The Social Functions and Implications of *Voseo* in Quito, Ecuador
A Linguistic and Anthropological Account

Georgia C. Ennis

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank the many people that I met in Ecuador, without whom this research would not have been possible. I was consistently overwhelmed by their generosity in inviting me into their homes to share their experiences, as well as their friendship, with me. I also owe a debt of gratitude to The Quito Project for giving me the opportunity to work in Ecuador, and for allowing me to combine my research with my volunteer work.

I would also like to thank my advisor, Teresa Satterfield, whose guidance has been incredibly influential in my academic development and in the completion of this project. I feel extremely fortunate to have formed a relationship with Professor Satterfield, as I have learned so much from her. Her advice, feedback and encouragement were instrumental in all stages of writing my thesis; she has truly helped me to grow as an academic and consider new perspectives on my work. In this vein, I must also thank Julia Paley for her insights on my work and for her introduction to writing ethnography; I have learned a great deal from her that I hope to carry into my future research. Finally, I would also like to express my gratitude to the many professors, fellow students and friends who discussed my ideas with me or patiently read drafts of my thesis.

The fieldwork for this thesis was made possible by grants from the University of Michigan's International Institute Individual Fellowship and Department of Anthropology

Preface

"*But* vos *is to say to the family, 'we're here with each other.'*" — Luz Castillo, personal interview, San Blas, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010.

"*For example* […] *when they begin to fight* […] *I've heard in the street that they say, 'What do you mean* "vos"*?' so that it's understood to mean, 'Who are you calling* "vos"*? You can't come up and say* "vos" *to me!' as if because they're calling you* vos*, you would be someone inferior, or of a lower class, or whatever* […]." — Kevin Vargas, personal interview, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010.

"*The thing is that there are different classes, there are two classes in the Sierra,* [….] *those from the upper class use* usted *more, those from the lower class use* vos." — Gloria Salazar, personal interview, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 5, 2010.

As a native English speaker, one of the most difficult aspects of learning Spanish has been navigating a language that distinguishes social relationships through formal and informal singular second-person pronouns—that is, to say *you* in English. Native Spanish speakers appear to me to have an innate understanding of how to use the pronouns available to them to intricately shade their interactions. I, on the other hand, feel that I clumsily fumble through conversations. I regularly default to the formal, respectful *usted* unless my partners make it clear that the use of the informal, personal *tú* would not offend them. Moreover, I do not always have a clear sense of what the pronouns used to address me might mean about our relationship: is my partner being respectful? Is he or she being condescending? Does he or she think of us as friends or intimates? Over the time that I have studied Spanish and visited Spanish-speaking countries, I have developed a better understanding of the meanings encoded in pronoun choice, but I still frequently find myself unsure.

When I first traveled to Quito, Ecuador as a volunteer in the summer of 2009, I knew that the relatively uncommon pronoun *vos* is used there in conjunction with *tú* and *usted*, all of which are equivalent to *you* in English. I talked with many people I met about *vos*, and was told things like, 'only indigenous people use *vos*,' or 'it's bad Spanish.' Given that *vos* is not a form taught in university-level Spanish courses, I wanted to know more, to develop an understanding of *vos* and with whom, how and when it is used, as well as to explore the beliefs about it. Based upon the narratives I encountered that first summer, I thought that *vos* might be more likely to be used by indigenous and rural speakers, and that its use had become a social marker for these groups. In studying the use of *vos* in Ecuador, however, I have found that it is much more complex than I had initially imagined.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to provide a linguistic and anthropological analysis of the social complexities of *voseo*—the use of the second-person singular pronoun *vos*— in Quito Ecuador. As Ralph Penny (2002, 2000) has discussed, *vos* is the dominant form in Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and much of Central America, while it is used to varying degrees in conjunction with *tú* and *usted* in Ecuador, Chile and Colombia, among others. However, the majority of work discussing *voseo* examines general patterns of usage in Latin America, rather than regional use (León 1998). I begin with the basic argument that in Ecuador and other countries where *vos* is not the dominant form, *voseo* exists in a complex sociolinguistic relationship to other modes of address (Penny 2000). This has been shown, for instance, in JoEllen Simpson's (2001) investigation of *voseo* in Cali, Colombia, which demonstrates that a speaker's stance towards *voseo* in contrast with *tuteo* is linked to their gender and social class. The main purpose of the present account is to examine how *voseo* fits into the language ideology

of Ecuadorian Spanish and its role as a social indexical, as well as what personal and interactional factors influence *vos* pronoun choice. This research is also a step towards providing more regionally focused studies of *voseo*.

