

Tanishq Chaudhary 2019114007

Preliminary Analysis

I worked on the computational part of the movie analysis. This includes all the graphs; the pie charts and the bar plots that you have seen in our previous projects. My work started with data cleaning, and converting the textual data from the movie scripts into a workable format. Once that was done, I sat with all the other team members one by one and helped them with confirming or rejecting their hypothesis. For example, I sat with Aaradhya to figure out the pronoun split in Dangal and I worked with Shivansh to figure English/Hindi split pre and post Rani's visit abroad, and so on. We drew upon numerous insights about context, power, solidarity and social hierarchy, by focusing on the variations in the language used.

To summarise, I explored:

- pronoun split (best case in Dangal)
- language split (seen in Pink and Queen)
- pure language split (only english/hindi sentences) (seen in Pink mostly; due to court related locations)
- frequencies of words used (general idea of words used. Names along with functional words came on the top for all the movies)
- splitting the use of language pre and post an event (mostly used in Queen, for her visit outside of India)

I also read up on Lakoff's work - articles and papers relating to it, to find testable parameters, and came up with the analyses of the major features:

- Slangs: Slangs showed the most distinctions, but their overall quantity was quite low. Since they were feminist movies, it can be explained that all of them showed a greater use of slangs by females than men. The difference is in the ratio of approximately 1:2 for men:women.
- Taboo Words: Another interesting thought was that the feminist themed movies show a lot of conversations between close female friends. This allows for talking about taboo subjects for women; which is a common theme to explore and showcase for such movies.
- Questions: Surprisingly, the number of questions asked were greater for men than women. This is very tricky to explain, and we could not find any good reasons for such a result.
- Hedges: the use of hedges was not statistically significant; men and women showed an almost equal number of usage of the chosen hedge phrases.

=====

Survey Analysis

Robin Lakoff - Still Relevant?

We made a google form (credits: Prajnaya) and had it filled by undergraduate students of age 18-20. The form had multiple questions which we made based on the ideas of Lakoff. The detailed statistics are explained in Joint Team Report, and the visuals (all done by me) are attached there as well.

To summarise, we noted that there were a handful of differences between the features of conversation in men's and women's speeches. However, the differences were minimal. Lakoff's findings were true, but only to some extent. It seems partly due to the fact that we are all of the same age, between 18-20 and there are no

power relations as such; a thing we explored going further. It thus seems that today's awareness is able to age out the claims by Lakoff.

(we also had the option to fill in non-binary, and 5 people did. However, the data is statistically insignificant to make any solid conclusions)

Talking from 9-5

Women and Men at Work - Deborah Tannen

Deborah Tannen explains how many a times, conversations are like rituals. Much like other rituals, we do them not at their face value. For example, consider how we say, "Hey! How are you?" as a greeting. It is not meant literally; it does not mean that we want the listener to hand their entire detailed medical report! It's merely meant as a greeting. In the Philippines, they say, "where are you going?". This may seem odd as a greeting, but only due to cultural differences.

So, how does this tie into a Gender Based Study of Variations in Language? Quite like how cultural differences are able to make things uncomfortable for a person who doesn't know their way around, gender differences have been known to cause much issues in the workplace.

Tannen goes into great detail about all of this and more in her book, "Talking from 9-5: Women and Men at Work", which I chose to read. Many of the differences in the styles of conversation rituals stem from the basic social fact: Men are competitive and Women are cooperative.

Before giving examples, I have to mention that I read the entire book, and quite a few chapters focus purely on sociological differences, one was based on just sex and the other on the ways of dressing, and another one on personality traits. For a dive in the socio-linguistics aspect, I do not think they are helpful. Following are only some examples I cherry-picked, which cover some of the important aspects.

So, let's get a clearer picture here. Conversational Rituals among men are: joking, teasing, banter and playful put downs. In contrast, for women, they are: appearance of equality, avoiding down-playing other's authority, consideration of implications of the interaction.

1. Wage Gap: Let's consider the case of negotiating your salary. There is a superior and a subordinate. Considering the different combinations of M and F, we get:

1: highest raise - 4: lowest raise

sub/super->	F	M
F	3	4
M	2	1

It is clear that men and women in themselves are comfortable with each other in the conversational rituals. So, the pairs should come at the top. But, how MM is 1 and FF is 3. Why? It's because men are assertive. They speak a lot of imperative sentences, which is a way of showing their power.

For example, "We intend execute on plan X", versus, "Um, I think maybe we should try out that ... X plan we have.".

For women, its evident that they are self conscious about themselves. Its a battle of confidence. Thus, they end up setting a low bar for themselves. Both of these reasons directly draw from the rituals. For the case of male superior and women subordinate, we see the lowest raise. This is because the former perceive the latter as weaker and unconfident and too polite.

2. Getting a Job: Another case is that of male boss under whom is a female interviewer, who has to pick between two candidates: M and F. Both were equally qualified, but the change of one single pronoun changes everything: WE vs I.

The M candidate used WE, and talked as if he was already in the company, ready to take decisions. The F interviewer absolutely hated the arrogance of this person. On the other hand, the F candidate used I. She talked how she, as 'I', could contribute to the firm. The F interviewer liked her.

M: "We want to be doing ... so that our company rises on top!" F: "I want to contribute ... so that our company rises on top!"

Interestingly, the male boss thought the complete opposite. He like the M because of the exact same reasons why the F interviewer rejected him! It is evident that we need to be more aware of these differences, to make better decisions ...

3. Getting fired ... or not! There was a F engineer in a team of 4 other Ms. She would not say much even when she disagreed, so as to not make enemies. But once she broke character. She gave a detailed and passionate description about one particular task, and rejected one of the M's ideas. It was clear to her that she stepped over a line, and almost sat down in sadness of her getting fired. But, the M acutally responded by saying: "That was a great rebuttal. I'm really impressed. Let's go out for a beer after work and hash out our approaches to this problem." (quoted from the example)
4. Apologies. Tannen also mentions how women apologize more; not because they are the source of more trouble; but because its their cooperative nature. Many times women say "i'm sorry" to mean that they are sorry the event happend, and not beacause they are at fault. They say it so that the other person is also motivated to say sorry and take the rightful blame. Men, on the other hand do not do this at all. They only apologize strictly when needed. They are also avoidant of saying "sorry" as that puts them in one-down position. Again, these behaviour can be explained by their respective conversational rituals.

It is clear from the above samples that men and women have completely different approaches to the same task. Both use different languages to convey the same thing, but often to different results.

In fact, there are plenty researches out there, which prove that the teachings for children in their childhood affect their way of talking as the grow up. In fact for women, studies also claim that their polite way of speaking is similar to a "powerless" person's way of speaking. This is very well explained by the above idea, since girls are taught to be polite, while its okay for boys to be blunt.

In conclusion, one must be able to see through rituals and understand them for what they are. Be it the differential use of pronoun, or the use of apology words.

=====

Conclusions & Future Work

I did much of the computational work for the entire team, and I got to sit with great observations as I went through the data and sat with my teammates. We explored the drastic differences that context can produce and how there are little features in our speech that is completely missed in the day to day life. From apology words to specific color terms. Especially exploring Lakoff's ideas gave me whole new perspective on just ... talking and being aware of what I was saying. I'll also consider myself lucky that I got to read tannen's work, which is quite comprehensive and provides an unbiased approach to noting observations.

As a team, we accomplished a lot and got to truly understand the Varieties in Language, from a Gender Based Perspective.

Bibliography

- Transcripts of all the movies are provided in [./MovieScripts](#)
- [Lakoff's Work](#)
- Tannen's book is present in [./Final/Resources](#)