TIS The Independent Scholar

A peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal

OPEN ACCESS

EDITORIAL BOARD

The Independent Scholar

Volume 5 (August 2019)

FROM THE EDITOR'S LAPTOP

Welcome to Volume 5 of *The Independent Scholar (TIS)*. Once again, we present a very diverse set of papers in a variety of disciplines, which exemplifies not only the journal, but the National Coalition of Independent Scholars (NCIS) itself. This also is the first issue of TIS in which a paper is published bilingually, with a piece in its original French and a translation by Humanities Editor Amanda Haste.

While Volume 4 deliberately centered on one particular theme - gender - what stands out in this issue occurred quite by happenstance. A cursory glance at the Table of Contents reveals not only a diversity of papers, disciplines and methodologies, but an amazingly global perspective. A sociolinguistic paper on Spanish in Ecuador, the contributions of a Swiss psychoanalyst to Freudian theory, Australian influences upon the American women's labor movement, and the contributions of a British press magnate ins the struggle for Hungarian nationalism between the two World Wars. This number's book reviews include a cross-racial/ethnic account of America's Allotment Era, an exploration of the US Electoral College, a memoir of the Jewish Labor Bund in Warsaw, a book on women and American Muscle cars, a book on contemplation in paganism, and a volume on research ethics by a British author.

The TIS Editorial team could not have performed without the hard work of our anonymous Peer Reviewers – you know who you are! – and the proof reading genius of Catherine Prowse. For their work, the editorial board is profoundly thankful, and also to our authors who have willingly undergone up to three rounds of peer review to make their papers as good as possible . . .

As NCIS just finished celebrating our 30th Anniversary with a conference in Amherst, Massachusetts, our next issue – or two – will feature papers delivered at the Conference, on the conference theme "Making Connections, Meeting Challenges". Several papers are already under review, and once through this process will be published online as pre-prints, and then formally once TIS Vol. 6 is completed.

If you would like to submit a manuscript for consideration, please refer to the Notes for Contributors at the end of this volume, or go straight to https://www.ncis.org/the-independent-scholar/tis.

Shelby Shapiro, Ph.D.
General Editor, *TIS*

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Amy Absher is based in Seattle, Washington, USA, and is a historian, writer, and teacher specializing in the 20th-century African American Experience.

Karima Amer (Ph.D., University of Paris Diderot, Paris, France) is a psychopathology and psychoanalysis historian whose research focuses on the unconscious in the nineteenth century and on the history of Swiss psychoanalysis and the appearance of a mytho-poetic unconscious. Dr. Amer's research on Swiss psychoanalysts who, concerned with their independence and their freedom of thought, defend a psychoanalysis stripped of any sexual etiology sits alongside her work on exile and migration.

Patricia Clarke (Ph.D., OAM, FAHA, FFAHS) is a decorated Australian writer, editor, historian and former journalist who has written widely on women in Australian history. She is the author of thirteen books, including several biographies of women writers and journalists, and has published widely on media history. She is founding honorary secretary of the Independent Scholars Association of Australia; member Commonwealth Working Party, *Australian Dictionary of Biography* since 1987; member National Library of Australia's Fellowship Advisory Committee 1997-2017; Chair of the NLA Folk Fellowship Committee 2003-27; member of the ACT Historic Houses Advisory Committee 2010-16; consultant to Media Hall of Fame since 2011; and Past President, Councillor, Canberra & District Historical Society.

Amanda Haste (Ph.D. Musicology; Dip.Trans.IoLET) is a British musicologist and academic translator whose research interests include identity construction through music and language. She teaches courses in Translation and in English for Specific Purposes as adjunct faculty at Aix-Marseille University, France. Her research has been published in leading journals and books by major editors such as Palgrave MacMillan, Taylor & Francis, and Routledge; she co-authored (with Prof. James Block, DePaul University) *Constructing Identity in an Age of Globalization* (Paris: Ex Modio, 2015).

Literata Hurley holds master's degrees in education and history and has written about Wicca in a variety of contexts. She leads a coven in Columbus, Ohio and teaches in person and at conferences including Convocation, Sacred Space, and Between the Worlds.

Jordan Lavender (Ph.D., University at Albany, SUNY, USA) is an independent scholar currently teaching Spanish and Latin American History at Pomfret School in Pomfret, CT. After receiving his Ph.D. in 2017, he taught at the University at Albany, SUNY and at Colby College in Waterville, ME. He has conducted research on the use of minority languages on Twitter in Spain, bilingualism in the linguistic landscapes of Azogues, Ecuador, and has conducted recent work in forms of address in Ecuadorian Spanish, based on ethnographic research in both online and offline contexts.

Katalin Kádár Lynn (Ph.D., U. of Budapest, Hungary) is a historian based in Budapest and California whose principal area of scholarship is World War II and the Cold War. Founder and Editor in Chief of Helena History Press, she has authored *Tibor Eckhardt: His American Years 1941-1972*, edited *Tibor Eckhardt: In His Own Words*, and co-authored (with Károly Szerencsés and Péter Strausz) *Through an American Lens, Hungary 1938: Photographs by Margaret Bourke-White* (2010). Her upcoming publications include a biography of Béla Varga, a history of the Hungarian National Council and a survey of Hungarian immigration history 1938-1972.

Serena Newman holds a Master's in History from the University of Mass., Amherst, and specializes in Early American and Constitutional History. She has taught as Adjunct Faculty in History and Government, and has been a community college tutor. She is currently a Reader with the College Board AP History Exams.

Shelby Shapiro (Ph.D., U of Maryland, USA) gained his Ph.D. in American Studies for his dissertation dealing with acculturation and American Jewish women in the Yiddish press. He served for many years as the English-language editor of *Tsum punkt/To the Point,* the magazine of Yiddish of Greater Washington, as well as for its predecessor publication, and he is a Yiddish-English translator. Dr Shapiro is currently Associate Editor of *Records of the State of Connecticut,* and his research interests include Jazz and Blues, the labor movement, the First World War, and immigrant anarchism.

Dorothy Woodman, Ph.D. is a contract lecturer at the University of Alberta and Concordia University of Edmonton. Using intersectional feminist and indigenous critical theories, her areas of specialization center on race, gender, and class structures and logics. Her research and teaching focus on medical narratives, contemporary indigenous and global literatures, Marvel superhero comics and cancer, and breasts as cultural symbols.