This introductory study aims to describe the use of *vos* in Ecuadorian Spanish as illustrated by speakers living in Quito. It focuses largely on an analysis of the language ideology and social indexicality associated with *voseo*. However, it also entails a description of interactional setting and pronoun choice, as well as the verbal paradigm of *voseo* in Ecuadorian Spanish. This last element aids in the comprehensive description of Ecuadorian *voseo* by describing changes in the verbal paradigm since the last major study of *vos* in Ecuador[1]. The research for this study was thus guided by questions that centered on investigating the interactional settings and functions of *voseo*. These questions included: 1) In what situations can *vos* be used? 2) What is the morphology of *voseo* in Ecuadorian Spanish, and are different paradigms associated with different social indices? 3) Who is thought to employ *voseo* and what social features are associated with its use? 4) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, what do users of *vos* think it marks in their relationships and about themselves?[2]

In order to answer these questions, I undertook seven weeks of fieldwork in Quito, Ecuador during the summer of 2010. I primarily conducted research in the community[3] of San Martín, a working-class neighborhood located near the outskirts of southern Quito. I selected San Martín as my primary field site due to my past experiences there, which demonstrated that *vos* is in use within the community. Further, past connections and continued involvement there as a

[1] See Paez Urdaneta (1981).
[2] See Appendix A for a full listing of interview questions for adults and children.
[3] In this paper, I use *community* in a physical sense, primarily referring to the neighborhood of San Martín and its surrounding areas.

volunteer allowed me to conduct interviews with the children that I worked with and their families about their beliefs related to *voseo*. In order to parse out the possible differences and similarities in attitudes towards *vos* across social backgrounds and between age groups, I also conducted a small number of interviews with college-aged, middle-upper-class speakers to contrast with the data gathered in San Martín

Over the course of my time in Quito, I conducted 45 interviews: 24 with adult speakers and 21 with children. Interviews with adults attempted to elicit their beliefs about the use of *vos* through open-ended questions. However, the interviews also tried to establish how well self-reported belief and practice coincide through survey-format questions that focused on how and with whom informants use *vos*, *tú* and *usted*. The interviews conducted with children were much simpler and focused on the use of *vos* in specific interactional settings: with parents, with friends and at school. This data was later coded for statistical analysis and incorporated with the adult responses by establishing continuities between interactional categories. The results of this study are divided into two sections. The first is a statistical analysis of informants' responses to the survey-style questions about the morphology of *voseo* and their uses of the second-person singular pronouns *usted*, *tú* and *vos* within different interactional settings. While focusing on *vos*, it attempts to establish with whom these different pronouns are generally used, and also argues that *voseo* is largely regional in Ecuador.

The second section, however, attempts to enter into the more subjective social complexities of *voseo* by examining the qualitative data gathered through open-ended interview questions. As Julia Paley explains while analyzing political polls in post-dictatorship Chile, "limited-response questionnaires […] exclude what is meaningful […] and the actual practices through which [the respondent] functions" (2001:131-132). With this in mind, I have also chosen

to include relevant ethnographic analyses, which draw on multiple interviews to highlight the many ways that *vos* is used, and believed to be used, in Quito. Although *voseo* is largely thought of as a regional phenomenon, *vos* performs different social functions depending on the speaker and the specific context. This qualitative information regarding speakers' beliefs about *voseo* and the social relationships and categories enacted in its use—which tend to vary by class—is largely not visible in the statistical analyses, which utilize binary responses to establish larger patterns of use and more general beliefs. In order to holistically describe *voseo* in Quito I have thus chosen to utilize both quantitative and qualitative forms of analysis. In doing so, I illustrate the complex distribution and uses of *voseo* in relationship with *tú* and *usted*, as well as construct a narrative of the social complexities tied to *voseo* based upon the uses and beliefs speakers expressed. Statistical analysis will both inform and serve as an entry point into the daily, subjective experiences of the social landscape encapsulated in pronominal choices. Ethnographic and statistical analyses thus exist in dialog with each other in the present account.

When designing this study, I chose the community of San Martín as my primary research site because of my past experience there as a volunteer teacher with The Quito Project[4]. I planned to return as a teacher with The Quito Project, while simultaneously conducting my research. As a member of an established student organization, I believed I would have greater access to the community and its residents, and be able to establish rapport with my informants within the limited amount of time that I had to conduct research. I had initially planned to engage in participant-observation with the children that attended The Quito Project's summer tutoring program, as well as to conduct interviews with them and their parents, in order to construct a

[4] The Quito Project is an interdisciplinary student-run volunteer organization at the University of Michigan. Founded in 2004, The Quito Project has primarily worked in southern Quito in the community of San Martín with the goal of "find[ing] low-cost solutions to local problems in healthcare, social services, and education."

cohesive, generational analysis of pronoun usage and language ideology. This design also allowed me to feel that I was participating in a more ethical form of anthropology, by providing a service within the community I was studying, rather than functioning as a removed observer extracting knowledge. However, I quickly realized that the position that allowed me to establish a relationship with my informants also limited my research in important ways. Although most people were willing to discuss *vos* with me, after about a week working at the school, I was becoming disheartened that I had not observed my students using *vos*, either with me or with each other.

