RESONANCE
Journal of Gazole Mahavidyalaya
ISSN- XXXX XXXX
www.gmg-resonance.com

Narrative Intersections: The Interplay of Postcolonial Cinema and Urban Lives in Kiran Rao's *Dhobi Ghat (Mumbai Diaries)*, 2011

Debasree Dhar
Assistant Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shri Guru Ram Rai University
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India, Email: debasreedhar1@gmail.com

Article History: Submitted on: **April 19, 2026**; Accepted on: **May 4, 2026**

Abstract:

Kiran Rao's debut as director and screenwriter in *Dhobi Ghat* (*Mumbai Diaries*), released globally on 21 January 2011, was striking not only for its confidence but also for its formal ambition. The film threads together the lives of four Mumbai characters drawn from different social locations, using Yasmin's video diaries, Arun's quiet encounter with them, Munna's movement from dhobi to aspiring actor, and Shai's photographic observations of the city to build a layered portrait of urban life. Rather than treating Mumbai as a neutral backdrop, Rao makes it structurally central: the city shapes memory, desire, labour, and alienation in equal measure. In doing so, the film unsettles familiar cinematic patterns of linear narration and stable perspective. It also opens onto broader questions of cultural hybridity, inequality, and identity formation in postcolonial metropolitan India. Read closely, *Dhobi Ghat* becomes more than a city film. It is a careful meditation on aspiration, social difference, and the uneasy textures of contemporary urban belonging.

Keywords:

Identity quest;
Narrative intersections;
Cultural hybridity;
Postcolonial cinema;
Urban life

Introduction

The Indian film industry has undergone repeated reinvention, and each phase has altered not only style and genre but also the kinds of urban, social, and cultural worlds that cinema is willing to stage. In the early twenty-first century, that shift became especially visible in films that moved beyond familiar commercial formulas toward more experimental narrative forms, mixed genres, and peripheral voices. Cross-cultural collaboration, whether through international co-production, festival circulation, or shared creative labour, further widened this horizon. Kiran Rao's *Dhobi Ghat* (Mumbai Diaries) emerges from that changing field with unusual confidence. Released globally in January 2011 after its Toronto premiere in September 2010, the film signalled from the outset that it would not settle for conventional storytelling. Rao's own trajectory, shaped by work with filmmakers such as Ashutosh Gowariker and Mira Nair, clearly informed this ambition. Yet the film does more than display technical assurance. It uses the city, the diary form, and a set of intersecting lives to think through urban belonging in postcolonial India.

What makes *Dhobi Ghat* especially compelling is its refusal to treat Mumbai as a mere setting. The city presses into the narrative as a force that organizes memory, labour, intimacy, and distance. Through Yasmin's video diaries, Arun's retrospective gaze, Munna's aspiring but precarious labour, and Shai's mediated visual curiosity, the film draws together lives that remain unequal even when they briefly touch. That structure matters. It allows Rao to unsettle linear narration while also exposing the uneven textures of metropolitan life. The result is not a polished celebration of cosmopolitan Mumbai, nor a simple critique of urban alienation. It is

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20536171
2026, Vol-1, Issue-1

something more unsettled and, arguably, more interesting: a film that lingers on the ordinary frictions of class, migration, gender, and aspiration.

The present study reads *Dhobi Ghat* as a postcolonial urban text whose formal experimentation is inseparable from its social critique. Rather than separating narrative technique from cultural meaning, the discussion that follows shows how the film makes urban life visible through fragmentation, mediation, and spatial encounter. In that sense, Rao's debut is not just a remarkable first film. It is also a careful rethinking of how contemporary Indian cinema can represent the city, and what kinds of lives that city allows to be seen.

Literature Review

Recent work on Indian cinema increasingly refuses to treat Bollywood as a closed national form. Indian cinema now works through a productive tension between indigenous aesthetics and transnational storytelling, while Viswamohan and Chaudhuri (2022) show that contemporary Hindi films often gain cultural legitimacy through international festival circuits that position them between commercial and art cinema. Read against this literature, *Dhobi Ghat* is less an isolated debut feature than part of a broader post-2010 shift toward formally adventurous Hindi cinema. Yet the existing discussion still tends to separate industrial circulation from textual analysis, leaving open the question of how a film's form itself produces its cultural meaning.

