University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2017

Native Speaker Stance-Taking In A Multinational Conference Call

Vanessa Cristina Revheim Cunha
University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd

Part of the Linguistics Commons

NATIVE SPEAKER STANCE-TAKING IN A MULTINATIONAL

CONFERENCE CALL

A Thesis
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Modern Languages
The University of Mississippi

by

VANESSA CRISTINA REVHEIM CUNHA

May 2017

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the stance-taking measures of a native speaker director in a conference call, focusing on social contexts where foreign speakers are also involved. The transcript used in this study is comprised of a global departmental team meeting call from a multinational company based in Austin, TX. Subjects are native and nonnative co-workers or specialists in the field of home vacation rental and a native director. The analysis aims at finding what different stance-taking measures are enacted by the director throughout this conference call, what linguistic strategies are used to claim authority, and whether different strategies or stances are used towards nonnative speakers. Primarily, this study intended to address features of foreigner talk; however, no strong indications of usage of this register were found. With the purpose of accounting for style-shifting and linguistic strategies, the quantitative analysis will look at the frequency distribution of non-contracted forms for evidence of elision avoidance, and verify whether the director uses careful articulation by analyzing the number of words used per minute. The qualitative analysis will explore lexical choices, stress on both content and function words, and stance-taking measures used towards native and nonnative participants. The objective of this study is to understand how authority is expressed and how language and stance are used as tools for claiming and maintaining authority in a setting where the director does not have any visual contact with the participants.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family and friends, who helped me through the challenge of living and studying in a foreign country. In particular, I dedicate this work to my two sisters, Valéria Revheim and Vânia Revheim, who have always believed in my potential, especially during the times I doubted myself.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

FT Foreigner talk

NS Native speaker

NNS Nonnative speaker

WA Whole audience

ACKNOWLEGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1 INTRODUCTION

The use of a specific linguistic form can result from one's social identity, as language ideologies relate to several sociocultural factors, including one's hierarchical role. Labov (1972) suggests that social meaning is the primary motivation behind of one's linguistic choice. On the contrary, Kiesling (2009: 172) sees stance as the "main interactional meaning being created, and it is a precursor, or primitive, in sociolinguistic variation."

This study investigates whether a director of a company uses linguistic strategies and different stance-taking measures to claim authority in a context deprived of visual contact, assessing how particular interactions may lead to different stance-taking measures. The study will also look at the director's stance towards nonnative participants in the conference call in order to account for possible ideological motivations behind the stances being enacted. In the literature review, I will address how sociolinguistic research has accounted for variation and change, followed by the definitions of speech communities. Next, I will provide insight on how ideological processes and stance-taking measures can play an essential role in our linguistic choices, and which stances I will be investigating in this study.

2   LITERATURE REVIEW

As members of several speech communities (i.e., school, home, in the presence of visitors and family), we are instructed on how to function in society from the day that we are born. By learning the conventions that govern each community, we start becoming part of them. Language, obviously, is one important variable, including tone, vocabulary, and lexical choices, among others.

One language can present several varieties, going beyond geographical boundaries. Social settings, for instance, are known as a robust factor that can help describe different registers in a community of speakers. Sociolinguistic research has looked at variation from several different perspectives, which will be addressed in the next section.

2.1   Language Variation and Sociolinguistic Research

Early sociolinguistic studies have helped define and generalize patterns within social groups. However, research on language variation within groups was overlooked, as social processes were understood as the main explanation for variation and change. "The sharpness of the social stratification of language seems to vary with the degree of social mobility which exists in society as a whole." (Labov, 1972: 239)

Following Labov's argument, Tagliamonte (2009) considered that a quantitative approach could be used in order to understand such variations in members of the same structured set in the grammar. By identifying the variables that caused variation and conducting a

quantitative analysis of the variable(s), the results could help understand the process and reason for linguistic change and identify social class variation.

Hymes (1964) believes that language variation is neither merely regional nor social. Many other factors influence one's language, once it takes place in a social context. In his view, a single language has several varieties and nobody speaks the same variety exactly, but shares linguistic features within the speech communities of which he/she is a member, constantly adapting his/her discourse in the context of communicative functions.

2.2   Speech communities and contextualization cues

According to Hymes (1964: 36), speech communities share "rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules of interpretation of at least one linguistic variety." In other words, language goes beyond grammatical variation, combining it with what is culturally and socially adequate for a given community.

With this concept in mind, Hymes (1964) believes that quantitative survey-type research neglects social meaning. As an attempt to promote a theory that would embrace all instances of speech, and facets of a social context behind it, he established the SPEAKING model, defining 16 components of language variation (message form and content; setting; scene; speaker/sender; addressor; hearer/receiver/audience; addressee; purposes (outcomes); purposes (goals); key; channels; forms of speech; norms of interaction; norms of interpretation; and genres). These 16 components would, thus, operate simultaneously in a dynamic manner within each of our social circles, that is, each community to which we belong presents a specific variety.

Levinson (1979) states that interaction is governed by activity type. Gumperz (1982: 140) complements this statement by saying that our interpretation "is effected by conversational implicatures based on conventionalized co-occurrence expectations between content and surface

style." He then names these features *contextualization cues*, which indicate that we link every linguistic form to a specific schema. Our minds are able to pick up a cue and relate to a certain frame; therefore, we know how to behave once we are socialized. However, different communities will behave in different ways. For this reason, whoever has not been trained in a specific frame will not behave accordingly. A common example is to observe American and international students in an American school setting; international students will miss some cues, as they have not been socialized in that environment.

Contextualization cues go beyond syntax and lexicon, touching on how we open and close sentences, and our sequence strategies. What can happen if a listener does not pick up on one of the cues? The answer is miscommunication. As indicated by Gumperz (1982: 40), "when a listener does not react to a cue or in unaware of its function, interpretations may differ and misunderstanding may occur." Gumperz (1982) shows the importance of these cues and how detrimental to communication they can be once the listeners or speakers misunderstand one another. Therefore, these cues are essential to linguistic competence in communication and can also impede it. Hymes (1974: 4) indicates the complexity in which language is involved: "one cannot take linguistic form, a given code, or even speech itself, as a limiting frame of reference. One must take as context a community, or network of persons, investigating its communicative activities as a whole, so that any use of channel and code takes its place as part of the resources upon which the members draw." In his defense of the use of ethnography for sociolinguistic research, Hymes (1974: 4) raises the dichotomy between language and communication: "It is not that linguistics does not have a vital role. Analyzed linguistic materials are indispensable, and the logic of linguistic methodology is an influence in the ethnography perspective. It is rather that it is not linguistics, but ethnography, not language, but communication, which must provide the

frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be assessed."

Rampton's (2009: 698) work on speech communities further explains the complexity of studying language variation within communities, as communities can share some norms but occasionally present internal differentiation. Therefore, pre-established organizational forms can co-exist: "community often came to be associated with the second element of the binary dichotomies … vernacular, oral modes of expressions; close, solitary, home-based networks; minority and working class groups," making it impossible for research to insist a neutral definition that does not take into account the diversity that it entails. He thus summarizes the relationship between sociolinguistics and speech communities: "when our sense of speech community alters, there are often consequences for the kinds of language use that we attend to" (p. 695). There are three important factors: the speech community itself, the language used in it, and what we believe to be language used by that community.

The language that we use indicates who we are, what we believe and from where we come. For instance, simply by looking at someone, we might have expectations towards how he/she will sound, perhaps even foreseeing adjustments that we will need to make to our own discourse once we interact with that person. It is important to mention that some varieties are highly regarded as closer to the standard language, whereas others might indicate negative feelings about a person's educational and social background.

2.3   Ideology, linguistic choices and stance

Everyone has a personal opinion about what is considered standard, and accepted, or what indicates lack of formal education or even mental capability. "Some are well-established stereotypes, like *ain't*. Although dictionaries may vary in the way they label *ain't*, most native speakers are quite clear in their sociolinguistic approach to this word—in their social *evaluation*

of the form." (Labov 1972: 235)

Sociolinguistics defines that such relationships of unrelated connections are linked to each person's ideology. "We call these conceptual schemes ideologies because they are suffused with the political and moral issues pervading the particular sociolinguistic field and are subject to the interests of their bearer's social position." (Irvine and Gal, 2000: 375) Therefore, everyone is part of a situated socio-cultural community that dictates his/her system of believes and indexical connections, in other words, one's ideology is a result of his/her social world and social role(s).

Sociolinguistic research has studied and defined several varieties in the United States, as their linguistic properties, communities of practice, and relationship with regards to the community ideology. Wolfram (2003) advocates for the recognition of vernacular norms, as not only sociolinguistic but also ideological issues are implicated in the construction of vernacular forms. On the other hand, non-standard forms might be avoided or not adopted by some speakers of a given community, as they can be associated to negative stereotypes (Labov, 1972).

Linguistic choices can be either conscious or unconscious. When in an academic event, for instance, we will guard our speech by using standard and formal English, for we understand that this is what it is expected from that speech community. Colloquial grammatical and phonological features will be avoided consciously. However, the speaker might not realize that he/she modifies his/her repertoire in order to better address a specific interlocutor more appropriately in a given situation. This usually happens when someone is not closely monitoring his/her speech.

Kiesling (2009: 175) claims that stance is the reason behind speakers' choice of one linguistic form over another, that is, stance drives the use of variants: "Stancetaking is the main constitutive social activity that speakers engage in when both creating a style and style-shifting."

Stance indicates how we position ourselves in a given situation, evaluate the topic and express alignment towards interlocutors (Anderson, 2014). As pointed out by Du Bois (2007: 163), stance is enacted "through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (the self and others), and aligning with other subjects with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field." I break down stance into *positioning* and *footing*.

Positioning (Holloway, 1984) is how speakers make use of both lexical and grammatical tools to locate themselves in relation to the interlocutor. Holloway highlights that a variety of positions can be taken within a conversation and interaction determines which one(s) to be taken. *Footing* (Goffman, 1981: 128) can be described as how aligned (or not) the speaker feels in relation to the topic and the interlocutor; hence, it is how the speaker responds to production or reception during a conversation. It can have overt realizations on utterances (i.e., pitch, volume and tone), "being a persistent feature of natural talk." It can also affect positioning.

Kiesling (2009: 172) relates stance to the variationist conception of style, as it considers that style is not related to identity but instead linked to activity, that is, stylistic variation arises from interactions. He states: "sociolinguistic variants are initially associated with interactional stances and these stances become in turn associated with a social group meaning in a community over time and repeated use." We might present predictable stance measures depending on our social roles (i.e., professors, doctors, single men, married women).

Anderson (2014) provides three types of stance-taking categories, which will be used in the analysis of this study: authoritative, evaluative and interactive. Authoritative stance is enacted when the speaker wants to demonstrate credibility, positioning himself or herself as a knowledgeable agent with regards to that content. Evaluative stance is used when one declares his/her emotional states, revealing how he/she evaluates that situation or person. The last is the

interactive stance, which is enacted to show alignment or disalignment in relation to the interlocutor.

Style results from linguistic social practices shared by a community of practice (Eckert, 2000). Personal style is the product of a bundle of stances: "stances underlay these personal styles and personae…we simply understand the personal styles to be repertoires of stances" (Kiesling, 2009: 174). Therefore, our personal styles are defined by a life of interactions in the speech communities in which we participate and, as it is both a dynamic and everlasting process, it continues to evolve throughout our life as social actors.

Stance is innately connected to our linguistic repertoire, as we develop language in a contextual environment, acquiring it as attached to what stances to take and which ones are accepted by whom. Stance-taking takes place from the beginning of language acquisition, starting from our little environment of language interaction as we observe how a child behaves with his/her parents. Children can be very sarcastic with their parents, depending on the stances being enacted and accepted by the parents; however, in households where parents are strict and authoritative, the reverse will be true and different stance-taking measures might be apparent. Variants are dependent on repeated interactions, calibrated over time and ultimately becoming what Kiesling (2009: 175) describes as "census-like identity categories such as gender, race, class, sexuality, region, and so forth." Our socio-cultural stereotypes arise from the stances usually taken by these groups, and "identity and personal style are both ways of stereotyping habitual patterns of stancetaking, or repertoires of stance." These measures indicate much about our social, cultural and moral natures. "They provide a window into worldview and values" (Anderson, 2014: 138).