What I did not realize when designing my study was the extent to which my multiple and intersecting identities of teacher, foreigner and university student—among many others—would position me within the community and situate the research I was able to carry out. After conducting linguistic interviews with many of my students and their siblings, I realized that the use of the informal pronoun *vos* is not only stigmatized, but also punished at school. Students described that teachers strike them, pull their hair or send them to the principal's office for using *vos* in the classroom. Although the school setting allowed me to interact with this group of students, our location and my role as a teacher limited the type of language that was used and how I was treated within that space. Of course, I collected some isolated examples of children using *vos* at school: two friends looking at pictures on my digital camera exclaiming "vos estás aquí" [here you are], or the frustrated girl that used *vos* with me as I corrected her math test. Nevertheless, these occasional occurrences did not form a significant body of data. Rather, the absence of *voseo* grew to have more significance than its presence in the school in order to understand broader perceptions of *vos*.

Similarly, the identity I was invested with as a volunteer teacher and a foreign student situated my interactions with adult informants. Within the working-class neighborhood of San Martín, my role as a volunteer teacher from the U.S. positioned me as a relatively powerful outsider. When visiting my students' homes to conduct interviews with their parents, I was warmly welcomed inside, but I remained very clearly at a distance from the people that I met. As I would find out during the many hours that I spent sitting in peoples' living rooms, kitchens, or the single room that served these and other functions, it would be nearly unimaginable to use any form other than the respectful *usted* in these interactions. I became so accustomed to these identities and these formal interactions that shifts in my position expressed through pronoun choice were almost shocking. I distinctly remember feeling that something had physically happened to me when others redefined my identity through their pronoun choices. While at a party with upper-class Ecuadorian university students, I was considered a social equal and addressed as *tú*, following the normal usage expressed to me by that group in subsequent interviews. In San Martín, my occupation and foreignness had seemed to indelibly mark me as an influential outsider, but in another context, my age, as well as my gender[5], were foregrounded by my conversational partners. These different interactional positions are obvious in my interview transcriptions. In San Martín I give and receive *usted*; only one informant and I consciously entered into *confianza*[6] by switching to a mutual use of *tú* during our interview. In contrast, upper-class male informants comfortably use *tú* with me, as I haltingly respond with *tú*

[5] During the same party, male interlocutors would frequently lean in and say "Mira, flaca…" [Girl, look...] before answering my questions or explaining something I did not understand. In using both a *tú* command (*mira*) and an informal form of personal address (*flaca*, literally "skinny girl"), I was overtly positioned as a verbally solidary participant, albeit temporarily, in their social group.

[6] "Entrar en confianza" or "tener confianza" was frequently offered by informants to describe their use of *vos*. Literally meaning "to enter into" or "to have confidence," in this context *confianza* is difficult to translate as it encapsulates feelings of mutual trust, close friendship, personal intimacy or knowing someone well.

although my habitual use of *usted* occasionally slips through while asking standardized interview questions.

1.1 Theoretical background

This account of Ecuadorian *voseo* is underlain by a number of theories that have been influential in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. Roger Brown and Albert Gilman's theoretical framework of pronominal usage outlined in "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity" (1960) has been particularly useful in analyzing the above situations, as well as the data about pronominal choice gathered during interviews. Brown and Gilman propose that formal (V) and informal (T) pronoun choice can be broken down into power and solidarity semantics. Their first area of analysis is power dynamics between speakers, and they argue that for many centuries in Indo-European languages (including Spanish) "pronoun usage followed the rule of nonreciprocal *T*-*V* between persons of unequal power and the rule of mutual *V* or *T* (according to social-class membership) between persons of roughly equal power" (1960: 257). However, over time, the "*T* of intimacy" and the "*V* of formality" developed (1960: 257). They argue that these distinctions result from issues of symmetrical solidarity between speakers, who may have asymmetrical power relationships. They also claim that "solidarity has largely won out over power" in determining pronoun choice (1960:260). Brown and Gilman organize possible relationships between speakers into six basic categories, in which degrees of the solidarity semantic and the power semantic determine the choice of formal (V) and informal (T) pronoun choice (1960:259):

1. Superior and Solidary: T
2. Superior and Not Solidary: T/V
3. Equal and Solidary: T

4. Equal and Not Solidary: T/V
5. Inferior and Solidary: T/V
6. Inferior and Not Solidary: V

One of their most useful areas of analysis for the present account is of pronoun choice that expresses group membership versus pronoun choice that expresses a transient shift in attitude. They argue, "consistent personal style in the use of pronouns of address does not reveal enough to establish the speaker's unique character, but it can help to place him in one or another large category" (1960:273). That is, pronoun choice may be used to classify a speaker into one or more broadly recognizable social categories, regardless of the validity of this designation. Conversely, pronoun choice that is out of character or breaks a group norm—such as the use of *vos* by upper-class speakers—expresses an underlying meaning (Brown and Gilman 1960: 273-274). Brown and Gilman's analyses have interesting implications for the linguistic triad of *usted*, *tú* and *vos*; within this three-tiered pronominal system, I argue that the *tú*/*vos* distinction serves as another dimension in expressing relationships of solidarity, as well as power. Moreover, *vos* is used within Ecuador's pronominal system both reciprocally between intimate speakers, and non-reciprocally by social "superiors" to their "inferiors" who are expected to respond deferentially with *usted*.