Scholarship on Mumbai similarly treats the city as more than a backdrop. Machado and Jana (2023) argue that cinematic Mumbai operates as a "glocal" and polyphonic urban text in which the city itself becomes a character, while Sarkar (2023) emphasises urban contradiction, informality, slum culture, violence, and uneven governance as recurring cinematic markers of the metropolis. This line of inquiry strongly supports readings of *Dhobi Ghat* as a city-centered film, but it often stops at urban representation. The departure point of the present study is that Mumbai is not merely represented; it organizes the film's narrative architecture. The lives of Yasmin, Arun, Munna, and Shai are not simply set in the city but made legible through it, so that space becomes the mechanism through which intimacy, exclusion, and desire are narrated.

A second body of recent work has moved gender analysis in Hindi cinema away from static victimhood and toward agency, resistance, and self-fashioning. Viswamohan's (2023) anthology consolidates this shift by foregrounding women filmmakers as producers of distinct aesthetic and political visions, while Yadav and Jha (2023) read recent Bollywood as a site of resistance in which women's agency is increasingly central. Kamble and Biswal (2023) extend this argument by showing a gradual transition from cinematic marginalisation of Dalit women to more empowered representations. Even so, this scholarship usually tracks empowerment at the level of character type or industry trend. The newness of this paper lies in showing that female subjectivity in *Dhobi Ghat* is mediated through media practice itself: Yasmin's video diaries and Shai's photography do not merely express identity; they produce it under conditions of classed and gendered visibility.

Language and hybridity have also become central to recent cinema studies. Cowie et al. (2024) demonstrate that Bollywood remains fundamentally Hindi-dominant even when English appears frequently, and that code-switching in film is socially patterned rather than random. That insight is especially relevant to *Dhobi Ghat*, where Hindi, English, Marathi, and Bihari function as markers of class position, mobility, and belonging rather than as decorative realism. This paper departs from purely sociolinguistic readings by connecting multilingual texture to the film's non-linear and epistolary structure: Yasmin's recorded letters, Arun's retrospective viewing, and the cross-class exchanges around Munna and Shai make language part of the film's moral and spatial design. In this sense, hybridity in *Dhobi Ghat* is not only cultural; it is narrative and structural.

Taken together, the recent scholarship clarifies four important strands: transnational legitimacy, city-as-character analysis, women-centred agency, and linguistic hybridity. What remains underdeveloped is a reading that brings these strands into one interpretive frame for *Dhobi Ghat*. That is the strongest departure point of this study. Its novelty is that it treats Mumbai, narrative form, and postcolonial subjectivity as mutually constitutive rather than separate concerns. By arguing that Rao unsettles conventional storytelling through intersecting voices, mediated diaries, and spatially grounded class encounters, the paper offers a more integrated account of how the film turns urban life into cinematic critique.

Theoretical Framework

The article is positioned at the intersection of four recent critical perspectives: affective urbanism, intermediality, intersectional gender research, and transnational screen-culture theory. Taken together, these lenses make it possible to read *Dhobi Ghat* not simply as a story set in Mumbai, but as a film in which urban space, media form, gendered subjectivity, and cultural circulation actively shape one another. The conceptual emphasis here is deliberately relational. Rather than treating the city as backdrop and the characters as self-contained figures, the framework asks how the film produces meaning through circulation, mediation, and uneven forms of visibility.