In order to understand thoroughly the core of stance-taking measures, it is essential to

know how indexicality plays an important role in this puzzle. Kiesling (2009) defines it as being a sign that gains meaning through the context of an utterance. How do we connect the word *cute* to being feminine? The reason is because indexical meaning arises from a life of social interactions, which are defined and redefined constantly. Ochs (1996) states that our indexicality system is interactionally achieved. Therefore, it is ever changing and it is not constitutive of static equivalences (Anderson, 2014), but situated, defined by and reflective of context (Eckert, 2000), being different depending on a group's social context.

Mansplaining (Rothman, 2012) is an example of how indexicality, style and stance-taking operate simultaneously. *Mansplaining* takes place when men explain something to women in a condescending way. This implies overlapping, interrupting and taking an authoritative stance, as they believe that they know more about certain topics than women do; therefore, they hijack conversations, sometimes doing so unconsciously. This concept provides a label for the social reality that women are assumed to be ignorant in comparison to men (Cookman, 2015). One might conclude that *mansplaining* takes place due to men's indexicality system, in which women might index ignorance about certain topics that they believe to be part of the men's world only. However, ideological relationships are situated and, therefore, social interactions will constantly redefine them. In other words, *mansplaining* might occur when men are positioning (Holloway, 1984) themselves, but might change towards alignment (Anderson, 2014) once social interactions evolve and men realize that a woman can be knowledgeable with regards to any subject.

What might happen to second language speakers participating in a context dominated by native speakers? By understanding the concept of stance and style, it is fairly easy to predict that nonnatives will miss a contextualization cue as they come from a completely different life of

interactions. Their stance-taking measures and style differ according to their socio-cultural backgrounds.

As mentioned previously, this project also examines a native director's stance-taking measures towards nonnative participants, focusing on what happens in a social context where foreign speakers are present. The analysis mainly focuses on the director's discourse and the stances being enacted in a conference call with no visual contact in order to analyze what happens when directors interact with both native and nonnative participants and realize their authority without the use of visual tools, and find possible explanations for linguistic choices.

2.4   Language Ideologies

Crystal (2003: 14) claims that English has reached the status of a global language, which nobody owns anymore. With that concept in mind, the author points out the dangers of having a global language: [speakers may] "cultivate an elite monolingual linguistic class, more complacent and dismissive in their attitudes towards other languages." Nurturing such beliefs leads people to see English as a language of power; convincing English speakers that learning other languages is unnecessary. It is common to see English language programs and learners favoring American or British accents, denying the fact that English has become globalized. Research has widely advocated for the study and appreciation of world Englishes. However, common belief associates native-likeness to linguistic power.

It is possible that senior managers who do not have English as a mother tongue, and who find themselves working for English-language companies in such parts of the world as Europe or Africa, could find themselves at a disadvantage compared with their mother-tongue colleagues, especially when meetings involve the use of informal speech. There is already anecdotal evidence to suggest that these things happen. (Crystal, 2003: 16)

In conclusion, speakers trade their linguistic identity for the symbolic power and social leverage that English can provide.

As ideologies emerge from indexical, situated and contingent connections (Jaffe, 2009), they are being "suffused with the political and moral issues" (Irvine and Gal, 2000: 374). In other words, they are a system of beliefs with a strong ideological notion that standard English is superior. One's ideological response with regards to second language speakers may result in specific discourse strategies. NNS accent might index less capability of following a conversation and understanding words, less academic and empirical knowledge, and maybe less formal instruction. One might even consider a lower social status connection, as Americans' language socialization in that schema usually takes place in the interaction with immigrants from lower social classes.

Jaffe (2009: 391) calls attention to the fact that

language ideologies relate to a wide range of phenomena that include (1) ideas about the nature of language itself; (2) the values and meanings attached to particular codes, genres, media and discourses; (3) hierarchies of linguistic value (from how particular codes are ranked to more general esthetic criteria used to evaluate spoken and written language); and (4) how specific linguistic codes or forms are connected to identities (both individual and collective and at all levels) as well as sociocultural roles and stances.

It is expected, then, that different accents will lead to different ideological conceptions. A particular European accent might index a higher sociocultural status, whereas others will have the opposite effect. In order to make communication easier, a common strategy used by native speakers is "foreigner talk" (hereafter, FT), a variety used by native speakers when addressing a nonnative audience with the purpose of making understanding easier (Ferguson, 171). Much research on the topic has been conducted in the area of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), with focus on second language learning. However, FT has also been addressed in studies of syntax (Ferguson 171, Hatch 1979) and sociolinguistics (Tarone, 1980), among other fields. Ferguson (1971) was one of the first scholars to address the topic, pointing out the key characteristics of FT, defining it as a simplified register, and providing hypotheses with regards

to its linguistics features. Ferguson (1971: 4-5) claims that FT is a simplified version of a language used by native speakers communicating with interlocutors, such as babies, foreigners or deaf people, considered to be "unable to readily understand the normal speech of the community." In his view, native speakers understand FT as an easier, simplified language to understand. Speakers believe it to be an imitation of that person's use of the language (i.e. using baby talk to imitate how children speak.) Hatch (1979) complements Ferguson's (1971) arguments by stating that FT syntax presents short MLU (mean length of utterance), left dislocation of topics (i.e. 'your teacher, does he talk too much?'), as well as restating *wh-questions* as *yes/no* or choice questions. Tarone (1980: 424) suggests that FT consists in production and communication strategies; thus, FT features result from an attempt "to use the linguistic system efficiently and clearly with the least possible effort to stay in contact with the learner." Finally, Saville-Troike (2006) includes *topicalization* (i.e. topic at the beginning), confirming Ferguson's (1971) argument on more syntactic regularity and retention of full forms.

The analysis on SD's linguistic features will analyze whether she uses FT when interacting with NNS participants. The discussion of this study will not, however, focus on prejudice or racism. These interactions, as mentioned earlier, are intrinsically related to people's social perception of the world.

2.5   Characteristics of the Work Place

The business world is ever-changing. The new state-of-the-art enterprises have banned formality in terms of language, dress code and strict hierarchical roles: this trend promotes collaborative work and a more casual relationship between manager and subordinate. Mayfield, J. R., Mayfield, M. R., and Kopf, J. (1998: 236) explain that superiors use *leader communication*

to inspire and empower his/her employees, especially for the positive effect on worker motivation. It "has the goal of bridging the distance between leader intent and employee understanding to favorably influence employee outcomes."

Therefore, the relationship between power and language use in the workplace has shifted. In my data analysis, I expect to see cooperative language and interactive stance, as decisions are not supposed to be imposed but (at least pretend to be) constructed and discussed between the leader and subordinate. Workers today supposedly know that cooperative linguistic strategies used by people in positions of power might be disguised forms of authoritative stances that require an interactive stance of alignment as a response.

The dynamics of the work environment and its relationship to language use represent a real challenge for foreign employers. Banitz (2005) writes about the difficulties faced by ESL students in Business programs, concluding that humor has become an indispensable managerial tool in the American business sector and, hence, can be seen as the fifth component of a student's communicative competence. In Banitz' research, even though ESL students are competent communicators in English, they lack very culture-specific and world knowledge, impeding their understanding of sophisticated humor.

The proposed study claims that the workplace can be considered a very complex schema of contextualization conventions. NNSs will struggle to understand the contextualization cues behind interactions and, most importantly, how to respond accordingly to these cues. The current study will focus on the director's interactions during conference calls, which are becoming popular in decision making and brainstorming situations. Conference calls differ drastically from regular departmental meetings for they lack visual contact. Knowing how to participate effectively in conference calls is vital in most companies.

2.6   Conference Calls

Conference calls have become a popular way of communication, especially in multinational companies. It is important to highlight that knowing the contextualization cues that govern this speech act is essential, as they require more attention from participants when deciding to interrupt, take turns, accept and take stance. The latter has completely changed in the last few years, as offices tend to value a more relaxed and informal way of communication. As mentioned earlier, strategic competence is key, and missing a cue hinders communication. It is also important to mention that any non-linguistic cue, (visual cues, for example) are completely lost; therefore, callers rely on their linguistic cues regarding that schema. The company that I studied uses WebEX, a software for online meetings in which the main presenter SD shares her screen with several participants. Therefore, participants only see information on the projects being shared on the director's computer screen.

2.7   Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the linguistic features and stances enacted by the director SD by analyzing the audio content from a conference call, assessing how authority is realized and enforced. With regards to NNSs, it will be verified whether choices are a result of her ideological connections towards second language speakers. The analysis will address which linguistic features take place in this setting and also attempt to find which ones are specifically used when addressing non-native speakers (NNS) in the call.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What linguistic features could be found in SD's speech that indicate strategies used by someone in position of authority in a conference call?

2. How is stance used as a strategy to ensure that her authority is respected?

14

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Subjects

The subjects in this study were participants from a conference call. The data from the call was obtained from a multinational company based in Austin, Texas. Subjects have different hierarchical roles: most participants are specialists or analysts, having the same position but are merely located in different countries. Every team has a supervisor (from the Americas, Europe and Asia). Finally, the team meets with the team director in monthly calls.

Meetings without foreigners: These meetings usually take place in the headquarters, being conducted in the form of conference calls only when very close to a launch date. Participants remain at their desks and call a bridge number which allows for an unlimited number of participants on the same call. Unfortunately, the company did not provide any calls from this setting. Instead, I examined a meeting with several foreigner participants. These conference calls occur on a monthly basis and all participants involved in current projects are requested to attend and provide updates.

The subjects from the present study are listed below. As the study will also try to address how people from different positions interact with one another, I included participants' education level, number of years working for the company, and ranks: 1 is highest (the team director), followed by 2 (managers responsible for more than one brand) and 3 (managers from local brands, specialists and analysts). Although the company provided the global team meeting, no

team members from South America or Asia participated in the call.

Name	Nationality	Gender	Education	Job Title	Rank	Years working
S.D.	U.S.	F	B.A.	Director of Global Customer Experience Operations	1	8
E.	France	F	M.A.	Europe Education and Knowledge Manager	2	6
S.A.	Germany	M	Unknown	Senior Manager, EU Trust and Security	2	Unknown
A.	U.S.	F	MBA	Global Customer Experience Process and Operations Manager	2	5
C.	U.S.	F	B.A.	Manager of Education and Knowledge, Americas	2	3
V.	U.S.	F	M.A.	Senior Director, Americas Customer Service	2	5
E.T.	France	F	B.A.	Head of France Customer Service	3	3
S.T.	France	F	MBA	Head of Europe Customer Service Europe	3	4
S.T.M.	France	M	B.A.	Senior Manager, EU Trust and Security	3	6
F.	Spain	M	Unknown	Unknown	3	Unknown

M.	U.K.	M	Associate Degree	Global Workforce Planning Specialist	3	3
A.N.	U.S.	F	B.S.	Global Customer Experience Business Analyst	3	3
J.	U.S.	M	B.S.	Global CE Analyst	3	3
L.	U.S.	F	M.A.	Training and Content Specialist NA	3	3
M.I.	U.S.	F	B.A.	Web Production and Customer Support	3	7
R.S.	U.S.	M	B.A.	Trust and Security Manager	3	4

3.2   Method

For this study, the company provided one conference call with the participation of team members from all brands: Austin/Brazil/UK/Paris/Manila/Sydney. As I mentioned previously, members from Brazil, Manila, and Sydney did not participate in the call provided. The recording was transcribed and checked by an English native speaker with knowledge in linguistics and TESOL for any transcribing errors.

4   DATA

Data analysis is both quantitative and qualitative. First, a quantitative method is employed to identify the use of non-contracted forms by doing a type/token count and frequency distribution, followed by a speech rate measurement to account for slow rate of speech. The qualitative portion of the present study looks at vocabulary, stress, and stances that the director, managers and specialists enact in order to understand what stance-taking measure is ideally expected in this context. Finally, I observe the results from both quantitative and qualitative analysis and attempt to find answers related to SD's style-shifting.

4.1   Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative methods were used in order to account for the following features: Non-contracted forms as indication of careful articulation, speech rate and speech rate adjusted (measurement that excludes fillers, false starts, repetitions, partial repetitions, and items contained in repairs) as strategies for slower rate of speech.