In turning towards some of the social implications of *voseo*, the theoretical framework of language ideology and social indexicality is also utilized. Although there is a vast body of literature on these topics, Judith Irvine and Susan Gal (2000) have provided a very accessible explanation of them, which informs the present account. Irvine and Gal explain that a common semiotic process involves the linking of a linguistic form and one or more social identities, so that the linguistic form becomes a pointer towards—or an index of—those identities (Irvine and

Gal 2000:37). It is through this process that I propose *vos* is an indexical of a number of identities in Ecuadorian Spanish, some of which are stigmatized. These identities may be fairly neutral, such as the association of *voseo* with regional speech. *Voseo* can also positively index inclusion in a group identity, such as the family. Conversely, according to both upper- and working-class speakers *vos* can also negatively index an uneducated, lower-class identity.

Irvine and Gal further explain that language ideologies are created when speakers attempt to explain and thus naturalize indexical connections. These language ideologies in turn influence people's behavior and attitudes towards marked linguistic forms. They describe three semiotic processes through which language ideologies are created: iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure. Iconization, in which "linguistic features that index social groups or activities appear to be iconic representations of them, as if a linguistic feature somehow depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence," is especially useful for the present analysis of *voseo* (Irvine and Gal 2000:37). Throughout this study I argue that *voseo* becomes for many iconic of regional or class backgrounds, particularly of a lower class, uneducated image of its prototypical speaker, even for informants that use *vos*.

Elinor Och's work on indexicality (1990) also underlies this analysis of *voseo*. Ochs describes two layers of indexicality: direct and indirect. She argues that many examples of indexicality evidence "a *direct* – that is, unmediated – relation between one or more linguistic forms and some contextual dimension" (Ochs 1990:295). However, Ochs also proposes that indices can be achieved indirectly, in which

> a feature of the communicative event is evoked indirectly through the indexing of some *other* feature of the communicative event. In these cases, the feature of the communicative event directly indexed is conventionally linked to and helps to constitute

> some second feature of the communicative context, such that the indexing of one evokes or indices the other. [Ochs 1990:295]

Jane Hill's (1999) applied interpretation of Och's categories of *direct* and *indirect indexicality* further allows for the analysis of some of the functions *voseo* performs socially. Hill elaborates that direct indices apply to the construction "of non-referential meanings or 'indices' that are understood and acknowledged by speakers" (Hill 1999: 683). These non-referential meanings are accessed through *voseo,* which in a given context establishes a metacommunicative frame (Bateson 1972) that can directly reference inclusion in a regional or class identity, personal intimacy and affection, or annoyance or anger between both intimate and distant speakers. However, among upper-class speakers these direct indexicals are tied to a set of indirect indexicals—that is, non-referential meanings that are not acknowledged by speakers. Upper-class informants reported that they prefer *tú* to *vos,* and that they only use *vos* when they are joking around with friends. In using *vos*, I argue they may overtly draw on the non-referential meanings of personal intimacy, but they also covertly draw on stigmatized images of lower-class speech (and thus speakers) as uneducated, informal and confrontational when using *vos* to joke with or hassle each other.

***

This study will be divided into a number of sections. The preface and introduction have presented research questions and goals, and the theoretical background that informs the analysis. The introduction has also attempted to describe the setting of the research, as well as some of the issues that I faced in conducting fieldwork for the first time. The first section is a brief survey of the historical background of the *vos* pronoun in Spain and Latin America, as well as of previous research regarding *voseo* in Latin America. The second describes the research methodology

utilized in data collection and analysis. The third section presents the quantitative data gathered through interviews and is divided into three parts. I first describe the morphology of Ecuadorian *voseo* and argue that the verbal paradigm has changed in the thirty years since Israel Páez Urdanet published *Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo*, which includes brief regional studies of the morphology and use of *vos*, in 1981. I then describes speakers' judgments about the uses of *usted*, *tú*, and *vos* within different interactional settings and argue that *vos* is used very similarly to *tú*, although there are also important differences between *tuteo* and *voseo*., I conclude the third section by arguing that *voseo* is primarily a regional phenomenon. However in examining survey responses and statistics, it is sometimes difficult to speak fully about answers that do not fit general patterns, as well as more subjective beliefs and meanings. The fourth section accordingly deals with the social experiences and beliefs related to *voseo*, and argue that categories inscribing class, ethnicity, and the relationship between speakers—rather than region—are of the most significant ways that my informants described *voseo*.

