational background follow the trend rather than real religious sensitivity. One respondent shared, *"If your faith is strong, no movie can shake it. These films are just reflections of society, not attacks on it."* For this group, filmic critique of religion was not considered as necessarily insulting but rather as a platform for discourse.

These patterns demonstrate how viewers' attitudes to religion in film are informed by their cultural background and long-term ideological affiliations. These divergent reactions demonstrate how long-standing views and access to dominant narratives impact a viewer's tolerance for critical portrayals. The understanding of religious material is mediated via personal identification and group affiliation, which leads to emotional defensiveness or openness depending on cultural training. Thus, cinematic representation grows the site of struggle between tradition and critique.

3) Subjective selection of the actors

This research investigated whether the audience's selection of the actors determined these films. The portrayal of actors in Bollywood films often influences audience perceptions and, consequently, the success or failure of a movie.

For instance, Aamir Khan, known as the "Perfectionist of Bollywood," is celebrated for his dedication to his roles. The actor goes above and beyond to make his character appear credible on screen. While his portrayal in the PK film made his lips redder during the shoot, he consumed paan, or betel leaves (What Aamir Khan, 2023). In *Laal Singh Chaddha*, he looks unhinged, starting from voice tics and overdone acting, making Laal wired and more like Mr. Bean than Forrest Gump. The laal's bug-eyed stare and



exaggerated gestures give the impression that he is parodying a real person (Mukherjee, 2022). However, despite his efforts in films like *PK* and *Laal Singh Chaddha*, some critics argue that his performances lack the depth seen in his earlier work. One respondent said, "*I used to respect Aamir Khan, but after his statements, I cannot separate him from the character*". This reaction demonstrates how viewers transfer their real-life selves onto fictitious roles, influencing film interpretation through past emotional associations.

Conversely, Akshay Kumar's role in *Raksha Bandhan* receives praise for his emotional range and commitment to his character. In the comedic moments, he is funny, and in the emotional ones, he is incredibly vulnerable (Kukreja, 2022). However, his portrayal in *Samrat Prithviraj* faces criticism, with some attributing the film's failure to his awkward depiction of the historical figure. Akshay Kumar is old, and his white, hairy chest, representing the 26-year-old kind, is quite funny; just wearing a king's cloth and a fake mustache (Mitra, 2022). Such audience reactions demonstrate how personal connection with an actor, or lack thereof, influences how viewers interact with a character and whether or not they interact with the film.

The qualitative research inquired into whether the boycotting of the films was determined by the audience's subjective selection of the actors. The respondents, who were the audience, belonging to the age group 26-31, expressed that the actors' past actions and remarks in the public domain affect the audience's selection of the actors. They highlight the subjective nature of attitudes towards actors and acknowledge the potential impact of their actions or statements on boycott decisions. Additionally, they recognize the importance of actors' cultural backgrounds and personal images. The failure of *the Samrat Prithviraj* film is due to Akshay Kumar's subjective approach.

On the other hand, Respondents aged 18-21 primarily attribute boycotts to actors but also consider influences such as the masses or the film's subject matter and themes. One remarked, "*I did not watch Laal Singh Chaddha because everyone on Twitter said it was anti-national. I did not want to support it*". In this case, the collective mood generated by digital media exposure rather than personal evaluations influenced audience judgments. For others in this group, actor identification has become a surrogate for political or cultural affinity, supplanting critical engagement with the film.



In contrast, the 22-25 age group's response is mixed. Some expressed doubts about the actors' impact and raised concerns about other aspects like dialogue or filmmaking techniques, while others refrain from discussing the role of actors altogether. Others choose not to remark on the actor, indicating a disengagement from off-screen concerns.

These findings show that viewers do not merely react to films as self-contained texts; instead, they understand them via the lenses of actor-image, ideological alignment, and cultural trust. The performer becomes a symbolic character, representing ideals audiences embrace, reject, or are uncertain about. When there is a mismatch between the audience's values and an actor's public persona, the actor's mere presence might result in disengagement from the film, regardless of its quality.

This behavior also reflects long-term exposure to media narratives in which performers are idolized or condemned, resulting in predictable audience expectations. The film becomes a place where off-screen personality and on-screen performance merge, causing spectators to judge based on personal trust, cultural affinity, or political resistance, rather than just narrative.