4.1.1   Non-contracted forms;

Table 1. Frequency distribution of non-contracted forms

To be	NS			NNS		
	Token	Type	Freq	Token	Type	Freq
am*	1	17	5.8%	0	3	-
is*	77	200	38%	11	22	50%
are*	42	100	**42%**	9	14	64%
Will **	9	31	29%	0	1	-
Have***	8	41	19%	1	2	50%

*Interrogative forms were excluded, as these cannot be contracted
** Only after pronouns
***Both uses of 'have' in present perfect and passive voice were considered

Before analyzing results, it is important to highlight again that nonnative speakers' (NNS) participation was minimal; therefore, fewer examples were found for this group. Native speakers (NS), on the other hand, have used non-contracted forms in several moments of the call. It was also noticed that native participants would transition between 'want to' and 'wanna', as well as 'going to' and 'gonna'. As the overall register was informal, the use of 'want to' and 'going to' could be an indication of careful articulation or a specific strategy used towards NNSs. SD might see the contracted forms of 'want to' and 'going to' to be more difficult for NNS to understand for lack of phonological experience with elision.

Table 1.1. Frequency distribution of the use of 'going to' and 'want to'

	NS			NNS		
	Token	Type	Freq	Token	Type	Freq
Going to	6	42	14%	2	3	**66%**
Want to	9	19	**47%**	1	0	-

The two results with higher frequency distribution were analyzed according to each participant with the purpose of finding how SD would stand out in comparison to other NS participants.

Table 1.2. Individual native participant's frequency distribution of non-contracted forms

NS		'are'	
Name	Token	Type	Freq
SD	12	23	**52%**
V	13	31	42%
C	3	4	**75%**
J	13	34	38%
A	1	6	17%

Table 1.2.2. Individual native participant's frequency distribution of the use of 'want to'

NS		'want to'	
Name	Token	Type	Freq
SD	3	4	75%
V	2	6	33%
C	-	-	-
J	3	8	37%
A	1	1	100%

Participants who communicate to the whole group and have higher ranks show a tendency of using non-contracted forms, possibly avoiding elision. The director SD uses the non-contracted forms of 'are' and 'want to' more than 50% of the time. It is possible to claim that using non-contracted forms and avoiding elision may be an indication of sounding more clear on a conference call. Another possible explanation will be addressed later in the study. To account for speech rates when addressing specific audiences, I have decided to measure NS participants' speech rate to confirm whether SD would speak at different speech rates.

4.1.2   Speech rate per second and speech rate adjusted

As mentioned earlier, this measure attempts to find whether SD presents a slower rate of speech in comparison to other participants when addressing the whole audience, NNSs and NSs. I separated two other NS participants who had spoken the longest during the call. For each participant, the longest turns of speech were selected: one in which he/she addresses the whole

audience, one addressing NNSs and one interacting with NSs. Unfortunately, only SD interacted with all groups in this call.

With regards to the method, participants' rate of speech was measured by counting the number of words used per second (speech rate per second), and later I repeated the same measurement, this time excluding fillers, false start and repetition (speech rate adjusted). These methods of measurement have been adapted from García-Amaya's (2009) study on fluency measures, in which he reported developmental ranges across levels of fluency. His analysis used rate of speech in syllables per second and rate of speech adjusted consisted of:

syll - (syll.in repeated segment + syll.in repaired segment)/seconds

García-Amaya (2009) measured fluency in L2 Spanish by dividing words in syllables. English is not a syllabic language, thus words were not subdivided into syllables. The speech rate adjusted excluded fillers, false starts and repetition.

Table 2. Native participant's speech rate per second and speech rate adjusted

Name	Whole group		NS		NNS	
	Speech Rate	Adjusted	Speech Rate	Adjusted	Speech Rate	Adjusted
SD	2.76	2.56	3.89	3.77	3.21	3.21
V	2.58	2.39	3.15	2.89	-	-
J	-	-	3.58	3.23	3.30	3.09

Both SD and V's speech rate decreases drastically when addressing the whole audience. SD and J also decrease their speech rate when conversing with NNS. With regards to the speech rate adjusted, this measurement has revealed that, in most samples, fillers, repetitions and false starts represent roughly about 0.20 of the words used in one turn, leading to the conclusion that these strategies were only reflective of spoken discourse. As also concluded by García-Amaya

(2009: 73) "if a line were to be drawn joining all the results obtained for both rates of speech, it would most likely be very similar for both rates of speech, indicating that the amount of repetitions and repairs is not a robust strategy to gain fluency". In this study, repetitions, repairs and false starts were not means of providing a more clear articulation, being only a regular feature at utterance and discourse levels.

Interestingly, SD's speech did not present any fillers, false starts or repetitions in her interaction with NNSs. I decided to measure other two examples where she converses with NNSs to verify whether hesitations, repetitions, repairs or false starts could be found.

Table 2.1 SD's speech rate per second and speech rate adjusted from three samples

Name	Sample 1		Sample 2		Sample 3*		Sample 4	
	Rate	Adjusted	Rate	Adjusted	Rate	Adjusted	Rate	Adjusted
SD	3.14	3.14	3.21	3.21	2.87	2.68	2.83	2.83

The first, second and fourth samples have no fillers, repairs nor false starts. The third sample is the only sample where fillers were used; however, the excerpt from Sample 3 shows that SD used fillers when introducing the product, before addressing E.:

> *SD: Alright. **Hum**, let's see, next stop is the**-e** new money back guarantee program, **um**, affecting Europe only, **hum**, so it isn't really a specific PLT/ but, E., I put your name on it, since your team is doing a good portion of the work on this/

Sample 3 also yields the same results from the other examples, where SD does not use any fillers when addressing the NNS participant specifically. Another interesting factor is that utterances show a continuous decrease in speech rate during the call. In the first sample, the rate was at about 3.14, and in the final one, it reached 2.83.

4.2   Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative methods were used in order to account for the following features: Simple vocabulary; high frequency of words/phrases; stress on key words, and stance-taking. As mentioned previously, I will also be analyzing SD's stance-taking measures used when addressing NSs and NNSs.

4.2.1   Simple vocabulary

In interactions with NNSs, SD uses more casual words and less common expressions one would use in a conference call, as in examples (1), (2) and (3):

(1) SD: Okay, set <inaudible> it's a **big day** around the world!

(2) SD: Yeah, well/ Yu-you-**you don't know until you know**, right? <giggles>

(3) SD: Alright (.) **fantastic!** <giggles> **real nice** when we get a date!

The previous examples seemed to be used exclusively when addressing NNSs, as SD appears to be less excited when interacting with NS participants, using most of the times one-word responses to NS's comments:

(4) SD: Well done.

(5) SD: Alright

(6) SD: Awesome!

(7) SD: Awesome/ So we'll change this from red to (.) in progress <giggles>

These examples reveal a possible style shift in SD's linguistic choices when addressing NNSs, at least in terms of the vocabulary choice. Not only does she use what I would label more casual words, but also higher pitch. When addressing NSs, intonation and pitch become flat. It was not possible to find examples from other participants for the limited examples of NS and

NNS interactions. Therefore, examples taken from her interactions with NS participants show that SD uses these responses as links in order to move forward to the next topic. I conclude that these links are linguistic strategies that compensate for not having any visual contact with participants.

4.2.2 High frequency of words or phrases

It is clear to see that the director SD tries to use the very same wording with both NSs, as shown in (9) and (10), and NNSs, as in (8), when asking about the progress on projects:

(8) SD: ST, **would you like to comment** on the (.) service fee but with confidence launching in Portugal and in the Netherlands today? Or STM / maybe you **could comment** as well? (interrupted)

(9) SD: <laughter>A's still not on the call yet I haven't heard her, so, hum, C, **do you want to talk about** merchant of record since your team is probably doing must around it at the moment?

(10) SD: C, **do you wanna comment on** training, V **do you want to comment on** anything else for North America CE?

4.2.3 Stress on key words

SD, as well as other NSs who provide updates on projects, tend to add stress on content words related to products/processes and departments, as in (11) and (14), functions and action verbs related to these products and processes, as in (13), and time reference information, as in (14). The following examples could indicate strategies used in conference calls, thus stress is being added to guarantee that all participants follow these key words and any important information with regards to the projects being discussed throughout the call. For this reason, the following examples might be reflective of setting.

(11) V: There's been ton of alignments (.) conversations happening with, hum, **finance** and **C Team**/ (W.A.)

(12) V: Uh, I-I think that we're finishing the training **tomorrow**/ (W.A.)

(13) SD: And along those lines just as a comment/ we … released the ability in compass for agents to **<u>disable</u>** or enable payments account from within compass / (W.A.)

(14) A: I can talk about that/ so the-there are some changes that have to do with what we're launching today in the **<u>dash</u>** / (W.A.)

A few excerpts with stress on function words were found. As stressing function words is considered uncommon in English, the following examples could also be reflective of the setting for it does not have any visual contact.

(15) V: on-one that is important for us to know is **<u>be-cause</u>** of all the sensitivity around, this transition, part of this was E <in> and part of it is where we're **<u>at</u>**/ (W.A.)

(16) SD: because this means that expedia will actually be supporting those travelers going forward, not **<u>us</u>**/ (W.A.)

(17) J: when **<u>we</u>**-we're looking at this we could examine sorta declines (NS)

(18) SD: Next stop is **<u>the</u>** new money back guarantee program, um, affecting Europe only (NNS)

 SD's interactions with NNS did not yield strong results indicating the possible use of FT in both the quantitative and qualitative analysis; therefore, results were very inconclusive, once SD used many of these features when addressing the whole group as well. The quantitative analysis on contraction and speech rate reveals that not only SD, but also other NS participants used non-contracted forms, avoiding elision to a certain degree, and also more careful articulation when addressing the whole group, which leads to the conclusion that these features reflect the conference call frame. The qualitative analysis reveals different strategies in SD's discourse when addressing NNSS. Excerpts (1), (2) and (3) are the strongest indications of style-shifting, as these were used specifically towards NNS participants. SD's responses to NSs are mainly used as a way to end that interaction and move to the next project. There was a clear use of repeated words and expressions, and these were used towards both NS and NNS participants.

Stress on both content and function words could be found, but most examples are very common in spoken English. Apart from the use of simple words towards NNSS and the same wording towards all participants, the other linguistics features addressed in this analysis were also understood as strategies one would use in conference calls. I will address the issue on simple vocabulary and high frequency words in more detail in the discussion section.

4.2.4   Stance

Anderson (2014) provides three types of stance-taking categories: authoritative, evaluative and interactive. Authoritative stance is enacted when the speaker wants to demonstrate credibility, positioning themselves as knowledgeable agents with regards to that content. Evaluative stance is used when one declares his/her emotional states, revealing how he/she evaluates that situation or person. The last is the interactive stance, which is enacted to show alignment or disalignment in relation to the interlocutor. In my analysis, I will first use the nomenclature [AUTH] for authoritative stance, [EVAL] for evaluative stance, [INT/A] for interactive stance of alignment and [INT/D] for interactive stance of disalignment, followed by assumptions regarding participants' relationships, and whether they are intending to address the whole audience (WA), NS or NNS. I will also support my conclusions by looking at previous research on stance.

4.2.4.1   Authoritative

SD, the director, usually uses affirmative sentences or rhetorical questions for most part towards all participants, regardless of their rank or nationality, as shown in the underlined sentences from (19), (20) and (21). As mentioned previously in the second section of the qualitative results on high frequency of words or phrases, in the underlined sentence from (22),

27

SD attempts to use the very same wording when asking for product updates. After analyzing these two examples, I concluded that these are common cooperative strategies used by managers or team leaders. SD's particular language choices in these examples are aligned with the hypothesis that I noted in the literature review, in which people in position of power prefer using more cooperative speech. Even though Anderson's (2014) work interprets the following examples as interactive stances. such strategies can be interpreted as another way of enacting authoritative stance. These sentences are phrased as questions or requests, but are instead clear commands for project updates, which reveal her position of authority. SD also resorts to solidarity stance at times, but only when addressing NNSs. I will address the issue on solidarity in greater detail later in my analysis on SD and NNS interactions.