Affective urbanism offers the first point of entry. Urban theory has increasingly shifted attention from the city as a fixed spatial arrangement to the city as something felt, sensed, and lived through atmospheres, routines, and emotional textures. Paiva (2024) is especially useful here because the city is understood as holding two tensions at once: a space of consumption and spectacle, and a space that can still be remade through care, attention, and everyday relation. That distinction matters for *Dhobi Ghat*, where Mumbai is not rendered as a stable or neutral environment. It is noisy and intimate, yet also exclusionary and restless. The city presses differently on Yasmin, Arun, Munna, and Shai, shaping their silences, desires, and hesitations. What emerges is not urban scenery but urban feeling, and that feeling is inseparable from social difference. This is one reason the film resists any simple reading of Mumbai as either cosmopolitan promise or oppressive chaos. It is both, and neither fully captures its texture.

The second lens is intermediality. Recent work suggests that contemporary audiovisual texts often derive meaning from the movement between media forms rather than from a single medium alone. Chudý and Müller (2023) treat intermediality as a space where semiotic meaning and media technology must be read together, while Mello (2023) shows how mixed media can deepen, rather than weaken, documentary and realist expression. In *Dhobi Ghat*, this matters because Yasmin's video diaries, Shai's photography, and Arun's artistic practice do more than decorate the narrative. They organise access to the story itself. The film becomes legible through fragments, recorded testimony, and visual traces. Such mediation is not incidental. It is the mechanism through which private memory turns into social commentary. The film therefore asks viewers to think not only about what is shown, but about how seeing is structured.

Intersectional gender research adds another layer of precision. Draude (2024) argues that gender cannot be analysed in isolation from class, race, sexuality, ability, and other social positions, since inequality is generated through their interaction. That insight is essential for *Dhobi Ghat*. Yasmin's vulnerability is inseparable from marriage, migration, and emotional precariousness, while Shai's ease in the city reflects privilege, mobility, and cultural capital. Their experiences are not comparable in any simple sense, even though both are women moving through the same urban landscape. The film also foregrounds the uneven distribution of voice and visibility. Yasmin's testimony reaches the audience only after death, whereas Shai's presence is amplified by art, travel, and social confidence. The framework therefore avoids flattening female subjectivity into a single category. It treats it as socially stratified and differently mediated.

Finally, transnational screen-culture theory helps situate the film within broader patterns of cinematic circulation and hybrid form. Yang and Higbee (2024) show how contemporary screen culture is shaped by policy, co-production, and cross-border practice, while Zhai (2024) links co-production to soft power and transnational talent development. These debates are relevant because *Dhobi Ghat* belongs to a moment when Hindi cinema was becoming more visibly global in style, circulation, and reception. Yet the film's hybridity is not only industrial. It also operates at the level of language, address, and narrative organisation. Hindi, English, Marathi, and Bihari are not decorative markers of realism. They index class, mobility, aspiration, and belonging. On that basis, hybridity here is less a slogan than a structural condition.

The value of bringing these four frameworks together lies in what they reveal jointly. Affective urbanism explains how Mumbai is experienced. Intermediality explains how the narrative is assembled. Intersectional gender research explains how visibility is unevenly distributed. Transnational screen-culture theory explains how the film's hybridity exceeds the local without abandoning it. The resulting argument is that *Dhobi Ghat* constructs urban life as a field of converging relations, where city, media, and subjectivity are mutually constitutive rather than analytically separable.

Discussion

Kiran Rao's *Dhobi Ghat* (*Mumbai Diaries*) remains distinctive because it refuses the easy separation of narrative technique from social meaning. The film is often praised for its formal confidence, and rightly so, but that praise can sometimes flatten what is actually a much more unsettled achievement. Its real strength lies in the way Mumbai is made to operate not as a neutral backdrop, but as an active pressure on the lives unfolding within it. Four characters from sharply different social locations are brought into contact, yet the film never pretends that proximity produces equality. Ponnachan is right to note that "The parallel narratives of the four characters are brilliantly woven together by Rao, highlighting the interconnectedness of human lives in a vast and diverse city like Mumbai" (Ponnachan 2023, 54). Even so, the film is less interested in seamless interconnection than in the fragile, uneven, and often incomplete forms of relation that metropolitan life permits. Mumbai links people together and keeps them apart at the same time. That tension gives the film much of its force.