THE SOCIAL VALUES OF TÚ, VOS, AND USTED IN ECUADORIAN SPANISH: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF USAGE IN AZOGUES

Jordan Lavender, Ph.D.

(Andover, MA, USA)

Correspondence should be addressed to: Jordan.lavender@ncis.org

Abstract

This study examines the use of forms of address among a community of practice in Azogues, Ecuador through both ethnographic observation and in interviewing participants about their use of address forms. Observations of usage and interview data show that usted *is the preferred address form among this group of speakers and among frequent interlocutors in their daily lives. Deviations from* usted *can have emotive function when occurring as variation from regular use of* usted. *However, using forms besides* usted *can be socially marked, as expressed by all informants in their interviews with the researcher. As such, this shows the sociocultural value of* usted *among this group of speakers and the degrees with which it can be used to express solidarity in conjunction with* tú *and* vos *in other contextually appropriate ways. The use of* tú *and* vos *is restricted by speakers' ideology of its use and the tendency is to limit its use in order to avoid misinterpretation of these forms by interlocutors.*

Keywords: Address forms; pronominal; social interactions; social markers; linguistics

1. INTRODUCTION

Language marks nearly all interactions between speakers in their daily lives, and, although a considerable amount of our use of language is concerned with speaking about ourselves, much of our language use concerns talking about, or to, others. The lexical items used to address others are referred to as *forms of address*. The way in which we address others can reveal how we perceive the relationship we have with that person and can express politeness, deference and respect, or solidarity (Jakobson 1960). Languages have different means of expressing various aspects of the relationships between speakers, that is, forms of address can refer to *pronouns of address, nouns of address* or *verbs of address*, referring to second person pronouns, nouns used in addressing others, such as *papá, mamá, etc.* and the verbal morphology that distinguishes between second and third person verb forms, as well as distinguishing between different types of forms of address. These various kinds of address forms interact with each other to create the social meanings mentioned above.

Many factors can affect the forms of address used by a speaker such as the type of communicative event, the features associated with the type of social activity carried out, commonly shared expectations of participants, and the social distance and power relation between the interlocutors, as well as, age, sex, social class, level of education, and geography (Blas Arroyo 2005). That is to say that everything from the location of the interaction, to the characterization of the participants involved, can affect the forms of address used and the meanings created by the speaker and those interpreted by their interlocutor. This dual process of production and interpretation characterizes the use of address forms in every interaction in which they occur.

This study analyzes the use of address forms among a group of speakers from Azogues, Ecuador, through on-site ethnography, by working with a group of informants and observing their interactions with interlocutors in their daily lives, and by interviewing participants to understand their use of address forms in daily interactions. It situates this analysis and examination of address forms within a broader discussion of the use of address forms in other Andean communities in Venezuela and Colombia (Álvarez 2010; Alvarez and Barros 2001; Álvarez and Carrera 2006; Freites-Barros 2008). In this sense, this study will expand our current understanding and knowledge of both the types of address forms used in Ecuador and the manner in which they are used by Ecuadorian speakers.

This study proceeds to document patterns of usage among the informants observed. Then deviations from *usted* will be analyzed in depth to understand the effect of alternative choices of address forms in interaction. To this end, this study answers the following questions:

(1) What forms of address are used by the speakers observed to address each other?
(2) How do deviations from commonly used forms signal the meanings of address forms in a sociocultural context?

The following sections will introduce crucial themes relating to address forms in situating the discussion of address forms in the broader context in Spanish, as well as more locally in other Andean regions.

2. ADDRESS FORMS IN SPANISH

Several varieties of Spanish have two singular, second person pronominal forms of address: *tú,* used with second person singular verb forms and *usted,* used with third person singular verb forms.

Table 1. *Tú* and *usted*

	Conjugation I	Conjugation II	Conjugation III
Tú	*amas*	*comes*	*vives*
Usted	*ama*	*come*	*vive*

These pronominal and verbal forms have evolved from classical Latin, which distinguished between a singular, second-person pronoun, *tu* and a plural, second person pronoun, *vos.* However, in late Latin, *vos* had acquired a deferential meaning in conjunction with the plural meaning. Hispano-Romance inherited this system (Penny 2002) but *vos* was gradually abandoned, as it acquired yet a third meaning as a marker of distance between superiors and subordinates. Various nominal address forms began to be used for formal address, most notably *vuestra merced*, from which the contemporary *usted* is derived. *Tú* and *vos* continued in competition for a few centuries, but were eventually abandoned in Spain in the 18th century with colonial centers of authority in Latin America following Peninsular varieties.

Many varieties in Central and South America, such as Costa Rica, parts of Colombia, Chile and Argentina among others, include the use of the subject pronoun, *vos*, which may be accompanied by a unique morphology. Table 2 presents various types of *voseo*[1], as presented in Torrejón (1986**)**, which are referred to here by Type 1, Type 2 and Type 3.

---

[1] *Voseo* refers to the use of the *vos* pronoun instead of the normative pronoun, *tú,* also called *tuteo.*

Table 2. Types of *voseo* in Ecuador[2]

	Normative tú	Type 1 Voseo auténtico	Type 2 Voseo mixto verbal	Type 3 Voseo mixto pronominal
-AR Verbs	Tú amas	Vos amáis	Vos amás	Vos amas
-ER Verbs	Tú comes	Vos coméis	Vos comés	Vos comes
-IR Verbs	Tú vives	Vos vivís	Vos vivís	Vos vives

The use of varying *voseo* morphology can index a number of things about the speaker and indicate something about their linguistic identity (Ochs 1990). Páez Urdaneta (1981) showed considerable variation in the types of *voseo* in Ecuador, contrasting between a residual *voseo* in the Coast, an upper class *voseo* in the Sierra and a lower class *voseo* in the Sierra. Residual *voseo* in the Coast is associated with Type 2; upper class *voseo* in the Sierra with Type 3; and lower class and rural *voseo* in the Sierra with Type 1. Ennis (2011) argues that Ecuadorian *voseo* has simplified since Torrejón's (1986) study so that Type 3 is now the most prevalent form of *voseo* in Ecuador, noting an adoption of the upper class *voseo* by rural and lower class speakers. Other work has associated Type 3 with Ecuador and Peru (Arrizabalaga 2001) but noted that, overall, *voseo* is on the decline there (Moyna 2016).