SD's excerpts from interactions with three different NNSs:

(19)
SD: Alright/ and then/ **it looks like next week we expect to have Germany, Finland, Greece and Poland** <long pause> [INT/A]
SA: Right! [INT/A]
SD: Right/ **So you guys ready, SA?** <giggles> [AUTH]

(20)
SD: Alright. Hum, let's see, next stop is the new money back guarantee program, um, affecting Europe only, hum, so that's really a specific PLT but, E, **I put your name on it, since your team (is) doing a good portion of work on this** [INT/A]
E: Yup. <inaudible> You're right <inaudible>

(21)
SD: Yup (.) and, uh, **readiness in the EU, ST?** [INT/A]
<long pause>
ST: Readiness in the EU/ sorry/ I miss the point, ah, so you are talking about the EU (product), I mean?
SD: **Yes!** [AUTH]

Excerpts are examples of SD's interactions with NSs: C in (22) and J in (23) and (24):

(22) SD: C., **do you want to talk about merchant of record** since your team is probably doing must around it at the moment? [INT/A]

(23)
SD: hum, let's see, **<u>next up is</u>** WholeOrg/ [INT/A]
J: (Is) that me? <laughs>
SD: **<u>What?</u>** <really low on the background> [AUTH]
J: <laughs> So, hum, we are we're (?) we're in the middle of our– fast and furious in the middle of the Dojos right now

(24)
SD: So **<u>it sounds like we have some exciting news about</u>** PayPal [INT/A]
J: Soon, I don't have a date yet/ hum/ (...)
<long pause - SD is typing>
SD: **<u>Awesome/ So we'll change this from red to (.) in progress</u>** <giggles> [AUTH]

After analyzing the following examples and SD's discourse throughout the call, it is possible to confirm that SD prefers the use of cooperative strategies as an alternative to authoritative stance by observing how she often initiates each interaction with either NS or NNS participants. In the underlined phrase in (22), SD uses the interrogative form to request information, although the example is a clear command, and in (24) she uses a rhetorical statement where one might expect the use of imperative forms. However, in (21) and (23), SD does not continue using these strategies. She instead reinforces her authority by using clear authoritative stance-taking measures in case the participant does not respond accordingly. In these examples, SD only resorts to more direct authoritative stance-taking measures when she is not receiving the feedback that she expects. Since SD uses the same strategy towards NSs and NNSs, it is not possible to categorize this strategy as a response towards one's linguistic failure. In other words, authoritative stance can either be FT (towards NNSs only) or a response towards someone's inappropriate attitude/response (towards either NSs/NNSs).

With regards to the authoritative stance, the results found in this study partially confirm Labov's (1972) belief that social group meaning defines style, as the data yields both linguistic and social factors. By looking closely at her bundle of stances and the quantitative results, it is

possible to claim that her style is partially defined by her social and gender groups. Therefore, the use of proper speech (i.e. non-contracted forms, elision avoidance and formal register) and authoritative stances may be connected to her status of authority in this setting. However, the fact that she also uses more cooperative strategies as an alternative to authoritative stance in the beginning of most interactions resonates with Kiesling's (2009: 172) view, in which he states that a variant is "initially associated with interactional stances." SD's stance-taking measures are being defined by social meaning (i.e. authoritative stance and formal register) and redefined by interpersonal interactions (i.e. cooperative strategies and solidarity), as I had discussed in the literature review.

4.2.4.2   Authority and other NS participants

With regards to NS interactions, both [EVAL] and [INT/D] can be easily noticed in NS/NS interactions, as shown in (25), (26) and (27). Even when interactions lead to an argument, SD attempts not to interrupt them, especially when these involve participants from rank 3, in which participants from rank 2 (immediate supervisors) are expected to intervene if necessary. The following excerpts exemplify a situation in which there was an argument between J and L. It is important to highlight that although J and L have the same rank in the company (both are specialists), and have been working at this company for the same number of years, they belong to different departments; thus, one would expect different stance-taking measures to take place, especially because interactions involving different departments demand cordiality.

In excerpt (25), participant J seems to be annoyed when responding to L's comments/questions by observing the expressions he uses to enact the [EVAL] stance, such as "it's surprising." His comment is followed by a passive response from L.

30

(25) J: Yeah, that-that that was/ **that's been changed for quite a while**/ I don't know-uh-**it be surprising if it's just now being noticed but, hum, <giggles>**, hum, that was a supplier side change where we, yeah, everything now's gonna be driven completely from your lat-long based on your-your uh verified location / not, hum, being able to specify your advertising region/hum, I can get you the-the-the article that we have about that, **I think hum but that- sorry/ that's been out for a while** so but I/ <interrupted> [INT/D] [EVAL]
L: Okay [INT/A]
J: By all means I can help with that if hum if we need messaging <giggles> [AUTH] <interruped>

After taking an evaluative stance towards L, J also enacts an authoritative stance by offering help with a news article. As a response to J's comments, V (rank 2) promptly interrupts the interaction between J and L disputing his comments and asking for more detailed information on the change. It is important to mention that V is L's immediate manager.

(26)
V: There's no reason for us t-to change advertising regions, it's irrelevant <pause> that's global? [INT/D] [EVAL] [AUTH]
J: Correct [INT/A]

Excerpt (26) shows that V's comment is evaluative towards the topic. As V continues on the topic, SD interrupts her, once SD had noticed that V was unsure of the product change. Her comment on (27) shows her preference for an affiliative management style. Her decision of taking part in the discussion and interrupting V's turn clearly states that SD is taking back her position as the authority in the call. The underlined line in (27) is a clear example of her 'collaborator' style. However, it is taken as an authoritative stance as all participants act upon it. As she takes turn, stance-taking measures from other participants shift. In (28), it is L who takes the authoritative stance after having her comments supported by V and SD. Although it is L who would be responsible for communicating customers about any changes on the website, her final response in (28), in which she enacts an authoritative stance, it does not correspond to her rank, being therefore a response to the stances enacted previously by V and SD. These examples

further confirm the assumptions that interactions defined the enacted stances.

(27)
V: It doesn't, we should / yeah/ I wanna make sure we're not sending cases to production and we're uh if it's an irrelevant change and also one that we can't even make then that's just gonna reset – set our customers off, so / I'm even wondering if that's big enough to announce in the owners statement <pause> <int>
SD: I think they may (.) uh? [INT/A]
V: Perhaps it's already been done
SD: **Seems like I've seen it but I've seen a few things flying around so <int> don't quote me** [INT/A] [AUTH]
V: Right, I know [INT/A]

(28)
J: But you L, you're saying the-the for some reason th-it's been only been noticed on PPBs? Like, that's a thing **that's kinda strange to me** is that-the (.) it was sorta or is it that-that was kinda user case that came in that basically people ar-reacting to [INT/D] [EVAL]
L: I think it was the user case, I yeah it just seems like **we just need some clarification on that/ probably all around/** [EVAL] [AUTH]

Another example of how SD claims her authority by using affiliative stances and a

collaborative style can be found in the following sequence. In (29), V's response to one of the

projects clearly shows [INT/D] towards A's comments on the progress that the team had made.

(29)
V: So, anyway/ I- just think that's something/ it feels just like it's (?) **don't know which PLT is running**, you know, **it just feels like it's running lot of things that's touches a lot of different** (.) hum (.) **descriptive policy processes that we have and so** I just (.) **maybe it's worth tracking here** [AUTH] / I-d/ from what I understood yesterday there's not a date for it or (?) another topic on whether homeaway's gonna get advantaged and best match <pause> hum, this's just something (?) talk but it hasn't been formalized/ [INT/D] [EVAL]
A: (?) **seems to be adding more and more things that/ we don't want to change** ours (?) and (?)/ we're just saying that (?) call CS? [INT/D] [EVAL]
V: Right, hum <int>
A: <IN> which, huh <giggles> **I'm hopping that this is a stepping stone actually changing** (?) and fees/ this is not like/ going forever, 'cause it'll affect our contact volume if (?)[INT/D] [EVAL]

Although it can be noticed that she is struggling to select mitigating ways to convey disagreement and her point of view regarding the topic, she enacts both [EVAL] and [AUTH] stances in different moments, which may be interpreted as inappropriate for the same reasons as for J and L: although both V and A have the same rank and have worked for the company for the same number of years, they also belong to different teams. However, this interaction happened between two people from very high ranks, therefore one would expect greater cooperation or compromise between different departments rather than the stances being enacted in the following excerpts. In conclusion to NS/NS interactions, the examples analyzed have confirmed that interactions determine what stances will be enacted.

Example (28) helps confirm the assumptions made in the previous paragraph and how social meaning can be neglected but later be redefined, as V seems to be aware of the fact that she has exposed her disappointment in a way that could have been inappropriate in that moment or setting. On the other hand, social meaning is only overlooked among interlocutors from the same rank.

(28)
V: Yeah/ I'm-**I'ma not trying to insinuate but someone's dropped the ball** I don't know who has/ **trying to clarify who has the ball** <in> thank you

Example (29) clearly shows that V is upset, asking whose responsibility, which participants call 'owner,' was for a specific project. Once she discovers that SD was the responsible for that project, she decides not to pursue her complains. A plausible reason would be that SD's rank in the company impedes further discussion.

(29)
V: I guess do we have an owner that I mean I know it's (.) is it-is it (.) **who's huh-who's our owner I guess just in terms of (.) readiness**/ are we even (?) discussion happening about this being a CS activity? [INT/D]
SD: **That's happening in supplier side/ so that would be me [AUTH]**
V: **Kay** [INT/A]

SD: **And I've already raised objections** <nervous giggle> [INT/A]

Examples (28) and (29) show that stance-taking measures are being constantly revaluated, and most likely redefined by social meaning. Once again, SD uses her authority to end the discussion, but uses affiliative stances instead of a more clear authoritative stance for she knows it will be understood as authoritative by V. Therefore, V responds by acknowledging her authority without any further comments.

4.2.4.3   Solidarity

Interactions between SD and NNSs, on the other hand, do not show the previous stances coded for her interactions with NSs. When interacting with NNSs, SD avoids disagreement and mainly uses solidarity in her interactions, as shown in (30) and (31). The underlined sentences show a clear shift in terms of vocabulary use in comparison to NS/NS interactions (as mentioned previously in the qualitative analysis) and stances being enacted:

(30)
S: But team is prepared/ just wait what the customers are saying <pause>
SD: Yeah, well/ Yu-you-**you don't know until you know, right?** <giggles>
S: That's true <laughter> that's true/
SD: So I think – I think, uh, if **we're prepared for worst case**, **maybe we'll be pleasantly surprised** so/ we'll keep our fingers crossed for Germany <long pause>

(31)
SD: Alright/ Moving on to Phone reaction in PPB e-mail/ ST, do you have any update on that?
St: Yeah, so that should've (?) ready on the 28 of June/ that has been confirmed by Legal/ (?) Legal align with Globally, hum, anything to be ready for hum the 28 of June this is what Legal confirmed
SD: Alright (.) **fantastic**! <changes to "ready" on the screen> <giggles> **real nice when we get a date!**

As defended by Ochs (1992), when interacting, speakers will focus primarily on taking an interpersonal stance; however, their position might move towards an epistemic or evaluative

position depending on how a speaker want to position him/herself in relation to the interlocutor(s). These conclusions are aligned with the excerpts from the call when analyzing NS/NS interactions. It is easy to see that [INT/A] can instantly shift to [INT/D], moving towards both [EVAL] or [AUTH]. At the same time, social meaning plays a role, possibly helping redefine the stances being enacted. Nonetheless, this conclusion does not hold true when SD interacts with NNS. It seems to be the case that SD prefers using positive responses and solidarity as stance-taking measures towards NNSs responses, regardless of the stances being enacted by NNSs participants.

5 DISCUSSION

Initially, it was expected that SD would only present different stance-taking measures towards nonnative participants (i.e., authoritative stance towards NNS specialists). It was also expected that the use of unexpected strategies, vocabulary or stance would result in communication breakdown. Most importantly, information loss was hypothesized as the robust result of a more simplified way of communication (i.e., FT).

After analyzing both our quantitative and qualitative results, I conclude that quantitative results (i.e. non-contracted forms and speech rate) show linguistic strategies used in conference calls, as not only SD but also other participants make use of these features. It is important to note that participants with higher numbers are also in a position of authority; therefore, it can also be reflective of one's position in that company.