One of the most notable features of *Dhobi Ghat* is its refusal of linear narration. That choice is not merely decorative or experimental for its own sake. It captures something recognisable about urban experience, which rarely arrives in neat sequence. City life is interrupted, recursive, and full of partial encounters. The film's structure, with its flashbacks, retellings, and mediated points of entry, mirrors this condition closely. The narrative does not advance as a straight line so much as move through traces. This is especially evident in the way Yasmin's video diaries appear after her death, making her voice present only in retrospect. The effect is emotionally subtle but significant. The audience is drawn into a relationship with her that is delayed, incomplete, and therefore more painful. Her words arrive as remnants, not as immediate presence, and that belatedness becomes part of the film's ethical design. It asks viewers to listen after loss has already taken place.

Yasmin's recordings also introduce the film's epistolary dimension, which is easy to describe but harder to reduce to function. They are not simply a plot device used to move information from one scene to another. They are acts of self-address shaped by distance, affection, and restraint. Speaking to her younger brother, Yasmin tries to narrate Mumbai as a place that can still be inhabited with hope, yet the tone of the diaries often carries a quiet melancholy beneath the warmth. The opening image of her speaking from inside a car while looking at the city is especially telling. She is physically within Mumbai, but not fully at ease in it. She sees the sea, the streets, the movement, the promise of scale, but the scene never resolves into belonging. Her migration from Malihabad to Mumbai carries that same suspended quality. She is between places, not securely settled in either. The film does not dramatise this with excess. It allows the uncertainty to remain visible in the texture of her speech and the pauses around it.

That is why Yasmin's narrative matters so much to the film's broader social argument. Her life gathers together several of its central concerns: gendered vulnerability, migration, class pressure, emotional disappointment, and the precariousness of urban hope. Her marriage does not provide the security it seems to promise, and the film is careful not to sentimentalise that failure. Instead, it presents disappointment as something cumulative and ordinary, emerging from daily life rather than from a single spectacular crisis. Yasmin's dignity lies in the film's refusal to reduce her to a victim. She is vulnerable, certainly, but she is also reflective, observant, and quietly resilient. The tragedy of her story is not simply personal. It reflects the structures that make certain forms of female suffering less visible until it is too late. Her voice survives only through mediation, which gives the film its most poignant reminder of how easily some lives disappear from public attention.

Arun represents a different kind of urban condition. His alienation is not imposed from outside in the same direct way as Yasmin's, yet it is no less real. He is materially secure, socially mobile, and culturally insulated, but he is also detached, subdued, and emotionally withholding. The film does not simplify him into a privileged observer who merely benefits from the city's inequalities. Rather, it shows a man whose distance from others has become a kind of habit. That habit is interrupted by Yasmin's diaries. Her recordings pull him back toward ordinary life, toward the city as lived environment rather than as artistic abstraction. The shift is not dramatic, and its refusal of drama is part of what makes it persuasive. Arun's return to the spaces Yasmin has shown him suggests that art can still be an act of attention, but only when it remains answerable to other lives. His painting, then, is less a declaration of mastery than a revised mode of seeing, one made possible by contact with a voice he can no longer answer.

The brief relationship between Arun and Shai extends this line of thought, though in a more fragile register. Their encounter is not presented as a romantic solution, nor does the film try to build it into one. What matters is the asymmetry of expectation that passes between them. Shai is drawn to Arun's reserve, perhaps because she senses in it a depth absent from the more polished social circles she inhabits. Yet Arun remains elusive in ways that frustrate the very intimacy she seeks. Their interaction reveals how metropolitan encounters often begin with curiosity but end in misunderstanding. The city creates opportunities for contact, but it does not guarantee emotional availability. That simple fact is one of the film's quieter insights. Shai's disappointment is real, but so is the film's refusal to treat that disappointment as melodrama. It is one more example of the incomplete exchanges that structure urban life.