3. ADDRESS THEORY

This section presents the two major streams of address theory, that being, one that presents forms of address as essentially indexing fixed, sociocultural values, and the other type, which considers forms of address to exist as essentially neutral terms that acquire interpretation and meaning in context through use in conversational episodes. Forms of address index many issues in a conversation, such as the nature of the relationship between the interlocutors, the nature of the circumstances of the interaction, and the place of each interlocutor in the larger, social order (Morford 1997: 3).

Brown and Gilman (1960) examined pronouns of address as indexical of the sociocultural values of power and solidarity. They postulated that pronouns of address could be divided into an informal T pronoun and a formal V pronoun.[3] The nature of when to use each address form relates to the dynamics of power and solidarity that exist between the speakers in an interaction. Power, in this context, is used to linguistically express a hierarchy between interlocutors, so that an asymmetrical treatment in verbal and pronominal forms will be manifested. An interlocutor, perceived to be of a higher social rank, will use T forms to address those of perceived lower ranks and would receive, and expect to receive, V forms from lower ranked individuals. Factors such as socioeconomic status, age, physical appearance, gender, social status or familial status are some factors that determine which interlocutors receive V forms and can also vary according to location. Speakers with equal power equivalence use equivalent forms, mostly T, although V forms can be used in cases where speakers do not have a close relationship (Brown and Gilman 1960: 258). This is to say that address forms act as a grammaticalized manifestation of politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987).

Both T and V forms have a politeness function in a conversation, relating to the concept of face. T forms are associated with the domain of positive face, the expression of solidarity in grammaticalized forms of address. The use of V forms is associated with the domain of negative face, which is manifested in deference to the interlocutor through indirect expressions. Calderon (2010) sees modern society as elevating T forms to emphasize solidarity, due to the prominence of egalitarianism in modern societies, and proposes a continuum with regard to the degrees of solidarity and intimacy a speaker can link to with the use of T forms: (1) minimal (solidarity without trust or intimacy; (2) middle (trust), and; (3) maximum (intimacy). The use of T forms implies proximity to the interlocutor in any of these three levels. The use of V

---

[2] This table shows both the normative *tú* conjugation and the variations in *voseo* conjugations. Type 1 and Type 2 differ from normative *tuteo* with an ultimate stress (in contrast to penultimate stress in tuteo) with Type 1 being diphthongized.

[3] The abbreviations are based on French *tu* and *vous*, with *tu* being informal and *vous* being formal

indicates distance. In the case of Spanish, *tú* or *vos* (both T forms) may be used with children or adolescents without regard to the three levels of solidarity previously mentioned (Calderón 2010: 233). The speaker relies on social convention or other forms of obligation to judge the right pronominal form in each situation. A misjudgment will result in the perception that the speaker is disrespectful, overreaching in solidarity, or cold, due to being excessively distant.

Brown and Gilman's (1960) theory has been challenged as treating pronominal forms as representing a static order of macrosociological categories, that is that the mere use of a pronoun of address necessarily always assigns a social category to the speaker or interlocutor. Other work has suggested that the individual speaker and their linguistic ideology must be taken into consideration when analyzing their use of forms of address, which might result in the fact that some uses of address forms are neutral or lacking in meaningfulness to the interlocutors. Additionally, while neutral forms can exist, the temptation to assign static values to address forms must be resisted, as variation is the rule rather than the exception, and the nature of the meaning of address forms finds meaning in the *contrast* between the various options available to speakers (Braun 1988). Yet, forms of address index aspects of the social identities of the interlocutors involved, and are indexical of some of the sociocultural values previously mentioned, such as formality, degrees of deference and/or intimacy, and aspects about the speaker's own identity (Morford 1997).

Indexicality reflects "the dimension of meaning in which textual features 'point to' (index) contextually retrievable meanings" (Blommaert et al. 2014: 4). Linguistic features can index a variety of social acts and social activities (Ochs 1990), or regional accents, a speaker's identity, verbal etiquette in deference and demeanor (Hanks 2000). The use of various linguistic features can be used to construct social identities (Eckert 2008) and speakers maintain their relatively fixed identities by aligning themselves with ethnolinguistic patterns associated with their ethnolinguistic group (Schilling-Estes 2004). However, identity is polyphonous, so that displays of identity can index multiple social categories, much in the same way that linguistic features can index multiple associations (Bakhtin 1981; Barrett 1999). The following sections will compare the use of solidarity forms in Venezuela and Colombia. This is followed by a discussion of the use of solidarity forms in Ecuador to situate the discussion in spatial terms, as it relates to the distribution of forms across various Andean communities.

3.1 Venezuela

The address forms used in Mérida, Venezuela, have been noted by many scholars (Álvarez 2010; Alvarez and Barros 2001; Álvarez and Carrera 2006; Freites-Barros 2008). This Andean region of Venezuela is characterized by its dual use of *usted* in both formal and informal situations. However, the use of *usted* of solidarity has also been noted in Costa Rica (Vargas 1974; Quesada Pacheco 1996; Michnowicz et al. 2016; Moser 2010b). The use of *usted* in Mérida can be explained in one of three possibilities: a) there is an absence of differentiation between trust and formality; b) there is a functional differentiation not manifested between trust and formality, an *usted* of solidarity and a formal *usted*, and; c) a functional differentiation between trust, intimacy and formality with three pronouns, *usted* of solidarity, *tú* of trust, and *usted* of formality (Álvarez and Carrera 2006). Freites-Barros (2008) asserts that *usted* is the *only* address form in Andean varieties and, as such, is not subject to being interpreted as the solidarity form or as indexing deference, which also functions as a regional identity marker. Álvarez and Carrera (2006) posit a dual function for *usted*, in contrast to Freites Barros (2008), constituting of a formal *usted* and an *usted* of solidarity. This dual function can be a result of the proximity between politeness and emotivity. As identity work occurs in discourse, speakers use deictics in the form of *usted* as a way of expressing identity, which consists of a continuum of three levels: personal identity, relational identity and communal identity (Álvarez 2010; Goffman 1967). Additionally, identity markers serve to assign a connotation of group membership and symbolize communal beliefs about social categories (Alvarez and Barros 2001).