With regards to SD's linguistic strategies to demonstrate authority, I highlight that SD prefers to use subtle strategies for a more informal and collaborative environment during the conference call. For instance, the words used when replying to NSs, such as 'alright' and 'awesome', are not a reply to participants' turn but a strategy to end their participation and proceed to the next topic. It can also be understood as a subtle strategy to demonstrate authority, assuring that she is the one that runs the call. Another example of her collaborative style could be found when analyzing the moments in which she intervened in interactions. SD tries not to interrupt and also negotiates her authority with participants from lower ranks, V being one

example. However, she decides to interrupt when she sees the need for her authority to be acknowledged.

SD's bundle of stances confirms her attempt to be seen by all participants as either 'the collaborator' or 'the boss.' When initiating interactions, SD mainly uses affiliative stances; however, she shifts towards authoritative stance when a participant does not respond accordingly in order to demonstrate that she is the boss. After analyzing SD's interactions with NS participants, it is safe to say that social meaning is present in all interactions, and SD's position has a clear effect on participants' stances.

Regarding SD's interactions with NNS participants, I conclude that NNS are almost invisible in conference calls. The call is dominated by NSs, where NNSs participate only when they must provide information regarding a project. F was the only NNS participant who asked a question without being related to any specific project update. Therefore, that was the only example of genuine NS/NNS interaction. The other moments involved project leaders or participants and SD, who requested updates on each project in progress. The nature of these interactions explains the quantitative results with regards to speech rate adjusted, in which most samples from the director SD have the very same speech rates. The director SD is not actually interacting with NNSs, but only asking for project updates as she reads them on the computer screen, and therefore, no repetition, false start nor fillers were found in her discourse.

With regards to stance-taking, qualitative results have shown that SD uses words such as 'fantastic' and 'real nice', accompanied by solidarity as positive reinforcement. Therefore, I conclude that SD wants NNSs to participate and collaborate, thus SD tries not to enact stances that would drive them away or impede their participation even further. Even when NNSs reveal

that a project might have negative results, SD reacts positively and adjusts her epistemic and evaluative repertoire of stances.

The fact that SD shifts from distancing stances towards a more affiliative one when interacting with NNSs confirms the argument that stance is a property of interaction: "any choice of linguistic form made by a speaker is based ultimately on the interpersonal or epistemic stance they wish to take with their various interlocutors at a particular time" (Kiesling, 2009: 172). Finally, it is possible to claim that language is a symbolic power in this setting. SD might use language as a mechanism of power, but unconsciously. Although SD does not use foreigner talk, she might have used solidarity in order to negotiate power with NNSs. As we are socially adaptable and we do not do this consciously, language power becomes socially classified and NNSs might feel linguistic insecurity.

6   CONCLUSION

As previously noted in the data analysis section, no features of FT on NS speech could be found in both quantitative and qualitative results. Findings from this study reveal that careful articulation (i.e. non-contracted forms, slow rate of speech) and stress could possibly indicate strategies used in conference calls. Therefore, it is not possible to confirm FT based on the data presented in this study. As mentioned in the discussion, the qualitative results on word choices (i.e. simple and high frequent words) reveals that SD uses language aligned with different stances either to be seen as a collaborator or to reinforce her status as the boss.

The qualitative analysis on SD's stance-taking measures towards NNSs yield opposite results from the ones previously expected. When analyzing these interactions, it is not possible to relate the stance-taking measures used by SD to the ideological view of English as symbolic power. SD is actually willing to revaluate language ideology by using solidarity. One could associate these results to the fact that SD has been working with NNSs for many years, which might have caused an ideological shift. As mentioned in the literature review, our social relationships define and redefine our ideology. Thus, SD might use solidarity as a way to invite and motivate NNSs to participate more efficiently: "there are signs of a growing respect for other cultures." (Crystal, 2003: 18) On the other hand, NNSs might share a different view in terms of ideology, believing that they are powerless because of their language. It is important to highlight that the only genuine interaction from NNS was initiated by a Spanish participant, whose culture is known as highly social. If F does not see English as a superior language, then its iconization of

power does not exist and he does not feel any pressure to speak up.

As observed by Crystal (2003), some cultures share the belief that English represents linguistic power due to socio-economic factors. English courses should step away from teaching one specific register, as mutual intelligibility should be the main focus. For instance, Business English courses could focus on pragmatic strategies for language teaching in the context of the work place for several varieties of English, instead of favoring a particular one.

6.1   Limitations of the study

Access to recordings was rather limited, as the company provided only one recorded conference call. The reason may be due to the fact that confidential information is shared during the call, including products that have not been launched. The company was originally asked to provide two recordings from each setting; however, the company provided the monthly global meeting only. Ideally, having a conference call with only native speakers could have yield more expressive results, which could have driven the discussion to more conclusive claims. Also, having other calls in which only ranks 2 and 1 participate could have further confirmed SD's shift to authoritative stance to reinforce authority.

6.2   Further Research

Although this study was focused on how social meaning defines style, the data also yields gender factors. SD's style might not only be defined by her social status but also by her gender group, as women are often evaluated on moral authority (Eckert, 1989). A possible future study could focus on leadership and gender, verifying whether the use of proper speech (i.e. non-contrated forms, elision avoidance and formal register) associated with interactive and authoritative stances may be connected to morality.

With regards to NNSs participation, in order to achieve a concrete idea on solidarity and the possible relationship of language power, it would be interesting to carry out a survey with both NSs and NNSs who participated in this conference call. Questions could address the issue of meetings through conference calls with hopes to obtain answers from NSs that would touch on strategies towards NNSs. Answers could help confirm some assumptions made in this study, such as solidarity as a conscious strategy used in response to ideological conceptions with regards to NNSs; and confirm whether NNSs participate less because they lack security in terms of language. As mentioned previously, transcribing and analyzing more calls will yield a stronger claim on the issue. Finally, running the same analysis using conference calls from other multinational companies would further confirm the strategic features discussed in this study, as well as the use of solidarity as a linguistic strategy of negotiation of power, and possibly finding opposite results in companies where NS managers would use different stances to claim power.

7   REFERENCES

Anderson, B. L. (2014). Appalachian Migrant Stances. *Southern Journal of Sociolinguistics* 38(1), 136-158.

Banitz, B. (2005). *Funny business: Verbal humor in business negotiation and the English-as-a-second-language speaker* (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 2005). Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. Retrieved April 10, 2016,http://umiss.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.umiss.idm.oclc.org/docview/305386867?accountid=14588

Burkette, A. (2016). Linguistic and object-based stance-taking in Appalachian interviews. *Language in Society* 45(3), 331–351.

Cookman, L. (2015). Allow me to explain why we don't need words like 'mansplain.' *The Guardian.* Retrieved from: https://www.theguardian.com/media/mind-your-language/2015/feb/12/allow-me-to-explain-why-we-dont-need-words-like-mansplain

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In Robert Englebretson, (Ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction,* (pp. 137–182). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Eckert, P. (2000). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Eckert, P. (1989) The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1, 245-267

Ferguson, C. A. (1971). Absence of copula and the notion of simplicity. In D. Hymes, (Ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, (pp. 141–150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, C. (1975). Toward a characterization of English foreigner talk. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17, 1–14.

García-Amaya, L. (2009). New findings on fluency measures across three different learning contexts. In *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, (pp. 68-80). Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Contextualization conventions. In C.B. Paulston & G.R. Tucker (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 139-155). New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Hatch, E. (1979). Foreigner Talk discourse. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics,* 39-60.

Hymes, D. (1964). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In C.B. Paulston & G.R. Tucker (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 314-349). New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Holloway, W. (1984). Gender difference and the production of subjectivity. In J. Henriques, W. Holloway, C. Urwin, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine (Ed.), *Changing the Subject: Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity* (pp. 228–252). United Kingdom: Methuen.

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language--Ideological Processes. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Ed.), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 375-377). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Jaffe, A. (2009). The production and reproduction of language ideologies in practice. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Ed.), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 391-403). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Kiesling, S. F. (2009). Style as stance: Can stance be the primary explanation for patterns of sociolinguistic variation? In A. Jaffe (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Stance* (pp. 171–194). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Labov, W. (1972). Some Sociolinguistic Principles. In C.B. Paulston & G.R. Tucker (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 235-249). New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Levinson, S. C. (1979). Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, *17*(5-6), 365-400.

Mayfield, J. R., Mayfield, M. R., & Kopf, J. (1998). The effects of leader motivating language on subordinate performance and satisfaction. *Human Resource Management* 37(3), 235-248.

Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Ed.), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 395-423). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Preston, D. R. (1989). *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rampton, B. (2009). Speech community and beyond. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Ed.), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 695-710). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Rothman, L. (2012). A cultural history of mansplaining. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2012/11/a-cultural-history-of mansplaining/264380/

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2009). Be like: The new quotative in English. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Ed.), *The New Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 75-91). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage.

Language learning, *30*(2), 417-428.

Wolfram, W. (2003). On the construction of vernacular dialect norms. In C.B. Paulston & G.R. Tucker (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 251-271). New York: Blackwell Publishing.

8 LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: MEETING TRANSCRIPTION

Global Team Meeting Transcription
Participating Brands
Austin/ Brazil/ UK/ Paris/ Manilla/ Sydney

V: <in> Dangerously close to having Global rollout for the intersection of three other refund policy and save the sale retention efforts/ thank you to the cast of thousands who's been helping with that/hum/ in particular Jessie and Ann, and the trainers, hum, (.) so yeah, this is a, this is a, it's important for everyone in the call to understand that this is sort of a … I am not even using the word policy but sort of, hum, p # like (.) a-**approach** because generally it's-it's-we're not being as black and white, we're leaning towards costumers, there's a lot of discretion, , in there, hum, just to make, just to try to smooth over this transition, so there's been ton of alignments (.) conversations happening with, hum, **finance** and **C Team**/ and hum/ you know, business leaders and trying to deal with accounting and had a lot, lot of false, I would say false start-well/ we call false starts and we've had, we've been off sites several times (.) uh, so, sorry I'm gonna keep this metaphor as well as I can, hum, some penalty kicks, there's been some corner kicks involved <laughter> hum, we are-we are smart people/ (?) try-trying here <laughter> Alright (inaudible) so anyway, we are, hum, there's definitely been injury time, and, uh, we are-we-are-we are gonna roll, so (.) we'll have to just match to (?) really closely we have operating agreements in terms of how much revenue/ what the <noise> capacity looks like, uh, and we have, uh, this very similar global billing refund, we've got a-a very tight aligning process for tracking that, which is fantastic (.) hum (.) and J and E have been working of-on that together, and so, we're just gonna have to keep-keep monitoring it, but the part of - on-one that is important for us to know is **be-cause** of all the sensitivity around, this transition, part of this was Company's name (?) and part of it is where we're **at**/ it's been -- we need to be careful about what we document and what we're putting in the email in terms of , hum, putting policy around 'n stuff, because it's really (?) guidance and approach, where/ because our official external policy is still no refunds, uh, this is part of what (?) So, anyway, we'll, we're launching today, we'll count down to the rest of the brands, uh, one more other thing to know is that, there's some/ a little bit of gap from between the VR pilot and the rest from the global exposure versus, uh, **sort**, and now we've got messaging out thanks to Linda and, uh (.) it's kinda going from there …we're gonna have a whole new level of customer input, right, from once we don't have this things to sell, so expecting some special offer, eh – uh – you know, turn, expecting a little classic (?) uh, and, just sort of a oops I – I've had my head in the sand, hum, which is shocking but we'll-we'll get there as well/ Uh, the other thing I just want to make sure we're all clear on is that (.) even some of the non 3.0 brands (.) uh, Nordics and **Brazil**/ are also gonna **lose** kinda, you know, **bundle** stuff, (.) uh, and so, they need-they're gonna be snaping into this so this's already been – been aligned, but we just sort of kinda need to kick the corners out, we'll be checking in for Brazil to make sure that they're clear and sort of know that they/ what- what our approach will be for that (.) uh, (.) that's that/ for me/ we haven't had a lot of contact that I've seen in terms of the-the auto renewal part, I haven't looked at that (.) uh, (.) very recently (.) and (.) uh (.) <long pause – S is typing> I'm thinking if anything else (.) we realize that there's a CSAT gap and, uh, new, hum, program response, that's one of these ones I have never triggered the survey, so we've unfortunately been missing some insights from cases for 3.0 that have been encoded for that, I know there's a ticket in, to hum fix that, in the upcoming sprint, but - it's ah, it's a little bit on the lost for insight/ thank goodness we also have sentiments, I don't know if those cases would've helped or hurt CSAT, uh, but we are where we are

SD: Well done

<pause>

SD: Alright! Hum (.) I haven't heard Q get on/ Q, are you (.) with us?