2. A Brief Background on Second-Person Address in Spanish

Although their uses continued evolving in the New World, the forms of second-person deferential and non-deferential address that would eventually be carried to the Americas during the colonial period were the result of long-term linguistic change in Spain. Many authors (Penny 2002; Morse 1955; Páez Urdaneta 1981; Benavides 2003) signal that early Old Spanish followed the late Latin system in which the subject pronoun *vos* was used for second-person singular deferential address and both second-person plural deferential and non-deferential address. *Vosotros*—"vos" + "otros" [others], equivalent to plural *you* in English—was eventually adopted to distinguish between plural and singular forms, while still following the verbal paradigm of *vos* (León 1998; Penny 2002). The singular subject pronoun *tú*, on the other hand, expressed non-

deferential address or social solidarity (Morse 1955; Penny 2002). During the 15th century, however, *vos* was used increasingly between social equals, eventually emerging as a form largely interchangeable with *tú* (Penny 2000:152; Páez Urdaneta 1981:46). As 15th century Spanish society continued to require deferential modes of address between social classes, this path of linguistic change is attributed to giving rise to the deferential form of "vuestra merced" [your mercy[, in which the previously deferential possessive *vuestra* was combined with an abstract noun and a third-person singular verb (Penny 2002:152). The deferential second-person singular and plural pronouns, respectively *usted* [you] and *ustedes* [you all], are widely considered to be formed from the contraction of the deferential forms of address *vuestra(s) merced(es)* (Penny 2002:144; Lathrop 2003:153).

The *vos* pronoun continued to be used in Spain until the 16th century to express solidarity between social equals, but it gradually acquired a pejorative tone (León 1998: 135). Although in the 16th century *voseo* could carry the tone of the closeness between very intimate speakers, it was also used as an insult and to indicate the social inferiority of the person addressed as *vos* (Benavides 2003: 613). Within Peninsular Spanish, the use of *vos* as a form of non-deferential address was gradually abandoned in favor of *tú* by the end of the 17th century (Penny 2002; Morse 1955). The socially fraught and conflicting uses of intimacy and degradation associated with *voseo* are largely considered to be the reason that by the end of the 17th century, *voseo* had been almost abandoned disused in Spain (Simpson 2001; Benavides 2003; Penny 2002). This is an overly schematic and simplistic explanation of a long, complex sociohistorical development

of pronominal usage[7]. However, the fundamental point is that at the time that Spain was entering the colonial period, Peninsular Spanish was undergoing a complex body of changes in its pronominal systems, which would distinctly influence the modes of address that became established in the Americas (Páez Urdaneta 1981).

The continuing competition between the *voseo* and *tuteo* in some areas of Latin America is thought to stem from differences in settlement and communication within the colonial empire. Richard M. Morse observes that at *vos* was used as a familiar and non-deferential form similar to *tú* at the beginning of the colonial period, but it "was less well received than *tú* and might denote a master-servant relationship or a speaker's wrath" (1955:525). Written records indicate that *vos*, *tú* and, eventually, the deferential contraction *usted*, were all present within the linguistic systems of the colonial centers in the Americas. However, some areas eventually followed the peninsular pattern of eliminating *voseo* (Penny 2000: 152-153). Nevertheless, *voseo* continues to be the dominant form of second-person singular address, or exist in conjunction with *tuteo* in the Spanish of the Southern Cone, the Andean highlands and Central America, while *tú* tends to be exclusively used in Mexico –with the exception of Chiapas – most of Peru and Venezuela, and the Spanish Antilles (Penny 2000; Benavides 2003; Páez Urdaneta 1981).

Carlos Benavides (2003), drawing on many noteworthy studies of the sociolinguistic history of *voseo*, argues that the location of the colonial viceroyalties is the main factor determining the present distribution of *voseo* and *tuteo* in Latin America. Significantly, the areas in which *voseo* is uncommon or unused are the areas that were the most closely tied to Spain during the colonial period; that is, the earliest viceroyalties, which maintained the closest contact

[7] The sociohistorical and linguistic development of *vos* within the Spanish pronominal system has received a great deal of attention. For more detailed analyses see Penny (2002), Benavides (2003), Páez Urdaneta (1981), and Léon (1998).

with the linguistic and cultural norms of the Spanish peninsula (Benavides 2003: 613-614). Areas of intense settlement by Spanish colonists in the 16th century centered on regions that contained precious metals and large indigenous labor bases. Consequently, Spanish colonization broadly fell within the areas of the former Aztec and Inca Empires (Williamson 1992:78). Further, as Spanish settlements expanded into other regions, Lima and Mexico remained central lines for trade and imperial administration between the colonies and Spain, with the Caribbean ports remaining a significant intermediary point (Williamson 1992:79, 104). Penny also proposes that the differences in the frequency of *voseo* and *tuteo* in New World Spanish are the result of these patterns of settlement and communication. Areas that were in close contact with Spain, and thus Peninsular linguistic norms, also abandoned *voseo,* while those areas that were more peripheral to the colonial system continue to use the dual forms of *vos* and *tú* (Penny 2000:153).

Given that Ecuador is the focus of the present account, a short discussion of Ecuador's place within the viceroyalty hypothesis of the distribution of *vos* in Latin America is valuable. Although Quito was the seat of a regional *audiencia* and Ecuador fell within the area of the Viceroyalty of Peru, which was founded in 1544, it has remained an area where *voseo* alternates with *tuteo*. Benavides proposes that this is due to the much later founding of the Viceroyality of Nueva Granada in 1717, which included the regions that are now Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela—all of which are zones in which *vos* and *tú* alternate in importance (2003:614). As this viceroyalty was founded much later, many of the areas within it remained marginal to the colonial system, and did not adopt the linguistic developments brought by peninsular speakers to other zones (Benavides 2003:615). This can in part explain the present distribution of *voseo* in Ecuador as a non-dominant form of second-person singular address.