However, research in the area has documented a shift to the use of *tú*, especially when addressing speakers from non-Andean regions and among young people (Álvarez 2010; Freites-Barros 2008: 22). *Tuteo*[4] is a trait associated with normative varieties, and, as such, it is slowly being incorporated into Andean varieties, most notably by younger speakers, who are more familiar with its use and more comfortable with its use. Álvarez and Carrera (2006) likens the shift from *usted* to *tú* to language shift, describing it as a 'code switch.' *Voseo* is used in limited contexts in Mérida, particularly among family and close friends (Álvarez and Freites Barros 2010), although many note that it is in danger of extinction (Freites Barros 2008).

---

[4] The use of *tú* forms

3.2 Colombia

The use of *usted* with friends and family has been noted in Colombia. This type of usage of *usted* to show solidarity has since been noted by other researchers in Cuba, Chile, and Uruguay (Marín 1972) and in Honduras (Castro 2000). Flórez (1965) noted the use of *usted* in family interactions in the Santander Department in Colombia. In Bogotá, Montes Giraldo et al. (1998) note that *usted* is used to address a trusted interlocutor more by males than by females and more among younger speakers than older. Uber's (1984, 1985) earlier studies note that the use of *usted* in Bogotá can imply solidarity when used with family members or friends and no solidarity when used with others not known to the speaker. Many families used *usted* among members of the family, with pets, and with close friends. The use of *tú* in Bogotá conveys familiarity but with a certain distance implied. This implies a continuum with two opposing uses of *usted*, one use of *usted* implying a lack of solidarity ('usted of no solidarity') and social distance and another being an *usted* of solidarity, which implies social proximity and solidarity. *Tú* occupies a middle space between these two types of *usted*. Uber's (2011) later studies in Bogotá confirm that in the 1990s the use of *usted* of solidarity was still common among family and close friends. This latter study adds that among close friends, either *tú* or *usted* may be used and confirms an overall trend in the increase of *tú* (Uber 2011).

3.3 Ecuador

Many studies on forms of address in Ecuadorian Spanish focus on Quito (Peñaherrera 1988; Placencia 1996; Toscano Mateus 1953; Uquillas 1989). Toscano Mateus (1953) described the variation found in Ecuadorian Spanish with regard to form of address in four forms: *tú, vos, usted,* and *su merced (sumercé)*, the latter is only heard in very rural communities. The context of the interaction can influence address forms but also speakers exhibit considerable intra-speaker variation, such as the use of either *vos* or *usted* to address children. Placencia (1997) found reciprocal use of pronominal forms in analyzing telephone calls in Quito. Older speakers preferred *usted*, while younger speakers preferred *tú*. However, work in Andean regions, other than Quito, has been less frequent.

The use of *vos* in Ecuador has varied uses in indexing power and solidarity, often depending on the regional background of a speaker, as it is found to be used between social 'superiors' to 'inferiors', in which they are expected to respond with *usted*, yet, *vos* is also used between interlocutors to index closeness and intimacy (Ennis 2011; Páez Urdaneta 1981). Ennis' (2011) study of *voseo* in Quito elaborates on the various use of pronouns of address among a group of speakers, where *usted* is used as a general form of address and with strangers. Among friends, *tú* and *vos* alternate, although the latter expresses greater *confianza*[5]. Children generally use *usted* with parents and teachers, as, in general, older interlocutors are treated with *usted* and older speakers can use *tú* or *vos* to address younger interlocutors; however, *vos* is generally used with one's own children. Ennis (2011) also outlines the ideology of *voseo*, showing its various sociocultural values in Ecuador, also noting a dual function of *voseo* to mark closeness but also in expressing emotion, particularly anger. It can also be used to express social distance, particularly when used 'out of context' and, in these cases, indexes social inequality to be used in a derogatory manner. Ennis' (2011) informants reflect a powerful ideology of *voseo*, which reflects a broader social concern with politeness and upbringing. That is to say, that the misuse of pronouns of address shows bad manners and a poor upbringing.

Lavender (2017) studied the use of address forms on Facebook Messenger among a group of speakers from Azogues, Ecuador. Facebook Messenger is a type of synchronous computer-mediated communication in which users expect a quicker response time than in other mediums. This type of instant messenger CMC is regarded as being close to natural conversation (Crystal 2006; Sebba 2012). He found an extensive use of *usted* among friends and family members, which followed similar patterns in Colombia and the Venezuelan Andes, but which differed slightly from other studies of Ecuadorian use of address forms. The results of Lavender (2017) seem to indicate a preference for a use of *usted* as a solidarity form over *tú* or *vos*. The use of *usted* of solidarity was marked linguistically by the inclusion of nominal address forms, such as kinship terms, terms of endearment, and other such nominal forms that distinguished *usted* of solidarity from formal *usted*.

---

[5] Literally refers to confidence, trust, etc. but in a linguistic sense is referring to familiarity, particularly in Latinx culture, denoting a sociocultural value attached to closeness.

Figure 1. Map of Azogues

Figure 2. Cañar Province

4. DATA COLLECTION

This study expands current knowledge of how forms of address are used in Ecuador by focusing on a group of speakers in Azogues and follows in calls for more ethnographic studies of address forms (Steffen 2010: 443; Vázquez Laslop and Orozco 2010: 264). This is to account for the considerable variation that accompanies the use of forms of address by various speakers (Braun 1988).

Azogues is the capital of the Cañar Province and forms part of the Cuenca metropolitan area. It has a population of around 40,000 citizens. It also includes a larger *cantón* ('county'), which encompasses much of the eastern half of Cañar. The population of the city itself and the *cantón* is 70,064. Figure 1 shows the location of Azogues within the Cañar Province, as well as the location of Cuenca in relation to Azogues, while Figure 2 shows the relation of the Cañar Province of Ecuador, which is the outlined region in the map below.

The researcher stayed with an Ecuadorian family in the summer of 2017 and observed patterns of use of address forms in a well-defined community of practice (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992: 464; also Lave and Wenger 1991), in observing the forms used among these four principal informants and with various interlocutors with whom they interacted during the researcher's stay in Azogues. Table 3 outlines the four principal informants of this study and their relationship to each other.