<pause>

?: Business solutions was just finishing demoing the new help portal stuff, so she's just up watching that right now

SD: Well, she may have an update for us then afterwards

?: yeah…

*SD: Well, all the dates I had for the EU portal/ E, do you know if these dates are accurate for you guys?

E: <pause> Hum, yes, so far these on track, we are launching today, uh, Spain and Portugal if I'm not (.) **wrong** (.) yeah, Spain and Portugal today

<pause>

SD: Okay, set <inaudible> it's a big day around the world!

<pause>

E: Yup

SD: So (.) can I move on to (.) since STM and A is not on the call yet (.) *ST, would you like to comment on the (.) service fee but with confidence launching in Portugal and in the Netherlands today? Or Stephane / maybe you could comment as well? (interrupted)

ST: Hum, for what I **know**/ I <inaudible> today/ we should be on track (.) at least for book with confidence we are good/ Uh, I know there are some undetermined conditions with (program names) **I've** (.) don't-I'm not sure but both go together I would assume all is good/ unless someone's had otherwise

<pause>

Jim: No no /we are starting with Travelers service fee, (?) there's no difficulty on this one, uh, difficulty, uh, the agents have been trained so, ha, they have to take the contact, and to check that we have more of the same contact that we have on the other brands, so I'm nothing outside training that has been explained to know, in fact

<pause>

SD: Alright/ and then/ it looks like next week we expect to have Germany, Finland, Greece and **Poland** <long pause>

?: Right!

SD: Right/ So you guys ready, SA? <giggles>

Jim: Uh no/ We **need**, uh, <laughter> uh, ready, yes, but the problem is that we don't know how the German market will react, uh, I don't know that, I – if you want to talk about that, that's all main, main, uh, concern for Europe, in fact/

?: But team is prepared/ just wait what the customers are saying

<pause>

SD: Yeah, well/ Yu-you-you don't know until you know, right? <giggles>

?: That's true <laughter> that's true/

SD: So I think – I think, uh, if we're prepared for worst case, maybe we'll be pleasantly surprised so/ we'll keep our fingers crossed for Germany <long pause>

V: Uh, I-I think that we're finishing the training **tomorrow**/ we've been going in groups/ hum/ and/ we're taking a little capacity/ today's gonna be pretty busy day with the launch of postcard e-mail for North America, so, you know, buckle up, we've opened up some overtime to try to cover capacity hit/ Uh, I think we-we-we were-were working through July 4th, uh, 'cause we

don't have enough staff to kinda be open for that/ and then/ I think we're just gonna learn really quickly ST and I had a good **conversation** this morning about targets/ and sort of what's the denominator and what sort of the B level target levels we need to work through/ we need to talk to (dept) about that a little bit/ hum/ but I'm excited, I mean, it feels good to sort of just see what happens right? We don't know if you publish it would they come?/ hum/ we'll see/
<long pause>
V: Kris is in charge of having – uh, controling the dial/ hum, well, especially while Brian and I are out, and everyone knows that we need to maximize the utilization, uh, as quickly as possible learn-learn quickly about, uh, interval arrivals ih-it's just basically like traveler care, right? We, do we-do we have the right-right hours?/ the people at the right hours/ all that/ all that good stuff (.) hum/ but/ I think the team is pretty excited, uh, who-who is involved/ which is always-always good/ uh/ and again the posture is still to get this to general as quickly as possible <pause>
?: Contact (?)
SD: Yup (.) and, uh, readiness in the EU ST?
<long pause>
SA: Readiness in the EU so**rry** I miss the point, ah, so you are talking about the EU (product), I mean?
SD: Yes!
SA: Yeah, so the uh the readiness is for next week, uh, Ahhm, so we are ah we have (?) we are just ah to prepare (?) not yet done/ J. still working on that but the (product) will be trained between this week and the next week ahhh ehhh so <pause> no main ah (.) worry (.) now/ in fact
V: I would just like to say real quickly because we can't lock ours enough this's another example of like we are able to pull off as the global team when we work together and so hum/ I mean/ obviously we need to get the results from it uh but just uh (.) **getting-**getting to launch prospectus/ thank you to everyone who has/ (.) done (.) made heroic effort here (.) so (.) hum <pause>
SD: Yeah, we were just - we were talking about that in the beginning of the call, you know some-some groups do a lot of training we do the-the right amount of planning and I think we-we definitely know (.) execution <giggles> and the test and learn aspect is important too/ when we are ready to – to adjust as needed so yeah (.) amazing what we can handle as a global organization
V: (?) One of my favorite moments of last week was the call we had to kinda review the training materials (.) and it was just such a/ I mean/ the materials were great the team work of/ it was just a opportunity to talk about it and advance and kinda manirate in it and that was a highlight uh of last week for me and so I just it's like, wanna do much-much more of that and it was a good global feeling so uh anyway we need to say this to each other more probably
?: Yeah
<noise>
V: Especially, it's been a difficult year right (.) so (.) celebrate celebrate celebrate when you can <pause> definitely
?: Thanks V.
SD: <laughter>A's still not on the call yet I haven't heard her, so, hum, C, do you want to talk about merchant of record since your team is probably doing must around it at the moment?
C: **I**(.), yes, so our original plan was it was going to launch yesterday, hum, and that didn't happen, the launch is now slated for the 28th, <giggles> I'm not gonna lie and not say that training was kinda excited that it got pushed a week cause we didn't feel like we had you know

the necessary information/ to train the CSRs / I feel that we are at a good point now/ we've figured out how to handle those owner calls and traveler calls cause the traveler calls will affect /hum/ all brands globally (.) so I think we're-we have a little bit more / hum/ content to **create** (.) and we will plan on training NA on Tuesday the 28th and content will be ready for the rest of the globe hopefully by Friday (.) this Friday/ and that's kind of all the

12:41

updates that I had on this end/ I know A. spends **lots** of her time talking to people <giggles> about uh, where we are with the merchant of record but as far as I know/ we are in a good place to launch Tuesday/

<pause>

SD: And along those lines just as a comment/ we … released the ability in compass for agents **to disable** or enable payments account from within compass / hum (.) so that content will go up/ uh/ sometime this week/ the feature is there but we haven't told anyone about it so no one really knows it's there, hum, but we've done all the testing for merchant of record and so the nice thing is/ from a front line agent perspective/ they won't have to go to a different tool – to – handle questions about yapstone versus merchant of record/ everything is flowing through the same spot/ uh/ in compass with the different designator/ depending on who has/ huh/ the payments gateway/ so I'm excited about that as well/ API seems to be working great!/ we've-we've worked through a few uh uh wrinkles/ along the way/ but I think we got everything ready to go for for /hum/ the agents when it launches <pause> Uh, let's see/ J, are you on? <pause>

J: Ah, yes, uh, so this <interruption> <laughter> uh –I- I don't know how you wanna handle this SD I'm actually I usually try to go before this call and I go and update the wiki from the last meeting and put uh so I'll speak to what I put into uh <giggles> I just want to let you know that' the everything I'm gonna say is in the notes from the previous meeting <giggles> cause I'm I updated them/ so you might just wanna go copy and paste versus just tryin' to follow me/but anyways/ this test has gone/ hum/ to a 100%/ which is/hum/ having hum ah default large map/ do you want/ huh/ HA US?/ This was to address, uh, SEO issues <giggles> so, uh, the variation I've- that's-that's been communicated t(o) agents about which variation went to 100% based on our testing that we did so/ this is be-done and behind us as a June 14th <coughs> <pause>

SD: Alright, and so/ is that global?

J: No-no this is just – this was just on HA US, hum, t-but/ What I guess what is worth noting is that/ we will most likely be doing similar **tests** along these lines for European brands to address if we start to experience <panting> the same kind of SEO concerns that we've had on North American brands so/ hum/ that's just kind of a heads up that we've - I would be surprised if we did some AB testing, hum, with European brands/ but uh-they're not on the – on the books yet so uh/ I'm not gonna, huh, put them on here/ <noise>

SD: Alright <background noise/note taking> Alright, and GBS LBS

J: Hum/ yeah – the only update for here was that, hum, we did launch to- so the milestones we're in the middle of doing right now for the this is uh the fact that the PD, uh, the sca turning out PDP (?) probably details (?) page location use LBS data / hum, to display location and that the uh the type of head that we're

using is now LBS powered/ hum and/ we just uh – are launching this week on –hum- Brazil / hum/ is going out to 100 % this week <noise> hum/ which leaves us only with the-uh-the smaller brands / hum/ to be translated and roll to a 100% which will include/ The Netherlands and No-hum-uh-Norway, Greece, Poland , those, those (?) I just had them all in my notes so uh and the one straggler brand is the ODHR (?) and that has more to do with supervise networking issues

not (.) with the actual feature itself <noise> hum/ so that one is kind of , hum, that one is gonna just always be a little bit of a struggle so I think it has more to do with <noise> (.) what's gonna happen w-with regards to supersizing network plans on that brand versus, uh, versus this feature itself / so/ kind of following that closely/

L: J, do you know anything about PPB not having any GBS options?

J: Hum, no… <pause> not in particular/ hum

L: okay

<laugher>

L: We just saw-we just saw that last week that – that PPB listings will no longer happen in GBS options, it just moves to (program) based on where the map pin is dropped/

J: Oh, the-hum-okay, maybe I take that back, so ye-the-the-uh on the supplier side/ the ability to –hum- you mean –th-the ability to specify your advertisement region?

L: Yes/ Correct, as an owner

J: Yeah, that-that that was/ that's been changed for quite a while/ I don't know-uh- it be surprising if it's just now being noticed but, hum, <giggles>, hum, that was a supplier side change where we, yeah, everything now's gonna be driven completely from y our lat-long based on your-your uh verified location / not, hum, being able to specify your advertising region/hum, I can get you the-the-the article that we have about that, I think hum but that- sorry/ that's been out for a while so but I/ <interrupted>

?

L: Okay

J: By all means I can help with that if hum if we need messaging <giggles> <interruped>

?

V: There's no reason for us t-to change advertising regions, it's irrelevant <pause> that's global?

J: Correct

<background noise or chat>

?: There's also gonna be moving the location of that content in the dash, it's not longer gonna be in the listing editor/ I think that they ended up saying that it will go in the uh I believe they said they finalized the analytics area uh since the customer is unable to change that so that they recognize that there's been a shift in the business and that we're no longer letting them edit that

L: Yeah, we might gonna want to get a daily news article up for CS, cause I think we had a (?) reporting not being able to e-edit that and <back noise>uh something (?) as well

V: Yeah, it was reported by Brazil last week so yeah

J: Yeah, we'll

V: It doesn't, we should / yeah/ I wanna make sure we're not sending cases to **production** and we're uh if it's an irrelevant change and also one that we can't even make then that's just gonna reset – set our customers off, so / I'm even wondering if that's big enough to announce in the owners statement <pause> <int>

SD: I think they may (.) uh?

V: Perhaps it's already been done

SD: Seems like I've seen it but I've seen a few things flying around so <int> don't quote me

V: Right, I know

<laughter>

J: And I might <noise> (in) <int>

SD: (in) owner statement

J: But you L, you're saying the-the for some reason th-it's been only been noticed on PPBs?