4) Controversial comment of actors

One of the study's primary objectives was to determine whether the controversial comments made by the actors through social media platforms caused the boycott of the films in which they played prominent roles.

The film *PK* faced backlash on Twitter after people watched it, believing that it had insulted Hinduism, Islam, and godmen. Religious extremists expressed their discontent with the depiction of Hindus in the film, leading to irrational reactions on social media and the trending hashtag #Boycott. The controversy stemmed from perceived disrespectful remarks about Hindus and godmen, with some even accusing the movie of supporting the "love-jihad" movement (Ranjan, 2015). Others choose not to remark on the actor, indicating a disengagement from off-screen concerns.

Laal Singh Chadda's films were boycotted because of Actor Aamir Khan's statement on intolerance during an event. He further fueled the controversy, with his remarks leading to boycott tweets trending on Twitter. In an interview during an event, he said, "As an individual, as part of this country, as a



citizen, we read in the papers what is happening; we see it on the news, and certainly, I have been alarmed. I cannot deny it. I have been alarmed by several incidents". He added, "When I chat with Kiran at home, she says, 'Should we move out of India?' That is a disastrous and big statement for Kiran to make. She fears for her child. She fears what the atmosphere around us will be. She fears opening the newspapers daily" (Bagchi, 2022). This statement led the audience to boycott the film.

The writer of the *Raksha Bandhan* film's old tweet was the reason for their boycott. The Dillon's "Hinduphobic" post related to *gau mutra*, hijab ban, and communal lynching sparked online criticism towards the film (Why Is, 2022). Some audience members have shared screenshots of Kanika's past tweets. This kind of tweet by Kanika had made the audience boycott the film. The audience also questions Akshya Kumar for working with those people who are against the Hindu tradition.

The controversy about *Samrat Prithviraj* originated from actor Akshay Kumar's alleged hypocrisy regarding temple visits. During the release of the movie *O My God* in 2012, Kumar stated that he would not visit the temple anymore. However, the actor has been visiting temples nonstop to promote his new film, *Samrat Prithviraj*. He even conducted the "Ganga Aarti" at Varanasi's Kasi Viswanath Temple (Chauhan, 2022). One respondent stated, "*How can he say God is within us in one film and then do Ganga Aarti just for promotion? That is not faith, that is marketing.*" This represents a perceived breach of authenticity, in which promotional activity contradicts previous ideological beliefs, leading viewers to regard the actor—and hence the film—as opportunistic.

The qualitative research explored whether the controversial comments made by the actors on public platforms led the audience to boycott their films. The findings revealed diverse perspectives among respondents. Those aged 26-31, with higher education levels, agree that actors' controversial comments lead to film boycotts. They acknowledged the significant influence of famous personalities like actors in shaping public opinion and movements. They advocated for free expression without fear of backlash. However, they also pushed for free expression and warned against boycotts based merely on media uproar.

Respondents aged 22-25 doubt the direct impact of celebrities' statements on movie-watching choices, suggesting boycotts may have politically motivated campaigns or social media ecosystems. Others remained neutral, noting that spectators should separate personal beliefs from creative achievement.



Younger respondents (18-21) frequently echoed boycott tales discovered online, sometimes without responding to the original statement or substance. One trend is the dependence on social cues and viral mood, demonstrating how acquired media habits and the repetition of outrage narratives impact decision-making without direct content evaluation.

These comments show how public conversation, aided by social and digital media, shapes celebrity identity in ways that influence audience interpretation of films. An actor's off-screen conduct, attitudes, and connections influence how their on-screen performances are perceived.

As a result, the picture is no longer perceived in isolation, but rather as a symbol of political, religious, or cultural unity. Audiences react not only to filmic substance, but also to what the film is believed to symbolize, depending on who is affiliated with it. This impression is shaped over time by frequent exposure to ideological conflict, polarizing media narratives, and the personalization of politics through celebrity culture.