The importance of the American colonies' relationship to Spain in determining linguistic norms in the New World is widely recognized in the literature on *voseo*, but it is not the only factor that has been proposed (Benavides 2003; Paéz Urdaneta 1981). For instance, Morse contends that certain features of American Spanish are plebian forms of Peninsular Spanish that achieved legitimacy when unchecked by peninsular social norms due to "the shuffling of classes and regional groups during colonization" (1955:525). Benavides also argues that the social structure of the colonies was of particular importance in determining the distribution of *voseo* in Latin America (2003:616). Early in the 16th century Spanish-American society had not undergone intense stratification, and *vos* was still used to express deference, as well as solidarity and equality. However, the early spirit of equality quickly dissipated in the second half of the 16th century, at the same time that *vos* was acquiring meanings tied to social superiority and inferiority in Spain (Benavides 2003: 616-617). The stratification of society, and the changing pronominal norms brought from Spain were both significant factors in determining the abandonment of *voseo* in the areas more closely linked to the colonial system. Underlying conclusions about the role of settlement and communication patterns in determining features of pronoun use in American Spanish is thus the issue of the social factors in Spain and the colonies that influenced the appropriate modes of address among the social classes.

2.2 Regional Studies of *Voseo* in Latin America

Although *voseo* has been broadly studied, most research and analysis has focused on general patterns of usage and distribution throughout Latin America, rather than regional studies. (León 1998). There are nevertheless notable exceptions, which indicate that *voseo* differs significantly between countries. These include JoEllen Simpson's (2001) examination of *voseo* in Cali, Colombia, Alfredo Torrejón's (1986) discussion of *voseo* in Chile, Anne Pinkerton's

(1986) work on *voseo* in Guatemala, and Carlos Benavides' (2003) brief analysis of *voseo* in Honduras. Israel Paéz Urdaneta (1981) has also combined an in-depth sociohistorical analysis of *voseo* with brief regional studies throughout Latin America. His discussion of the morphology, distribution and functions of *voseo* in Ecuador will be referenced numerous times in the present account. In order to provide a background on the great variation in the uses of *vos* between countries, and the broad social factors effecting *voseo*, I will briefly discuss the findings of these first four regionally focused studies.

2.2.1 *Voseo* in Cali, Colombia

In her article "The 'American *Voseo*' in Cali, Colombia: An Ethnographic Study," JoEllen M. Simpson argues that the primary factor influencing the use of *tú*, *vos* or *usted* in the pronominal system of Cali, Colombia is social class, while gender plays a secondary role (2001: 29-30). Although *voseo* is present among all social classes, class position significantly effects a speaker's perception of *voseo* (Simpson 2001). Simpson describes that people from the high-middle classes think that *voseo* expresses friendship and solidarity, but that it also shows a lack of education. Greater awareness of social class and social climbing make these speakers more likely to describe *voseo* as "bad Spanish" (Simpson 2001: 29). Use between classes is very uncommon, and Simpson argues that members of the lower classes think that the upper class never use *vos*, because it is reserved for use with speakers of the same social standing, or to express intimacy and solidarity. In general, lower-class speakers accept *vos* as the appropriate form of address between family and friends, at the expense of *tú*. *Tuteo* is thought to be a form that indicates superficiality and is linked to the upper classes, while *voseo* belongs to *el pueblo* (Simposon 2001:29).

Simpson also turns to the analysis of gender and age in pronoun choice. She argues that in all classes *tuteo* between men is considered too intimate, and as carrying sexual undertones, especially by the lower classes. Women, on the other hand, are free to use *tú* or *vos,* although dimensions of class inform their uses. Age was the least significant variable in Simpson's study, as *voseo* was present among all age groups (2001: 30). However, she describes that negative evaluations of *vos* were more common among older upper-class speakers, although this was not a strongly marked difference (2001:30). She also notes that speakers sometimes use *vos* to express their anger or create social distance, although others will use *usted* to perform the same action (2001:30).

2.2.2 Chilean *voseo*

Alfredo Torrejón in "Acerca del Voseo Culto de Chile" (1986), asserts that not only does the use of *vos* vary between countries, it also varies across generations. In Chile *voseo* has shifted from a form that lacked social prestige, to now be popular among young, educated speakers (677). His argument thus focuses on class, age, and education as influencing the use of *vos.* Basing his analysis on more than twenty years of personal observation of the use of *vos* in Chile among university students, Torrejón argues that in Chile the uses of *vos* and its social meanings have changed and continue to change. This change in social meanings emanates from evolving perceptions of the differences between verbal *voseo mixto*, in which the *tú* pronoun is used with a *vos* verb conjugation, and *voseo auténtico*, in which the *vos* pronoun is used with a *vos* verb conjugation (1986:681). Torrejón further argues that verbal *voseo mixto* has been adopted by educated Chileans youths. This form incorporates linguistic elements from *voseo auténtico* that have traditionally pointed to an uneducated and stigmatized variety, into a new, socially acceptable form. Although *voseo auténtico* is considered a socially stigmatized form, used only