Table 3. Informants[6]

Informant	Description of participant	Location	Age	Sex
María	Daughter of Gloria; aunt of Cristina; has a son, Marco	Metropolitan Azogues	40s	female
Enrique	Husband of María; son-in-law of Gloria; uncle by marriage to Cristina	Metropolitan Azogues	40s	male
Gloria	Mother of María; grandmother of Marco	Metropolitan Azogues; has US visa	60s	female
Cristina	Niece of María; granddaughter of Gloria	Metropolitan Azogues	20s	female

Semi-formal interviews were conducted with the informants in various locations and recorded for transcription, which were recorded in Enrique and María's house with the four informants. Informants were asked about how they used address forms with a short questionnaire and follow up discussion about their use of address forms. Informants were asked about the social values of these forms and how using different forms would be interpreted by an interlocutor. These interviews were accompanied by observation in day-to-day interactions with a group of interlocutors, which consisted of friends, family, and some frequently visited shops. The researcher mostly accompanied Gloria and Cristina in daily activities, such as going to buy groceries, sending clothes to be repaired by the seamstress and other such activities. The researcher observed interactions between informants and these interlocutors and recorded interactions as they occurred.

5. FINDINGS

This section will describe the forms of address used among the informants and their interlocutors as observed by the researcher to establish a general pattern, as well as the preferences of each speaker. After establishing the prevalence of the use of *usted* in the data, it will proceed to describe deviations from *usted* will be analyzed in depth to understand the effect of alternative choices of address forms in interaction. The observations will be compared to statements made by the informants in their interviews with the researcher through the presentation of extracts.

---

[6] For the sake of anonymity, all informants were assigned a pseudonym.

5.1 Address forms used between interlocutors

The most commonly heard form of address was the use of *usted*, which was used in nearly all interactions observed among the participants in this study. This was true of all age groups from Cristina when addressing a variety of interlocutors, both older than her, and younger, as well as among middle-aged groups of María and Enrique and Gloria and her interactions with older interlocutors.

Gloria, and interlocutors of a similar age, use *usted* in nearly all contexts and are addressed with *usted* forms, both when addressing informants of a similar age or older, as well as with younger informants. Gloria's linguistic behavior and comments made in her interview reveal that she believes that the use of *usted* is better and that *tú* or *vos* can be bad social practice, which was also reflected in Ennis (2011) in her interviews with informants from Quito. Gloria corrected Marco on one occasion as he addressed the researcher with *vos* and she wanted him to use *usted*, as she believed this was more polite. She exhibited similar behavior when she corrected Cristina when she addressed her boyfriend with *tú*, as she believed that *usted* showed more respect between the couple than *tú*, although she revealed in her interview that she used *vos* with her late husband and that she thought it was acceptable for couples to use *tú* or *vos* among themselves.

María, Enrique, and Cristina all grew up in Azogues. While many of Enrique and María's interactions with friends of a similar age could not be observed, their overall use of *usted* was noted. The only case noted where *usted* was not used extensively was in the family interactions between María and Enrique, who are married and have a son. María and Enrique use both *tú* and *vos* forms among themselves and when addressing their son, Marco. There was variation between *tú* and *vos* forms used by both of them when addressing him, as well as when addressing each other. Cristina grew up in Azogues and like Gloria uses *usted* in most of her interactions with family members, including acquaintances of the same age as her. One example of this occurred when Cristina went to purchase additional minutes for her cellphone. The worker in the store was a distant cousin and social acquaintance of around the same age as Cristina, who invited Cristina to a baptism party.

This is to say that the usual form is *usted*; however, with the significant exception of María and Enrique, when addressing each other. This pattern of usage seems to conform with previous research on the use of address forms in Ecuador, as the immediate family uses *tú/vos* when addressing each other but older members of the family are addressed with *usted* and outsiders, such as the researcher, are addressed with *usted*, as well.

5.2 Deviating from usted

The above section described general patterns of usage of address forms among the participants in this study, noting the general preference for the use of *usted*, with the notable exception of María and Enrique. This section will describe how deviations from *usted* were observed in various interactions between participants and their interlocutors and how these participants describe the meaning of not using *usted*. In cases where *tú/vos* prevail, deviations from these forms will also be described.

On one occasion, Gloria and Cristina participated in a conversation with four other individuals in a small town outside of Azogues, in which an informal discussion occurred about forms of address. They believe that the use of *tú* or *vos* require a contextually appropriate situation to be used and the misuse of these address forms can result in social awkwardness or misinterpretation by an interlocutor. However, *usted* lacks such restrictions and can be used in all contexts and does not result in a negative interpretation. This interpretation gives *usted* a sense of neutrality so that it can be used when one is not sure of how to proceed with regard to address. These informants seem to indicate that *vos* is a better option than *tú*, if one were to deviate from *usted*, but they indicated that *usted* was the preferred form among themselves and observation of linguistic behavior revealed this to be the case, as they consistently addressed each other and the researcher, as well as Gloria and Cristina with *usted* during our conversations with them. Yet, the implication is that *vos* signals a higher degree of intimacy and less possibility of misinterpretation.

The informants consider that others might be willing to address intimate family members with *vos*, and express that individuals might learn different ideas about address forms, depending on their upbringing, which highlights the variation among groups of speakers with regard to their ideologies of the sociocultural meanings of address forms. They seem to be wary of saying that they use *tú* forms in interviews, as they are questioned about its use with children

or relatives and initially they say that they might use *tú* but then walk back and say that they only use *usted*. Even though Gloria states that she believes *usted* is best in all contexts, her linguistic behavior reveals that she does not always follow this rule. She does indicate that *tú* or *vos* can be used among close family, such as between husband and wife, as Enrique and María alternate between *tú* and *vos* in their conversations with each other. Gloria frequently retells stories about her mother and childhood in which she quotes her mother using *vos* forms when addressing her. In one case, Gloria left Cristina a voice message on her phone for Cristina's birthday. Gloria addressed Cristina with *usted* in all other contexts, except in this case. The message begins with the use of *usted* but switches when Gloria begins to send her birthday wishes to Cristina.

(1) Extract from voice message from Gloria to Cristina

> *Mija por ser **su** cumpleaños voy a decir unas dos palabritas mija linda que en este día tan especial que cumpleaños que el Altísimo **te** cubra con su manto y **tu** corazón se llene de alegría y que siempre conformes conserves la- lo que **te** inculcado y que Dios **te** cu- **te** bendiga hoy y siempre y un feliz cumpleaños mija*

> [My dear, as it's your [*usted*] birthday, I wanted to say a few things on your special day, your [*tú*] birthday. May God cover you [*tú*] with his mantle and your [*tú*] heart be filled with happiness and may you [*tú*] always conform, conserve the- what He has instilled in you [*tú*] and may God bless you [*tú*] today and forever. Happy birthday, dear][7]

Other informants were not in agreement about *vos*, for example, María indicated that *vos* was stronger than *tú*, but it all depends on how it is interpreted by the other person, which is an implicit admission of variation among speakers.