Yasmin's significance extends far beyond her own subplot. She becomes the film's clearest lens on how visibility works in the city. Her voice is intimate, but it is not immediately heard. Her testimony reaches the audience only after death, and that delay is not accidental. It underscores the fact that some lives become audible only retrospectively, when they are already lost. The film avoids turning her suicide into spectacle, which would have been the easier and less responsible choice. Instead, it frames her death as part of a larger pattern of neglect and disillusionment. That choice matters. Yasmin is not simply one suffering individual in an otherwise stable urban environment. She is a concentrated expression of the city's uneven moral economy. Her story makes clear that Mumbai's promise is distributed unevenly, and that the costs of that imbalance are often borne quietly, in private, before they become legible to anyone else.

Munna brings a very different but equally important perspective. As a dhobi and rat killer who dreams of becoming an actor, he embodies the collision of labour and aspiration that runs throughout the film. His ambition is not comic in any trivial sense, even if the film occasionally allows his energy to appear playful. It is one of the most serious elements in the narrative. Munna's desire to enter Bollywood is not just a wish for fame. It is a wish for social transformation. Cinema offers him a vocabulary for imagining a different self, one less constrained by the narrow expectations attached to class position and occupation. Hall's account of identity is especially apt here: "Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact… we should think, instead, of identity as a 'production', which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation" (Hall 1996; Hall 2011). Munna's life gives that argument concrete form. His identity is not fixed by what he does for a living. It is continually being produced through imitation, performance, desire, and frustration.

His relationship to Bollywood is particularly revealing. The film does not mock his admiration for Salman Khan, nor does it present fandom as simple delusion. Munna's attachment to film culture is bound up with the work of self-fashioning. Posters, gestures, clothing, and physical discipline all become part of his attempt to imagine a different life. At the same time, the film quietly reminds us that aspiration does not cancel hierarchy. Bollywood may sell mobility, but it does not open its doors equally. Munna's dream is sincere, even touching, but the barriers around him remain stubbornly real. The film therefore turns his storyline into a subtle critique of the industry that he admires. It suggests that popular cinema can nourish aspiration while still withholding access from the very people who most need its promise. That tension is handled with unusual tact.

Shai introduces another layer of ambiguity. As an affluent NRI, she moves through the city with ease, yet her ease does not eliminate loneliness or uncertainty. Her fascination with the dhobi community is one of the film's more difficult elements, and it is to Rao's credit that it is never made entirely transparent. At times her attention seems like genuine curiosity, at other moments it risks looking like the selective attraction of a privileged observer who romanticises the margins. The film does not resolve this ambiguity, and perhaps it should not. Shai is drawn to forms of life unlike her own, but her position of privilege remains intact. Her photography becomes a way of looking, yet also a way of testing who she might be in relation to the city. She is mobile, articulate, and socially confident, but these qualities do not secure belonging. They simply make it easier for her to pass through spaces without being fully claimed by them.

The scenes in which Shai is teased for spending time with Munna are among the most revealing in the film. Their bluntness is almost casual, which is precisely why they matter. Comments about class, contamination, and social "place" expose boundaries that the city would rather imagine as softened by cosmopolitanism. The joke about her being vaccinated if her mother learns where she has been, along with the reminders of Munna's supposed *"aukat,"* makes class hierarchy visible in ordinary speech. Rao does not press these moments for

symbolic weight. She lets their everydayness speak for itself. That is enough. The city may encourage movement, but it does not abolish rank. Often, it merely hides rank inside intimacy.

This is also where the film becomes especially persuasive as a meditation on hybridity. Its concern is not with abstract cultural mixing or with the celebratory rhetoric of global exchange. It is concerned with the uneven and improvised forms of contact that actually take place in urban life. Shai and Munna do not meet as equals, yet neither do they remain untouched by the encounter. She introduces him to other ways of imagining style and aspiration; he brings her into closer contact with the textures of labour and local life. Tuncer's formulation is useful here: "The idea of equality and mutual exchange between cultures is an approach that was proposed as an alternative to the criticisms of cultural hybridization and assimilation. This idea advocates for cultures to interact with each other while respecting each other, resulting in the emergence of new cultural expressions" (Tuncer 2023, 97). *Dhobi Ghat* partially fits this description, though the film is careful enough to show that respect cannot be assumed and power does not disappear simply because exchange occurs. Hybridity in the film is not harmonious. It is uneven, contingent, and sometimes awkward. Yet that awkwardness is precisely what gives it credibility.