among uneducated urban and rural speakers, the replacement of the stigmatized *vos* pronoun with *tú* creates a system of address that is considered to express greater spontaneity and solidarity among educated youths (1986: 680-681). Torrejón further proposes that this is tied to a tendency towards the weakening of social barriers, educated young peoples' rejection of their classes' social norms and inter-generational solidarity (1986:681). Conversely, *voseo auténtico* used by educated speakers maintains its stigmatized—and thus pejorative—meaning and is used to express anger and distance. Based on his observations, Torrejón concludes that *voseo mixto* will eventually replace *tuteo* as the standard form of second-person address in familiar or intimate situations among the educated classes and eventually among other urbanized communities (1986:682).

2.2.3 Guatemalan *voseo*

In her article "Observations on the *Tu/Vos* Option in Guatemalan *Ladino* Spanish" (1986), Anne Pinkerton asserts that in Guatemalan *Ladino*[8] Spanish *voseo* has not replaced *tuteo*, as other authors have argued, but rather that *tú*, *vos*, and *usted* form a three-tiered pronominal system, In this system second-person singular pronoun choice is primarily "sex preferential" (690;692). Pinkerton demonstrates the flexibility of the Guatemalan pronominal system and that, depending on the context, *ladino* speakers do not consider Guatemalan *voseo* an incorrect or uneducated form of address. Rather, *voseo* is perceived as delimited by gender, in which the use of the *vos* pronoun is primarily restricted to male-male interactions in order to express solidarity or intimacy (1986: 691). In contrast, the use of *tú* is restricted to express familiarity between women, or between a male speaker and a woman, which leads male speakers to label *tuteo*

[8] Pinkerton defines *ladino* as a person who, regardless of heritage, speaks Spanish and has adopted a Spanish, as opposed to indigenous, way of life (1986: 696).

between men as a sign of effeminacy (Pinkerton 1986: 691-692). In the same way, use of *vos* by women is considered to be "unfeminine" or "crude" (Pinkerton 1986:693). However, the *ladino* second-personal singular pronominal system is more flexible in practice than these general rules indicate. Many of Pinkerton's female respondents reported that they use *vos* and do not considerate it to be sex-inappropriate (Pinkerton 1986:692). Pinkerton proposes that women are adopting the male system of address of *usted* and *vos*, due to its use by the more socially privileged and powerful group—male speakers (1986:692). Moreover, Pinkerton reports that women, particularly older women, may use the *tú* pronoun with a *vos* conjugated verb, while younger women also use *vos* with a *vos* conjugated verb (1986: 693). Consequently there is a great deal of variation within the Guatemalan second-person singular pronominal system, in which young *ladinas* have the greatest pronominal and verbal options.

Pinkerton is primarily concerned with issues of gender associated with *voseo* in *ladino* Spanish, but she does briefly reference issues of class and ethnicity. She notes that indigenous bilingual speakers' use of *vos* is likely tied to indigenous men's migration patterns and interactions with male *ladinos* in the *fincas*. Further, she reports that her respondents depart from the standard evaluation that a *ladino* speaker would address an indigenous interlocutor as *vos*, who would in turn be expected to respond using *usted*. Rather, her respondents indicated that they would be most likely to use *usted* when addressing an indigenous speaker (Pinkerton 1986:691). Pinkerton thus explains that in the Guatemalan case, unlike in other countries, *voseo* is not believed to be restricted to the lower classes, rural groups or indigenous peoples, but rather to male speakers (1986:693).

2.2.4 Honduran *voseo*

In the article “La distribución del voseo in Hispanoamérica” (2003) Carlos Benavides is primarily concerned with the sociohistorical background of the distribution of *voseo* in Latin America. However, based on his personal experience, he does provide a brief regional analysis of *voseo* in Honduras (2003:618). Benavides argues that *voseo* predominates over *tuteo* in Honduas. Moreover, *voseo* is present in all social classes in situations of familiar, informal, or familial address. He also proposes that age, in conjunction with the degree of *confianza*, is the most important factor in pronoun choice: with younger interlocutors, or with greater *confianza*, the more likely the use of *vos* will be. Conversely, in situations with older interlocutors, or with a lower level of *confianza*, *usted* will most likely be used (Benavides 2003: 618). Benavides further argues that this is a general pattern of use that might also apply to most of Latin America.

***

Age, gender, class, ethnicity, and the relationship between speakers emerge from these regional studies as significant factors that influence the use of *vos*, although their importance varies between countries. Páez Urdaneta signals that in Ecuador class and regional background are important demographic variables effecting *voseo* (1981:97). The present analysis takes all seven of these variables into account when analyzing Ecuadorian *voseo*. However, it also foregrounds class and region, as well as the relationship between speakers, as the main factors inflecting the use of *vos* in Ecuador.