(2) Extract of interview with María

> *Sí, hay una diferencia. Dice, "tú estás dispuesto ayudarme," es como pidiendo ayuda. En cambio, si es como vos es como más de ordenarle, más fuerza. Si es, "vos tienes que hacer," es como una orden. En cambio, cuando usted escucha tú, es como, puedes hacer esto… [Tú] es más delicado. En cambio, vos, es una orden… Es un ejemplo de cómo la toma la otra persona. Si apenas lo estoy recién conociendo a usted, entonces, yo no le voy a decir, "Oye vos, irás abajo a dormir.*

> [Yes, there is a difference. One says, "You [*tú*] are free, help me," is how to ask for help. However, if it's with *vos*, it's more like an order, and somewhat stronger. If it's "you [*vos*] have to do it," it sounds more like an order. Whereas, when you [*usted*] hear "*tú*", it's like, "can you do this?" [*Tú*] is more delicate, whereas *vos* is an order… It's an example of how the other person takes it. If I am barely just getting to know you [*usted*], then, I am not going to say to you [*usted*], "Hey, you [*vos*], go downstairs to sleep."]

However, María indicates that deviating from *usted* implies a lack of respect for the other person, except in the few cases she indicated that *vos* or *tú* was acceptable, mostly in family situations.

(3) Extract of interview with María

> *Es como hay más respeto. En cambio, que cuando se trata de "vos, hey muévete," ese tipo de palabras, se dice como que más, o sea como que le está faltando al respeto a la persona.*

> [It's as if there is more respect. Whereas when you say, "hey you! [vos], move!" These types of words, they are said when there is more, I mean that the person lacks respect for the other.]

---

[7] This and subsequent translations of the corpus are those of the author.

María revealed a distinction between *tú* and *vos*. She emphasizes the manner in which address forms are used, which can carry more meaning than the actual form itself. She gave the example of the relationship between the researcher and her, as they were only getting to know each other during the stay and observation of the family, it would be very inappropriate for her to use *tú* with the researcher. Therefore, to be able to use *tú* or *vos* requires familiarity between the interlocutors and to use those forms prematurely or in a contextually inappropriate manner results in misunderstandings or the perception of rudeness. She does indicate that there can be differences in the interpretation of *tú* or *vos* by the interlocutor. It seems that, when used with the wrong interlocutor, i.e. when there is a lack of familiarity, the use of *vos* can be taken to mean a command, whereas *tú*, used in this context, would be the more appropriate choice of address forms. She strongly associates this negativity in the context of requests in her interview. *Vos* is always associated in her examples with requests that *could* be perceived by the interlocutor as rude. She offers several examples with *vos* and offers a 'corrective' *usted* version that would be more acceptable. For example,

(4)   Extract of interview with María

Es que los niños también sienten eso. Porque a veces ven a los niñitos del campo, les trató, 'oye, vos niño, muévete, cojete'. Les dice, 'oye vos coje ese caramelo'. En cambio es diferente que se diga, 'venga mijo, reciba ese caramelo'.

[It's that kids also feel this. Because sometimes they see other rural kids, they address them, 'hey, you kid, move away, take this'. They say to them, 'hey you, take this candy'. However it's different from saying, 'Come on dear (?), take this candy'.]

However, in contexts where there is familiarity between interlocutors, *vos* does not have this negative connotation. She explains that there is more intimacy in family life and between spouses or with children that *vos* can be used without having the connotation of being a command or being too 'strong', thus showing that familiarity is an important aspect in the interpretation of address forms by interlocutors and that these forms are often used between them without this negative association. She believes that other couples also use *vos* forms among themselves in much the same way that she and her spouse use them. Additionally, *tú* or *vos* can be used with children, as was observed between her and her son Marco, as noted above, without any negative connotations.

However, Enrique was observed using *usted* with Marco on several occasions, when involved in parenting tasks, such as encouraging Marco to finish his food at meals, which suggests a possible pragmatic function in shifting to *usted* by a parent. This compares with Gloria's deviations from *usted* mentioned above and her retelling stories of her own mother addressing her with *vos*. Cristina is now older and should be addressed with *usted* because she is now an adult. However, these variations in address forms are noteworthy because they are contextual, more so with Enrique's use of *usted*, in attempting to get Marco to do various tasks. This indicates an emotive use of *usted* to convey frustration when Marco did not do what Enrique wanted him to do. Gloria's use of *tú* might also indicate an emotive function of *tú,* so that it could be used in a positive context.

Cristina does not universally use *usted,* as she uses *tú* and *vos* with some of her interlocutors. Cristina met up with two friends from her high school during the researcher's stay in Azogues. She addresses both of these friends with *tú* and they likewise reciprocate with *tú*, which is not surprising, as recent work has documented a shift towards *tú* in many varieties of Spanish. However, Cristina's use of *tú* in these contexts should not be interpreted as 'neutral' or necessarily indicating a positive relationship between interlocutors in these interactions. Cristina revealed in later ethnographic interviews that her use of *tú* implies a certain distance. She described how there had been some 'falling out' among her and at least one of the friends she met up with during the researcher's stay in Azogues. In the case of one of these interlocutors, she reported that her use of *tú* implied a type of distancing between her and her friend from her perspective, yet, she doubted that her friend interpreted her use of *tú* in the same light, as she noted that her family uses *usted* more than her friend's family. On the other hand, she reported that the other friend in question was from Guayaquil, which she indicates had influenced her decision to use *tú* with that person, as she said that *Serranos* prefer *usted*, while speakers from other regions in the country preferred *tú*. Her use of *tú* with this friend seems to indicate an accommodation for a speaker not originally from the Andean region. In ethnographic interviews with Cristina, she

reveals that she grew up with what she called the 'traditional' way of thinking about address forms. She notes that she prefers the use of *usted*, as being more polite and necessary when addressing interlocutors, yet, she is willing to accommodate to others who prefer *tú*, such as her friends and when addressing Marco. She adds that she does not feel comfortable trying to correct the linguistic forms chosen by Marco, as she is not the mother of the child but, overall, she agrees with Gloria in that all interlocutors should, at least ideally, be addressed with *usted*, indicating a preference to use *vos* with one's own children and not necessarily with any child.