Conclusion and recommendations

The study findings provide a deeper insight into audience reactions to films like *PK*, *Laal Singh Chaddha*, *Raksha Bandhan*, and *Samrat Prithviraj*. Public reactions to these films show that boycotts are motivated by a complex interplay of personal values, ideological alignment, and collective sentiment, rather than content quality. Demographic variables, particularly age and education, significantly impact how audiences interpret films. Older and more educated respondents frequently linked boycotts to larger sociopolitical discussions, but younger and less educated viewers tended to focus on felt disrespect, internet trends, or simple narrative reactions.

These findings highlight that today's audience engagement with cinema is active, emotional, and influenced by long-term cultural exposure and identity positioning. Film is no longer consumed in isolation; it is assessed in light of the viewer's background, beliefs, and media habits.

In light of these findings, it is advised that the film industry actively reflect public sentiment, especially when dealing with delicate issues such as religion, nationalism, or historical depiction. Filmmakers should aim for cultural sensitivity and contextual richness in their stories while retaining creative integrity.



Moreover, there must be constant conversation between creative freedom and communal accountability. Industry professionals and consumers alike must realize that although films can disrupt norms, they must also traverse ethical limits intelligently.

To foster a healthier relationship between cinema and society, deeper audience research, open communication, and a balanced media environment—one that respects expression while discouraging reactionary outrage—will be required. Understanding the emotional, cultural, and ideological factors that shape audience perception will enable stakeholders to engage in more informed, inclusive, and responsible filmmaking.

References

- Adhikary, S. (2022, December 26). *What powers the boycott Bollywood movement and why is it working?* India Today. <https://www.indiatoday.in/movies/standpoint/story/what-powers-the-boycott-bollywood-movement-and-why-is-it-working-2313692-2022-12-26>
- Agarwal, S. (2023). *#BoycottBollywood: Camouflaging misogyny and Islamophobia in a movement* [Master's thesis, University of Michigan]. <https://doi.org/10.7302/7937>
- Bhat, P. (2022, August 11). *5 reasons why Bollywood films flop these days & 2 reasons why people still love them.* MENSXP. <https://www.mensxp.com/entertainment/bollywood/114351-reasons-why-people-are-boycotting-bollywood-films-flopping.html>
- Bhooshan, S., Pai, R. P., & Nandakumar, R. (2022). A sentiment analysis of a boycott movement on Twitter. In S. Smys, R. Bestak, R. Palanisamy, & I. Kotuliak (Eds.), *Computer networks and inventive communication technologies* (pp. 313–324). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-3728-5_23
- Chabba, S. (2022, September 13). *India: Boycott campaigns compound Bollywood woes.* DW. <https://www.dw.com/en/boycott-bollywood-hindi-film-industry-struggles-in-the-face-of-mass-campaigns/a-63105667>
- Chandan, A. (Director). (2022). *Laal Singh Chaddha* [Film]. Aamir Khan Productions; Viacom18 Motion Pictures.
- Chandra, A. (n.d.). *7 things we learned from PK.* Skyshot Media. <https://www.skyshot.in/post/7-things-we-learned-from-pk>
- Chauhan. (2022, June 3). *'Boycott Samrat Prithviraj' trends as Akshay's most ambitious movie releases, here's why.* MENSXP. <https://www.mensxp.com/entertainment/bollywood/108961-boycott-samrat-prithviraj-trends-akshay-kumar-manushi-chhillar-sanjay-dutt-sonu-sood.html>
- Dwivedi, C. P. (Director). (2022). *Samrat Prithviraj* [Film]. Yash Raj Films.