Like, that's a things that's kinda strange to me is that-the (.) it was sorta or is it that-that was kinda user case that came in that basically people ar-reacting to

L: I think it was the user case, I yeah it just seems like we just need some clarification on that/ probably all around/

J: Mk/ Alright, I can take that/ it's not a-not a big problem/

L: Thanks

J: Uhum

F: J, this is Frederico from Madrid/ I have a question regarding how the LBS works on Islands/ hum <pause> we have some customers calling us because they-they are for example in Maiorca or (city) suffering uh-they are suffering a few different islands around so, hum, I don't know how is working/ if it going to be revised for-for islands/ how works and it's like we have 3, 4 islands like in the (name) islands in Spain for example (name) islands

J: Yes, so I mean the way-the way sorta just looking forward – the way things are gonna work is that everything will be based everything's gonna be based on location that-that is provided by the property owner and then based on regions or polygons that LBS prescribes to those so/ and that would be true f-islands or you know uh any-any destination and –then what's gonna happen is that/ hum/wha-they would also appear in relevance search terms based upon that polygon so they're maybe like sorta nearby or adjacent areas that-that they could appear as well/huh-hum/which is all sorta done through hum through LBS so uh, you know,

GBS has the very sorta hierarchical like if you had to appear in/ you know/ if you in this top level and then you'd have to appear in the next level and,uh, and such and such and such all the way down , hum, more like a tree structure and LBS's not that way so everything is driven on lat-long of property owner's verified location that they provide and then also based upon what regions we have defined or what polygons we have to find for that search term in-inside the system so hum/so-it's gonna be it's-it's gonna be simpler from one perspective but then it-is gives a lot of flexibility about sort of hum how we can present the travelers relevant properties based upon what they search for so hum, hum, that's just we're, sorry, Frederico I just have to follow you online , you know, cause there's always this kinda strange cases like here in the US we have lots of problems with like hum you know where you have properties that're inside specific condo communities where they have sort of a certain amenities that are specific to those and/ you know/ their people are very, hum, particular about how these end up showing in search results/ and so I would guess that that's probably the same thing for like let's say an island like Maiorca , hum, so if we have <int>

F: Yeah, yeah, exactly/ no I know/ for example/ It could appear properties in France/ the south of France or (.) uh (.) the East of Spain, the peninsula in Spain/ that would be possible? Like, like, similar like that so they're <int>

J: Yeah

F: In the (?) we are offering, we are showing properties from

Showing properties in South of France or or East of Spain

<pause>

J: Yeah, we'll, ah-those're the ones I'd just want to look at the specifics of them, I don't wanna, like, in general like-I think we, we'd never cross like certain types of boundaries like country bondaries would never be crossed, hum, and things like that but <deep breath> there are cases where you know (.) relevance, hum, based on certain types of relevance that uh-hum things might show up like (?) we have some cities here in the US where they border right between a state/ and so/ we would cross state lines for instance like/ say places like Kansas city where's like

right on the-on the edge, where we might present properties in both because as a traveler you might wanna stay, you know, if you wanna stay in Kansas City you could be across those state lines, so, hum, those are areas where the-there's sometimes edge places like that that we just kinda have to like dig into, and so, what I'd love to do is just (.) see some cases where maybe, hum, search terms are not presenting the way you expect and I can just, we'll look at them and get you feedback on how it works. <int> If that's okay.

F: Yes, good good/ so we should just report it to you, then.

J: Yeah, just come to me,and uh, I can give you sorta (?) at the right place

F: Perfect, thank you

<Long pause – S is typing>

S: Alright. Hum, let's see, next stop is the**e** new money back guarantee program, um, affecting Europe only, hum, so that's really a specific PLT but, Emily, I put your name on it, since your team (is) doing a good portion of work on this

E: Yup. <inaudible> You're right <inaudible> content is ready as well, so, hum, it seems that we're gonna, ah, inform CS pretty soon about it/ hum (.) yup. It's-it's to be launch by, not the time of (monetization) on July11th, so, we are in a good shape so far. <laugh> so basically yeah changing fro m the criteria (acronym) criteria (.) hum (.) it's not anymore hum aiming at new hum (?) search time advertisements on the site, it's only for specific group of owners, hum, to add them going through the (acronym) transition so it's going to be only for (.) hum 'renewer' and for owners as in (?) hum with specific renewal date but basically this is what we're aiming at (.) so very few changes regarding the eligibility, hum, but the scope of the program basically is changing

<pause>

SD: Then, next up is the new onboarding flow, which is essentially a PPB first onboarding flow that this is gonna be launching on BR for July 19th and then it will be enrolling release, they're gonna test brands so before they release fully, hum, so that's hum what they've done is they've kinda – th-they detach this piece from the monetization piece, hum, and so that's why these dates have now shifted hum they're-they're no longer the same, so we're originally they're supposed to go today with the BR and monetization change but now it's been pushed out, hum, because they are having to make some adjustments for, hum, whether or not people can , hum, list their properties with, hum, if they don't qualify for HomeAway payments what we're gonna do with them, etc. Hum, so, we're working through that with Monica, we've had a wonderful meeting with C.R., where we've talked through all the different news cases and the, hum, if there's that can happen along the way hum so hum I know Linda is in the mids and Nicky is in the mids in making sure we have a documentation ready for that/ so it's in progress <pause> hum, next up is the Instant Booking pilot phase II/ we have a meeting on this today/ hum, this is where we have, I believe it was 3 different platform pins that were - going to try out instant booking in phase I, which is so is no longer 24 hour query hold/ where the owner accepts it, it's instant booking much like a **hotel**/ hum, phase I was completely supported by (name) so it's a very small group of owners and hum, CS had no no <back noise> (?) for that, other than if someone did call into CS and they were on this program, they'd just send them directly to (name)/ hum, phase II is going to be an expanded pilot/ hum, phase I was just HomeAway US, and so I'm expecting phase II to probably include some other brands on other huh, other regions, hum, and so, it will likely require some level of CS support and so we need to talk through what that means/ and also the size of that pilot/ hum, so, more to come on that as well. <pause> Uh, okay, another one (.) full integration on expedia/ this one is (.) going t'be expanding our-huh-how we appear on the

expedia site/ if you recall today/ hum, when someone goes to expedia and they search for **hotel**/ it will actually bring up some vacation rentals that may match their search criteria/ if they want to see more vacation <u>rentals</u>, it takes they to our search page <coughs> and then if they click on a property it takes them to a HomeAway property description page/ hum/ and if they go to **book** it takes them through the HomeaAway traveler checkout <pause> well, this next level of integration **is** going to be using our new,hum, shopping books API and that means that the traveler will actually stay **in the expedia** (.) shopping cart and (?)/ so we have a number of things that we have to work out from a supporter perspective/ because this means that expedia will actually be supporting those travelers going forward, **not us**/ and so, we also wanna make sure that, hum, we are handling these contacts appropriately and, because these are IPMs initially there can be some, hum, integration issues with IPM/ HomeAway is essentially acting as the middleman/ since we have an integration API to the IPMs and then we'll have a booking API <u>over to be</u> or shopping API over to expedia/ hum, you know, there're-there're potential points of failure, and so we need to make sure that we cover, hum/ you know/what those could be and how to make sure that customers are taken care on the way <pause> so there will be a lot more to come on that/ hum, that pilot is expected for September mid like Sep 7 (?)/ hum, and it will be starting with 3 IPMs/ I believe/ hum, one in the US and two in Europe/ and that number could change/ hum, but that was the last number I heard <pause> that's definitely more to come on that! <long pause> hum, let's see, next up is WholeOrg/

J: (Is) that me? <laughs>

SD: What? <really low on the background>

J: <laughs> So, hum, we are we're (?) we're in the middle of our– fast and furious in the middle of the Dojos right now, hum, we have completed a Dojo around the (acronym), and we completed the Dojo around the help portal registration process/ so, hum, those are the two we've gotten through this week we are doing a Dojo on screenpop (.) hum, so that's gonna be the next critical one once compass gets delivered, hum, we-we'll be doing another follow up on screen pops (?) sorta making sure that screenpop is floating on the compass where's okay/ hum, as far as this team is concerned ah, hum, my two needs are/ one, when I ask for Dojo testers do your best to make those- those people available, hum, for Dojo testing, and then, hum, we are still, there're still some tests that are not finalized yet, and so, hum, hum – we're gonna be reaching out to those people and making sure we're getting those (.) finalized and ready so/ and then/ you know/ I put the rest of the dates here-uh-just everyone can just kinda, you know, have their-their head around, we're looking to pull in the actual go like date the date before a major US holiday/ and so, hum, we're hoping that we can pull up some time hum during the –sometime in the uat flash training and content, hum, (?) delivery that we can pull in a little bit to (.) get that in maybe early in November / hum, but, according to schedule, you know, what's in there, that's the official go like date, we're-we're working on that <noise> that's the update/ if you have any questions, by all means, shoot them my way (coughs)

SD: Alright/ Moving on to Phone reaction in PPB e-mail/ STM, do you have any update on that?

St: Yeah, so that should've (?) ready on the 28 of June/ that has been confirmed by Legal/ (?) Legal align with Globally, hum, anything to be ready for hum the 28 of June this is what Legal confirmed

SD: Alright (.) fantastic! <changes to "ready" on the screen> <giggles> real nice when we get a date! Hum, let's see Testing Removing Supplier's Phone Numbers from PPB listings/

J: I think we can remove t <int> yeah, I think we can remove this one, S, because/ it hasn't been talked about for a month/ I think this was – I put this one here because / around the time they

were talking about doing this was right around service fee and there's a lot of sensitivity around that happening/ and, hum/ I gave that concern and they-it's put the back burn and <long b> and now it seems like we're – ih-kind of/ the testing team is all around sort of like these l-low rank (?) expedia winners/ hum/ so I just don't see this coming up so I-I think for now we can just safely remove this and- I'll bring it up as it comes up again/ <coughs>

SD: Okay/ I'll just delete it/

J: Yes/ It was mainly one of these ones I knew it was going to be a touchy subject so/ I just want to <laughs> aware of <coughs>

SD: So it sounds like we have some exciting news about PayPal (auth?)

J: Soon, I don't have a date yet/ hum/ our (?) was canceled for the last two weeks but I've been working with Lorena and that seems, hum, demos, so I'm assuming that means that we're very very close/ hopefully to have a date tomorrow at after our xteam meeting it's actually our date to launch

<long pause - S is typing>

SD: Awesome/ So we'll change this from red to (.) in progress <giggles>

J: yeah, sounds good <giggles> this's as close as I've seem <giggles>

SD: Yeah, exactly (.) and then/ last one on the list is 1 dollar authorization

J: Yup, hum, so/ have mix news on this one and so what we've/ obviously we're not near near to –to launching on this/ however I will say that we hum (.) have started doing some very preliminary dev testing on this/ hum/ there were some (.) work we had to do with yapstone to get the right reporting available so that/ when **we**-we're looking at this we could examine sorta declines and (.) understand what is happening so/ hum/ hum/ at the last time we'd met/ you know/ we were kinda struggling with the fact that (.) yapstone had decided to not adopt hum ventive across the board they were gonna do ventive for-u-for/hum/ for amex and then payment tech for the other cards/ so we had to kinda come up with a new approach and so (.) that is now happening/ so hum-I'm expecting that we'll probably start to do some testing, some official testing/ hum hum/ probably by the time we meet again so th-I-I want , this one-this one should definitely be last up there/ we'll most probably be in progress the next time we talk (.) so little heads up there we might see some some news around that the next month <coughs>

SD: Alright <typing> okay so opening it up to the **floor** do we have any thing else, hum, coming up that do we need to be aware of, that's not already on the list?

V: What about the <int> (?) around a little bit <pause> removing our (?) option for homeaway payments and all that stuff

A: I can talk about that/ so the-there are some changes that have to do with what we're lauching today in the **dash** / the, uh, like box engagement is no longer going to be ah – hum, following people to alternative payment methods unless they've been declined for HomeAway payments (.) hum/ and then we're also removing ah the, like ability to sign up for offline payments for anybody who has homeaway payments, hum, or in the future with who has (acronym), hum <int>

V: That's actually, that's wha-tha's happening when-I-I haven't realized that <> based on what I've got so yesterday there's no date for that second part

A: Right, we're gonna talk about that in the payments PLT here in 15 minutes <int> because

V: Okay, my point is that that's something that we need to track here because that's to me that's a (.) a real mover of <> it just touches on different things/ it's like, hum,

A: You mean the mor piece?