6. DISCUSSION

The previous presentation of findings of this study reveals a picture of how address forms are used in Azogues by observing their use among a group of speakers there. This study provides more recent information on how address forms are used in Ecuador after previous work by Placencia (1997). It reveals how speakers from Azogues differ from other speakers in Ecuador, as reported by Ennis (2011) but how they are similar to speakers in Colombia and Andean Venezuela. Previous work in Azogues shows how *usted* is used in a variety of contexts to address friends and family (Lavender 2017), and this study confirms this function of *usted* in Azogues. *Usted* is used in nearly all interactions that were observed in this study. There were few deviations from *usted* in interactions.

The use of *usted* is typically indexical of deference or respect, which can be linked to the important sociocultural notion of *confianza,* a "highly appreciated value that describes the types of close relationships in which people may genuinely express their identities...[which] involves affection, familiarity, confidence and sincerity" (Díaz Collazos 2016: 35), as several informants express concern that using an inappropriate address form can be interpreted as rude. There is a particular concern about the misuse of *tú* and *vos*, which suggests a belief that *tú* and *vos* have more rigid strictures with regard to their use that was also found by Ennis (2011) in what was described as an ideology of *vos*, which relates to politeness and linguistic upbringing. The use of *tú* and *vos* can be related to the degrees of solidarity: (1) minimal (solidarity without trust or intimacy; (2) middle (trust), and; (3) maximum (intimacy) (Calderón 2010). Different instances of the use of *tú* and *vos* by informants fall along this scale, such as the use of these address forms by María and Enrique among themselves and with their son, Marco, falling in (3) as expressing maximum intimacy. However, the use of *tú* by Cristina would express (1) minimal solidarity without trust or intimacy. The issue of *usted* and its use as a solidarity form adds another layer of complexity in considering the nature of pronominal forms of solidarity. The use of *usted* in Azogues by these speakers seems to follow Uber's (2011) scale of a formal *usted*, *tú* and *usted* of solidarity:

Formal *usted → tú → usted* of solidarity

Cristina's use of *tú* conforms with this pattern, as she indicates that her use of *tú* with certain friends does indicate a lack of solidarity in some sense. However, the use of *tú* as evidenced by observations of Enrique and María complicates this pattern. This leads us to remember Braun's (1988) assertion that variation is the rule and not the exception so that different speakers create different uses for address forms through contextual use. For instance, Cristina's use of *tú* suggests a dual function of *tú* in much the same way as *usted*, implying a four-way distinction, rather than a tripartite division of functions:

Formal *tú / usted* vs. *tú / usted* of solidarity

Thus, one who uses *usted* in a familial context can index more intimacy through the use of *tú* of solidarity in a way beyond *usted* of solidarity, this shows how María and Enrique's use of *tú/vos* fits into this paradigm. This also relates to María's reflections on the use of address forms and the notion that the interpretation of the interlocutor also affects the meaning of a form in addition to *how* it is said. Future research should extend Lavender's (2017) work on nominal address forms to examine the use of nominal forms in oral communication to ascertain if this trend carries over from online communication.

The preference for *usted* among these speakers could be viewed from a variety of points of view, beyond the discussion of solidarity above. One such function is the use of *usted* as an identity marker, particularly in Mérida, Venezuela, by Andean speakers (Álvarez 2010; Alvarez and Barros 2001; Álvarez and Carrera 2006; Freites-Barros 2008). The use of

usted in Azogues can have some association with Andean identity but its indexical values are overlapping and complex so that it has a multiplicity of functions. This is not to say that there is no aspect of identity present in the use of *usted* among Andean Ecuadorians. For instance, Cristina's use of *tú* with her friend, who is originally from Guayaquil, is an example of this. However, as discussed extensively above, Cristina's use of *tuteo* indexes dual associations. Her use of *tuteo* with this friend has an additional value of denoting a distance in the friendship. Cristina seems to possess a system similar to what Uber (2011) described in Bogotá, a continuum between *usted* of no solidarity - *tú* - *usted* of solidarity, with the addition of *vos*, which seems to be used in intimate family contexts, particularly when addressing children. The informants express a belief that the use of *usted* is the most correct address form and associated with 'traditional' ways, in contrast to *tuteo*, which is considered to be associated with young people, particularly children.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This study has analyzed the use of forms of address by a community of practice in Azogues, Ecuador through a combined approach of using ethnographic observation of how address forms were used by informants and through conducting interviews with participants themselves in which they reflect on their use of address forms. Each of the four principal informants reveals noteworthy linguistic behavior. Gloria uses *usted* in most contexts in a consistent way, yet, in one case that was observed, she deviated from *usted* in a birthday wish to Cristina, indicating an emotive function of switching forms. María and Enrique use *usted* with everyone except among themselves and with their son. Enrique was also observed using an emotive switch in trying to get Marco to do various tasks in which he switched to *usted*, which accompanied frustration with Marco. Cristina uses *usted* in most contexts, except with her friends from high school, with whom she had recently had a falling out. She describes this as having a social function in indicating distance between her and them, yet, notes that they likely interpret her use of *tú* differently. The observations in Azogues reveal that *usted* is the default choice among this group of speakers and among frequent interlocutors in their daily lives. Deviations from *usted* can have emotive function when occurring as variation from regular use of *usted*. However, using forms besides *usted* can be socially marked, as expressed by all informants in their interviews with the researcher. As such, this shows the sociocultural value of *usted* among this group of speakers and the degrees with which it can be used to express solidarity in conjunction with *tú* and *vos* in other contextually appropriate ways. This study has contributed to current understanding of Ecuadorian Spanish, particularly by investigating a region of the country that has not been accounted for in linguistic research to the author's knowledge. This study shows the value of ethnographic research in linguistics and, particularly, in analyses of address forms, as a valuable tool in linguistics to understand the use of address forms in a detailed and contextual manner.

WORKS CITED

Álvarez, A. (Eds.) (2010). La construcción de la identidad del hablante en el uso pronominal. In M. Hummel, B. Kluge, M.E. Vázquez Laslop (Eds.), *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico,* (pp. 325-340). El Colegio de México.

Álvarez Muro, A. & X. Barros (2001). Sistemas en conflicto: las formas de tratamiento en la ciudad de Mérida, Venezuela. *Lengua y Habla, 6.*

Álvarez Muro, A. & M. Carrera de la Red (Ed.) (2006). El usted de solidaridad en el habla de Mérida. In, M. Schrader-Kniffki (Ed.), *La cortesía en el mundo hispánico: Nuevos contextos, nuevos enfoques metodológicos*, (pp. 117-130). Iberoamericana/Vervuert.