- Firstpost. (2024, January 10). *Samrat Prithviraj director opens up on film's poor box office performance: 'Akshay Kumar had tears...'* <https://www.firstpost.com/entertainment/samrat-prithviraj-director-chandraprakash-dwivedi-opens-up-on-films-poor-performance-akshay-kumar-had-tears-aditya-chopra-13595212.html>
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 172–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x>
- Ghosh, S. (2022, August 11). *'Laal Singh Chaddha' review: Film stays true to the spirit of 'Forrest Gump'*. The Quint. <https://www.thequint.com/entertainment/movie-reviews/laal-singh-chaddha-review-aamir-khan-kareena-kapoor-forrest-gump-advait-chandan>
- Ghosh, S. (2022, August 11). *Review: Regressive & loud, 'Raksha Bandhan' is an unbearable watch*. The Quint. <https://www.thequint.com/entertainment/movie-reviews/raksha-bandhan-review-anand-l-rai-akshay-kumar-bhumi-pednekar>
- Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe, & P. Willis (Eds.), *Culture, media, language* (pp. 128–138). Routledge.
- Hirani, R. (Director). (2014). *PK* [Film]. Rajkumar Hirani Films; Vinod Chopra Productions.
- Khurana, A. (2022, August 11). *Raksha Bandhan movie review: A touching sibling bond story that turns into a social commentary*. The Times of India. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/entertainment/hindi/movie-reviews/raksha-bandhan/movie-review/93486447.cms>
- Kukreja, M. R. (2022, August 11). *RakshaBandhan review: Akshay Kumar's emotional film has strong message on dowry*. Hindustan Times. <https://www.hindustantimes.com/entertainment/bollywood/raksha-bandhan-review-akshay-kumar-film-moves-you-to-tears-with-strong-message-on-dowry-101660190649177.html>
- Mallick, K., & Abhilash. (2022, October 7). *Ballooning of the 'Boycott Bollywood' trend – Who are the players behind it?* The Quint. <https://www.thequint.com/news/webqoof/people-behind-the-boycott-bollywood-trend-analysis>
- Menon, N. (2020). Hindu Rashtra and Bollywood: A new front in the battle for cultural hegemony. *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, (24/25). <https://doi.org/10.4000/samaj.6846>
- Mitra, S. (2022, June 9). *'Samrat Prithviraj' movie review: An expansive, though dreary, historical epic*. The New Indian Express. <https://www.newindianexpress.com/entertainment/review/2022/Jun/04/samrat-prithviraj-movie-review-an-expansive-though-dreary-historical-epic-2461497.html>
- Mukherjee, N. (2022, August 18). *The worst thing about Laal Singh Chaddha is Aamir Khan | Review*. India Today. <https://www.indiatoday.in/movies/bollywood/story/laal-singh-chaddha-movie-review-aamir-khan-is-the-worst-thing-about-the-film-1986582-2022-08-11>
- Narmada. (2022, June 4). *Samrat Prithviraj: Is the movie based on mightiest king of India worth watching?* Shortpedia. <https://voices.shortpedia.com/arts-and-entertainment/film/samrat-prithviraj-movie-review/>
- News18. (2023, June 28). *What Aamir Khan did to ace his character in PK*. <https://www.news18.com/movies/what-aamir-khan-did-to-ace-his-character-in-pk-8193013.html>



- Pandey, G. (2022, June 9). *Samrat Prithviraj: Why did a Bollywood film on a popular Hindu king fail?* BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-61703724>
- Rangan, B. (2015, January 1). *Who is really offended with 'PK'?* The Hindu. <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/comment-on-pk-movie-controversy/article6745645.ece>
- Saltz, R. (2014, December 19). *Appealing to God, a disoriented space alien hopes there's help out there.* The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/20/movies/pk-explores-religion-through-an-extraterrestrials-eyes.html>
- Saxena, R., & Dhrangadharia, M. (2023). Hindi cinema and society: A study on the perception of Indian youth. *Journal of Communication and Management*, 2(1), 67–71. <https://doi.org/10.58966/JCM20232111>
- Sharma, R. (2022, June 6). *Akshay Kumar's 'Samrat Prithviraj' is an ahistorical nightmare.* The Quint. <https://www.thequint.com/entertainment/movie-reviews/samrat-prithviraj-review-historically-inaccurate-architecture-language-misrepresented>
- Subramanian, S. (2022, October 10). *When the Hindu right came for Bollywood.* The New Yorker. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/10/17/when-the-hindu-right-came-for-bollywood>
- The Express Tribune. (2022, August 13). *'Laal Singh Chaddha' under fire for disrespecting Indian Army.* <https://tribune.com.pk/story/2370964/enraged-emotions-laal-singh-chadda-under-fire-for-disrespecting-indian-army>
- Tilak, S. G. (2022, August 9). *Laal Singh Chaddha: How Aamir Khan adapted Forrest Gump to Bollywood.* BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-62427992>
- Vasudevan, R. (2011). The meanings of 'Bollywood'. In R. Kaur & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Bollywood: Popular Indian cinema through a transnational lens* (pp. 3–29). Routledge.