V: Not even the MOR piece/ just about whether/ I mean/ just from a CSR handling of (.) you know (.) awareness (?) customer (.) you know/ just all the stuff and how much it touches (?) how much it touches our (?) process/ you know/ I don't know

A: Ow, you mean the second bullet basically eliminating the ability for travelers to pay via OFP if the (.) supplier has homeaway payments

<pause>

V: Right/ And that-that not allowin**g** those customers (.) <inaud> owners to **ad** an alternative payment type <int>

A: So-so travelers will still be able to pay via OFP if the person already has it, like if <int> they're already signed up for alternative payments it doesn't change it all, it's only (.) what Val said, if they have homeaway payments currently, hum, and they aren't signed up for alternative payments they won't be able to sign up via the dash anymore

V: And so/ this whole thing, can they sign up via (acronym) it's just that <int>

A: Yeah, they can. Yeah, they-they'll be able to call CS and CS would be able to enable via compass <pause>

V: So, anyway/ I- just think that's something/ it feels just like it's (?) don't know which PLT is running, you know, it just feels like it's running lot of things that's touches a lot of different (.) hum (.) descriptive policy processes that we have and so I just (.) maybe it's worth tracking here / I-d/ from what I understood yesterday there's not a date for it or (?) another topic on whether homeaway's gonna get advantaged and best match <pause> hum, this's just something (?) talk but it hasn't been formalized/

A: (?) seems to be adding more and more things that/ we don't want to change ours (?) and (?)/ we're just saying that (?) call CS?

V: Right, hum <int>

A: <IN> which, huh <giggles> I'm hopping that this is a stepping stone actually changing (?) and fees/ this is not like/ going forever, 'cause it'll affect our contact volume if (?)

V: Yeah! That's a very deliberate conversation that Jeff was part of/ and in terms of like supporting the-the PPB on the onboarding but I don't want that to become a blanket acceptance of everything like this since so that was the email that I (?) yesterday/ Hum, which was sort of like/ "hey, is this an assumed agreement or is this this is an deliberate conversation that we had to understand that and I mean, if we, have a blanket agreement that-until we have an (acronym) policy/ we're gonna be trying to (?) things down and then just have CS support/ we need to sorta understand how many other of these (?) right? We're gonna be (.) supporting

<pause>

A: Yeah/ and with this one if we enable them for Offline payments and see in compass/ does that gonna enable them (?) that? <noise> in the dashboard

Q: It will, yeah

A: they don't have to call us to edit it (?)

V: So which-which team which PLT is driving this/ A, you seem to have the most information about it

A: Oh, yeah, we talked about it (?) dash kinda a bit so so prob-probably (?) <int>

SD: Well, that's the part we discussed in the (acronym) as well since they were kinda (?) a little bit

A: Yeah

V: (?) I guess do we have an owner that I mean I know it's (.) is it-is it (.) who's huh-who's our owner I guess just in terms of (.) readiness/ are we even (?) discussion happening about this being a CS activity?

SD: That's happening in supplier (?) so that would be me

V: Kay

SD: And I've already raised objections <nervous giggle> and (.) hum (.) this is one of those ones where they think that (.) hum (.) you know/ by removing this/ it just kinda removes the idea all together and so <background noise> the chanc e isn't likely (?) be contacting us actually reduce 'cause they're not gonna know that was an option which <int> I think would <int> it's also the case that we've seen going out by removing the setting page/ although I just noticed the email that goes out when you enable online booking is still has the link to the settings page so it does exist behind the scenes/ hum/ so <int> I honestly ha <int> I haven't <bn> seen the date <in> first bullet hum so I'm <int>gonna follow up <int>

?: The like box changes today/ hum/ it's the removing of the OFP settings inability to sign up that doesn't have a confirm date

V: Yeah so I think I mean even in terms of like CSR scripting like if if I don't want CSRs to be I'm very supportive about (.) reducing offline payments so I want to be clear about that (.) but hum so I do wanna support I do wanna support this (.) but I do think it's part of the OLB pitch right now for agents to (.) offer offline payments to people so they need stop that and I don't know what's in the compass email for OLB pitch and all (?) it just feels like we have a lot of-of little tenticles to check into/ help content/ where do we- where do we advirtise (Acronym) help content right / this-all that kinda stuff

And I believe that's all I actually been enables right now cause we do have a number of (?) about each number of these (?)/ hum, I know that (.) hum (.) part of the part of the olb objections are (?) articles (?) is modifying that based on this new changes as well/ hum, but we can set some time aside to go through all the articles and make they're all (?)

V: Cool-cool

<pause>

V: Yeah/ I'm-I'ma not trying to insinuate but someone's dropped the ball I don't know who has/ trying to clarify who has the ball <in> thank you

SD: Alright, anything else? <pause-adding info to the board, scrolling the page> no other releases we need to know about ?

?: I know we're talking about refer a friend today <long pause> hum

do we need update on <name of program>?

?: <giggles> () talked about that already

A: okay

V: that's okay

<pause>

?: SD, just to clarify, like box changes today's for the us brand, in HAUKand the rest of the world we're still, hum, TBD on

SD: Okay <pause> thanks <pause> is that true for the (?) option or (?)

Ah, I – I don't know about removing it in traveler check-out/

S: Oh, okay

J: Ow, that would be me/ probably that which follow on that, Val (.) and SD

?: kAY

j: I think that the navy test on that of having the option removed so (coughs)

SD: Alright! <pause> I think that's alwrap everyone I'll send out maybe news and uh link to the recording for those who may have missed/ and you have any humaddtional notes to add to the notes please do (.) alright, thanks, everyone
?: Thanks
?: Bye-bye
<Disconnecting Sound>

EDUCATION

The University of Mississippi – Oxford, MS/ United States
M.A. in Modern Languages, Emphasis in Applied Linguistics and TESOL – 2017

Yale University – New Haven, CT/ United States
Fulbright Non-degree Study Program – 2014

Gama Filho University – Rio de Janeiro/ RJ – Brazil
Graduate degree in English Translation – 2013

Catholic University of Santos – Santos/SP – Brazil
B.A. in Language and Literature – Portuguese and English – 2007

WORK EXPERIENCE

The University of Mississippi – Oxford, MS/ United States
Graduate Teaching Assistant – September 2015 to Present
Classes of Elementary and Intermediate levels of Portuguese, preparation of activities, quizzes and promotion of language tables. English and Spanish tutoring, and classes of English at the Intensive English Program for the local community, working with a multi-level class environment and students from different language backgrounds.

The United Nations – New York City, NY/ United States
Language and Communications Programme Intern – June 2016 to August 2016
Established procedures, documents and brochures for the six language programmes at UNHQ, participated in the project of revamping the programme website by updating content, improving user experience and including user guides for registration. Assisted English teachers, promoted tutoring sessions and remedial classes for the English Department.

HomeAway Brazil – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Content and Training Specialist - August 2014 to September 2015
Translation/localization of Customer Service and Sales content for South America (Brazil, Argentina and Colombia). Designed and delivered training to employees from Customer Service and Sales teams, including e-learning courses and facilitator guides. Participated in three global launches, being responsible for implementing them in South America. Supervised a team of 10 employees.

Cultura Inglesa – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Teacher of English as a foreign language – July 2014 to September 2015
English Classes to groups of all ages from Basic to Advanced level.

Yale University – New Haven, CT/ United States
Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant - August 2013 to May 2014
Primary instructor of Elementary Portuguese, preparation of syllabi, activities, exams, and promotion of language tables. Served as a cultural ambassador, developing projects to promote cultural awareness about Brazil.

Cultura Inglesa – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Teacher of English as a foreign language – November 2011 to July 2013
Taught Business and general English, including in-company classes.

Instituto Brasil Estados Unidos – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Teacher of English as a foreign language – February 2012 to October 2012
Taught kids from 3rd to 5th grade at bilingual schools, developing cross-curricular activities.

Wise Up Idiomas – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Pedagogical Coordinator – October 2010 to November 2011
Conducted Placement Tests, promoted regular staff meetings and training, observed teachers, coached and provided support to new teachers. Organized field classes and events in the school. Supervised a team of 10 employees (English teachers, the Teens Course Coordinator and the Assistant Coordinator).

Brasdril/Word Magic – Rio de Janeiro, RJ/ Brazil
Offshore English and Portuguese teacher - March 2010 to September 2010
Classes of Portuguese and English on board of Oil Rigs. Assisted with translation of documents and interpretation during line-ups.

Msc Cruise Lines – Naples/ Italy
Info and Excursion Hostess - November 2008 to March 2010
Support the communication among all departments in the ship; provide information regarding the ports of call and shore excursions; translation of documents and interpretation during meetings. Worked as a tour escort during the Mediterranean season and Crossing.

Wise Up Idiomas – São Paulo, SP/ Brazil
Teacher of English as a foreign language - April 2007 to November 2008
Classes from Basic to Advanced groups, one-on-one and remedial classes.

Exchange Program in The United States
Intrax Work Travel Program – December 2006 – march 2007
Experience with Hospitality and people from different nationalities and cultures.

PUBLICATIONS

2017 "Developing Communicative and Cultural Competences in Portuguese through an Online Collaborative Project." Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages. Volume 21. Accepted and forthcoming.

ACADEMIC PAPER PRESENTATIONS

2017 "Features of Foreigner Talk in Conference Calls" TESOL International Convention & English Language Expo Master's Student Forum, Seattle, WA.

2017 "Tablets in the Classroom: Promoting Collaboration and Cultural Awareness" AMTESOL (Alabama-Mississippi Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) Annual Conference, Hattiesburg, MS.

2017 "Negative Transfer in Learning English as a Second Language." AMTESOL (Alabama-Mississippi Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) Annual Conference, Hattiesburg, MS.

2016 "Atividades Híbridas e Presenciais na Promoção do Multilinguismo no Ensino de PLE: Experiências Como Flta na Johns Hopkins University - Sais e Yale University com Mesas De Conversação, Atividades Culturais e Recursos Tecnológicos." XI CONSIPLE (The International Society for the Teaching of Portuguese as a Foreign Language XI Conference), Salvador, BA, Brazil.

2016 "Ambientação Acadêmica e Dificuldades No Ensino de PLE nos EUA: Oportunidades Possíveis." XI CONSIPLE (The International Society for the Teaching of Portuguese as a Foreign Language XI Conference), Salvador, BA, Brazil.

2016 "Developing Communicative and Cultural Competences in Portuguese as a Foreign Language through Situated Learning and Self-Directed Projects" NCOLCTL (National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages) Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.

2016 "Developing Cultural and Communicative Competences Through a Self-Directed Project." AMTESOL (Alabama-Mississippi Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) Annual Conference, Orange Beach, AL.

2015 "Online games for cultural aspects and communicative competence" MFLA (MS Foreigner Language Association) Annual Conference, Starkville, MS.

2014 "Equívocos na tradução de turismo e hotelaria: uma discussão sobre o turismo como língua de especificidade" Translation Studies and Terminology Presenter, December, IV Simpósio Profissão Tradutor – PROFT 2014, São Paulo, SP.

2014 "Uma reflexão sobre os processos tradutórios em áreas específicas: um estudo terminológico sobre a hotelaria" Translation Studies and Terminology Presenter,

September, XXXIV Semana do Tradutor e I SIT – Simpósio Internacional de Tradução, São José do Rio Preto, SP.

2014 "O Uso Da Tecnologia Para Introdução Dos Aspectos Culturais Às Aulas De Língua Estrangeira: Atividades Para Ensinar Cultura Com Ferramentas Online" Teaching Techniques Presenter, September, III Simpósio sobre Ensino de Línguas Estrangeiras do CEFET/RJ, Rio de Janeiro, RJ.

2013 "Using the website www.amigosecreto.com.br for Portuguese Language teaching" Teaching Techniques Presenter, December, Fulbright FLTA Mid-Year Conference, Washington, DC.

AWARDS/ FELLOWSHIPS

2017 – Nominated for the Graduate Student Achievement Award.
2016 –Three Minute Thesis Competition Finalist – The University of Mississippi
2015/2016/2017 – Conference Presentation Travel Grant – The University of Mississippi.
2016/2017 – Graduate Student Funding at The University of Mississippi.
2015/2016 – Graduate Student Funding at The University of Mississippi.
2013 – Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant at Yale University.