Mumbai itself is the medium through which all these movements become visible. Iyer's claim that "Mumbai is refreshing in not focusing only on the glitzy, global attractions of Bollywood, as many recent popular publications have, but in touching upon various categories of Bombay cinema that provide a kaleidoscopic view of the city and capture the variety of experiences the city and its cinema afford" (Iyer 2014, 5) helps clarify the film's orientation, though Rao's handling of the city goes beyond representational variety. The city is not simply displayed in multiple forms. It is used to organise different relations of looking, labour, and memory. Streets, apartments, galleries, laundries, and railway edges all carry social meaning. That is why the title matters so much. Dhobi Ghat is a place where garments from different households are washed together, but they do not emerge identical. They retain traces, stains, and residues. The image is exact. The film gathers diverse lives into one frame without pretending that contact erases difference.

The ending follows from that logic. It remains open because the city itself remains open, unfinished, and unequal. Closure would have felt false. Rao is more interested in sustained attention than in resolution, and that choice gives the film its quiet confidence. The viewer is left with a sense that Mumbai is a place where people become visible to themselves only partially and often late, through others who may not fully understand them. That is not a bleak conclusion so much as a disciplined one. It recognises that urban life rarely offers neat moral lessons. It offers interruption, proximity, misrecognition, and occasional tenderness. *Dhobi Ghat* understands those conditions without romanticising them. Its value lies in that balance.

Taken together, the film's characters do not form a harmonious urban mosaic. They expose the pressures through which class, gender, labour, media, and aspiration are negotiated in contemporary Mumbai. Rao's achievement is to hold those pressures together without forcing them into a single ideological line. The formal experimentation, the diaries, the images, and the subdued emotional register all contribute to that aim. What emerges is a portrait of the city that is at once intimate and structural, private and political. That combination is difficult to sustain, and the film does so with unusual control. It remains compelling because it treats urban life as a field of crossings that are always meaningful and never fully settled.

Conclusion

Kiran Rao's *Dhobi Ghat (Mumbai Diaries)* gains its significance not simply from formal innovation, but from the way that innovation is made to bear social weight. The film's non-linear movement across Yasmin's video diaries, Arun's retrospective viewing, Munna's precarious aspiration, and Shai's mediated curiosity does more than connect four lives. It makes Mumbai itself active in the production of meaning, shaping intimacy, distance, and visibility in ways that are hard to reduce to a single interpretive frame. The city appears neither as a neutral backdrop nor as a celebratory emblem of cosmopolitan modernity. Rather, it becomes a contested social field in which class, gender, labour, and desire are continuously negotiated. Read from that angle, the film's fragmentary form is not ornamental. It is central to its critique.

Two findings remain especially important. First, the film confirms that identity in urban postcolonial life is not fixed but produced through relation, memory, and representation, a view that sits closely with Hall's account of identity as unfinished and relational. Second, the film shows that hybridity is not a polished sign of cultural openness. It is lived unevenly, through exchanges marked by aspiration, mobility, and exclusion, which

makes De Zoysa and Appadurai's (1998) account of global cultural circulation and Tuncer's discussion of hybridization useful, though neither fully captures the film's quieter tensions. Yasmin, Munna, and Shai never occupy the same social position, and the film does not pretend otherwise.

The study's contribution lies in bringing these concerns together. Instead of treating postcoloniality, class, or hybridity as separate topics, it argues that *Dhobi Ghat* binds them into one narrative system. That has value for film studies because it shifts attention from plot summary to form, and for broader cultural analysis because it shows how urban cinema can register inequality without turning it into spectacle.