Álvarez Muro, A. & F. Freites Barros (2010). Los estudios sobre pronombres de segunda persona en Venezuela. In M. Hummel, B. Kluge, M.E. Vázquez Laslop (Eds.), *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico,* (pp. 325-340). El Colegio de México.

Arrizabalaga, C. (2001). Noticias de la desaparición del voseo en la costa norte del Perú. *Lingüística Española Actual,* 23, 257-274.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination* ed. by M. Holquist and trans. by C Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barrett, R. (1999). Indexing polyphonous identity in the speech of African American drag queens. In Bucholtz, M. et al. (eds.) *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*, (pp. 313-331). Oxford University Press.

Blommaert, J., E. Westinen & S. Peppänen. (2014). Further notes on sociolinguistic scales. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*, Paper 123.

Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman (1960). The pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Sebeok, Thomas A. (Ed.), *Style in Language, Cambridge*, (pp. 253-276). MIT Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S (1987): *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calderón Campos, M. (2010). Formas de tratamiento. In, M. Aleza Izquierdo & J.M. Enguita Utrilla (Coords.), *La lengua española en América: normas y usos actuales*, (pp. 195-222). Valencia: Universitat de València.

Crystal, David (2006). *Language and the Internet*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Díaz Collazos, A. (2016). Pragmatic forces in the evolution of *voseo* object pronouns from *os* to *te* in colonial Spanish. In Moyna, M. & S. Rivera-Mills (Eds.), *Forms of Address in the Spanish of the Americas*, (pp. 34-61). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 453-476.

Eckert, P. & S. McConnell-Ginet (1992). Think practically and look locally: language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 21,* 461-490.

Ennis, G. C. (2011). *The Social Functions and Implications of Voseo in Quito, Ecuador: A Linguistic and Anthropological Account*. Master's Thesis, University of Michigan.

Flórez, L. (1965). *El español hablado en Santander*. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Freites-Barros, F. (2008). *De hablantes, gravedad y péndulos. Identidad andina fronteriza y uso lingüístico*. Caracas: Academia Venezolana de la Lengua.

Hanks, W. (1999). Indexicality. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1/2), 124-126.

Lave, J. & E. Wenger (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lavender, J. (2017). Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger. Lingüística en la Red.

Márquez Reiter, R. & M.E. Placencia (2004). Displaying closeness and respectful distance in Montevidean and Quiteño service encounters. In, R. Márquez Reiter & M.E. Placencia (Eds.), Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish, (pp. 121-155). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Michnowicz, J., J.S. Despain, & R. Gorham (2016). The changing system of Costa Rican pronouns of address: tuteo, voseo, and ustedeo. In Moyna, M. & S. Rivera-Mills (Eds.), Forms of Address in the Spanish of the Americas, (pp. 243-266). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Montes Giraldo, J.J., J. Figueroa Lorza, S. Mora Monroy, M. Lozano Ramírez, R. Aparicio Ramírez Caro, M.B. Espejo Olaya, & G.E. Duarte Huertas (1998). El español hablado en Bogotá: análisis previo de su estratificación social. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Morford, J. (1997). Social indexicality in French pronominal address. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 7(1), pp. 3-37.

Moser, K. (2010). San José (Costa Rica): Desde los significados pragmáticos del ustedeo en el registro coloquial actual hacia sus primeras manifestaciones en el Valle Central (siglo XVIII). In M. Hummel, B. Kluge and M. E. Vázquez Laslop (eds.), Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico, (pp. 671-714). Mexico City/Graz: El Colegio de México/Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz.

Obediente Sosa, E. (2010). Visión diacrónica y dialectal de las formas de tratamiento en los Andes venezolanos. Selected Proceedings of the 12th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium of Claudia Borgonovo et al., (pp. 87-96). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ochs, Elinor. (1990). Indexicality and Socialization. In Cultural Psychology. James Stigler, Richard A. Shweder, and Gilbert Herdt, eds. 287-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Páez Urdaneta, I. (1981). Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo. Caracas: La Casa de Bello.

Peñaherrera, A (1988). Trato pronominal en la ciudad de Quito: el habla de dos generaciones. Quito: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador.

Penny, R. (2002). A history of the Spanish language (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Placencia, María Elena (1996): "Politeness in Ecuadorian Spanish", Multilingua, 15(1), 13-34

Quesada-Pacheco, M.A. (1996). El español de América Central. In M. Alvar (ed.) Manual de dialectología hispánica: El español de América, (pp. 101-115). Barcelona: Ariel.

Schilling-Estes, N. (2004). Constructing ethnicity in interaction. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 8(2), 163-195.

Sebba, Mark (2012). "Researching and theorizing multilingual texts", Mark Sebba, Shahrzad Mahootian & Carla Jonsson (eds.), Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse, New York: Routledge, pp. 2-26.

Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Language & Communication 23, 193-229.

Steffen, M. (2010). El tratamiento en Paraguay. In M. Hummel, B. Kluge & M.E. Vázquez Laslop (eds.). Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico, (pp. 671-714). Mexico City/Graz: El Colegio de México/ Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz.

Torrejón, Alfredo. (1986). Acerca del Voseo Culto de Chile. Hispania 69(3), 677-683.

Toscano Mateus, H. (1953). El español en el Ecuador, Revista de Filología Española, Anejo 61. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Uber, Diane R (1984). The pronouns of address in the Spanish of Bogotá, Colombia. The SECOL Review, 8, 59-74.

-----. (1985). The dual function of usted: Forms of address in Bogotá, Colombia. Hispania, 68, 388-392.

-----. (2011). Forms of Address: The Effect of the Context. M. Díaz-Campos (ed.), The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics, (pp. 244-262). Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, UK.

Uquillas, M. A (1989). El tratamiento pronominal en Quito, diversos aspectos. Quito: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador.

Vargas, C.A. (1974). El uso de los pronombres vos y usted en Costa Rica. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, 8, 7-30.

Vázquez Laslop, M.E. and Orozco, L. (2010). Formas de tratamiento del español en México. In M. Hummel, B. Kluge & M.E. Vázquez Laslop (Eds.). Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico, (pp. 671-714). Mexico City/Graz: El Colegio de México/ Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.