Still, the analysis remains limited by its single-film focus and textual method. Future work could place *Dhobi Ghat* beside other Indian urban films or examine audience reception and circulation more directly. Even so, Rao's film endures because it renders metropolitan life with unusual tact, holding together fracture, tenderness, and inequality without forcing closure.

References

Ahmed, Akbar S. 1992. "Bombay Films: The Cinema as Metaphor for Indian Society and Politics." *Modern Asian Studies* 26 (2): 289–320. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X00009793.

Chudý, Tomáš, and Richard Müller. 2023. "Intermediality, Semiotics, and Media Theory." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Intermediality*, 253–284. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28322-2_18.

Cowie, Claire, Lalita Murty, and Beck Sinar. 2024. "Decoding Bollywood: Why Hindi–English Code-Switching and Standard English Outrank Indian English." *English Language and Linguistics* 28 (4): 683–708. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674324000534.

De Zoysa, D. A., and Arjun Appadurai. 1998. "Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization." *International Migration Review* 32 (4): 1073. https://doi.org/10.2307/2547675.

Draude, Claude. 2023. "Digital Transformation Through the Lens of Intersectional Gender Research." In *Introduction to Digital Humanism*, 83–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45304-5_6.

Hall, Stuart. 2021. *Cultural Identity and Diaspora*. Duke University Press.

Hall, Stuart, and Paul du Gay. 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: SAGE.

Iyer, Usha. 2014. "Book Review: World Film Locations: Mumbai." *Wide Screen* 5 (1).

Kamble, Chandrakant, and Santosh Kumar Biswal. 2023. "The Changing Role of Marginalised Women in Hindi Cinema." *Media Watch* 14 (3): 386–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/09760911231191266.

Machado, Glynis, and Ujjwal Jana. 2023. "The City in Film: Reading Dhobi Ghat and Island City as Cinematic Representations of Mumbai." *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies* 10 (2): 269–283. https://doi.org/10.1386/jucs_00074_1.

Mello, Cecília. 2023. "Looking at China from Abroad: Intermediality as a Tool for Documentary." *International Communication of Chinese Culture* 10 (1): 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40636-023-00261-z.

Ponnachan, Keerthy Sophiya. 2023. "One City, Many Lives: Exploring the Quintessence of Mumbai City in the Movie Dhobi Ghat." *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences* 8 (6): 50–54. https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.86.8.

Rao, Kiran, dir. 2010. Dhobi Ghat. Aamir Khan Productions.

Sarkar, Sumita. 2023. "Examining Mumbai, Space and Urban Informality Through Its Cinematic Lens." *International Journal of Social Science Technology and Economics Management* 1 (1). https://doi.org/10.59781/8634ajeu.

Tuncer, Fatih Fuat. 2023. "Discussing Globalization and Cultural Hybridization." *Universal Journal of History and Culture* 5 (2): 85–103. https://doi.org/10.52613/ujhc.1279438.

Viswamohan, Aysha Iqbal, and Sanchari Basu Chaudhuri. 2022. "Traversing Boundaries: Contemporary Hindi Cinema at International Film Festivals." *South Asian Popular Culture* 21 (1): 89–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746689.2022.2115736.

Yadav, Sheetal, and Smita Jha. 2023. “Bollywood as a Site of Resistance: Women and Agency in Indian Popular Culture.” *Journal of International Women’s Studies* 25 (3): 1–14.

Yang, Yanling, and Will Higbee. 2024. “Sino-International Film Collaboration and Co-Production.” *Transnational Screens* 15 (2): 121–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/25785273.2024.2375120.

Zhai, Poppy Qian. 2024. “The Recent Sino-Danish Film Co-Productions.” *Transnational Screens* 15 (2): 179–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/25785273.2024.2375132.

Note on contributor(s)

Dr. Debasree Dhar’s research expertise lies in examining women’s conditions, welfare policies, health, agency, and development. With a strong publication record in prominent academic journals, she has also presented her work at various national and international conferences, showcasing her contributions to the field.