3. Methodology

The initial design of this study included participant observation with children attending a voluntary summer school program run by The Quito Project at José Enrique Raza Bolaños, a local elementary school, in San Martín. This participant observation was to be combined with interviews with the children and their families. I also planned to recruit a limited number of middle and upper-class speakers in order to examine the differences or similarities in uses and beliefs between classes. However, given the limits of time and the school environment, a substantial amount of data was not gathered through participant observation. Rather, the majority of the data stems from separate sets of interviews conducted with adults and with children. Adult interviews focused on eliciting information about a speaker's primary uses of the second person singular pronouns available (*usted*, *tú*, *vos*) and the morphology of *voseo*, as well as his or her beliefs about those pronouns, particularly *vos*. Interviews with children were much simpler and were presented as a game, in which the child taught me, or sometimes a puppet prop used with younger children, how to use (or not use) *vos* in a limited number of interactional settings; these were speaking with friends, with parents, and with teachers. Children were also asked to specify the morphology of *voseo*. Interviews were later transcribed and the data coded for statistical analysis.

The statistical analyses presented in the following section are a fundamental aspect of the arguments presented in this account. However, as an anthropologist, I recognize that statistics are not the only way to describe linguistic phenomenon, and that a person's subjective social experience cannot be fully presented through numbers and the division of their responses into categories. Nevertheless, as a linguist, the ability to demonstrate significant relationships between variables and frequencies is a valuable element in the description of linguistic

phenomenon. Quantitative analysis provides evidence for a population's tendencies in linguistic practice and can clearly highlight actual differences in use between groups. It is also a means of comparing practice and belief. For these reasons, this study incorporates both statistical and ethnographic analyses of the data gathered during interviews, in which the arguments put forth in the quantitative analysis always underlie the qualitative discussions.

3.1 Informants

Between July and August 2010, I conducted 45 interviews in Quito, Ecuador. Informants were primarily drawn from the community of San Martín and surrounding *barrios*. The principal selection criterion for informants was that they had lived the majority of their lives in Ecuador. As this study partly aims to examine significant factors in influencing a speaker's use of *vos*, speakers from different regions, classes and language backgrounds were included to compare use and belief among different groups. These comparative cases are admittedly limited in number, but are sufficient to establish statistically significant relationships in this introductory study.

Parents were approached at the beginning of the summer tutoring program to request their family's optional participation in the study. The majority of the families interviewed had at least one student in the sixth grade class I taught, although siblings in different grades were also included when possible. A number of students from lower grade levels were also included to expand the age range of children. In all, 21 children between the ages of 6 and 13 were interviewed. Given that all of the children were drawn from the same neighborhood school, there is little variation in their backgrounds. The notable exception is the one Quichua-Spanish bilingual child that was interviewed. Other Quichua-speaking families were approached, but chose not to participate. All children had been born, or had lived for the majority of their lives, in Quito or other parts of the sierra. Although specific grade-level information is available for

children, only general educational level is given in Table 3.1. As adult informants were asked only about the general level of schooling they had achieved, and not the specific grade, it would be difficult to compare the two groups. Moreover, specific grade level did not appear to influence a child's use of *vos*, as the majority of children in the study reported or were observed using *vos*. Table 3.1 summarizes the background information for the children in the study.

Interview[9]	**Age**	**Sex**	**Education**	**Region**	**Class**	**Language**
001	8	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
002	6	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
003	10	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
004	12	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
005	11	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
006	8	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
007	12	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
008	9	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
009	13	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
010	13	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
011	7	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
012	5	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
013	13	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
014	12	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
015	10	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
016	10	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
017	12	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
018	7	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
019	10	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Quichua, Spanish
020	7	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish

[9] Names were removed for both children and adults during data coding and analysis. Given the relatively large sample size, I have chosen to code by interview number and not to provide pseudonyms for all participants in presenting the raw data. However, in later analysis pseudonyms will be used when discussing specific interviews.

021	9	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish

Table 3.1 Summary of background information of child informants.

The inclusion of upper-class children, children from different regions and more bilingual Quichua and Spanish speakers will allow for broader comparison in future study.

The majority of adults were contacted because of their children's participation in the summer school program. A few were other family members. Variations in their educational, regional and language backgrounds were not specifically selected for beforehand. For instance, I did not know that the two Quichua and Spanish speakers were bilingual until our interview, and I usually did not know if someone was from the Sierra or the Costa regions until the interview. However, the upper-class speakers were specifically sought out because of their class background in order to provide a contrast to the working-class speakers from San Martín. They were informally recruited through a mutual friend. Table 3.2 summarizes the background information for adults in this study.

Interview	**Age**	**Sex**	**Education**	**Region**	**Class**	**Language**
001	54	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
002	23	M	University	Sierra	Upper	Spanish
003	38	F	Secondary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
004	17	F	Secondary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
005	31	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
006	44	F	Elementary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
007	44	F	Secondary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
008	40	F	Elementary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
009	39	M	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
010	38	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
011	40	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
012	46	F	Elementary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
013	22	M	University	Sierra	Upper	Spanish

014	22	M	University	Sierra	Upper	Spanish
015	23	M	University	Sierra	Middle	Spanish
016	44	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
017	47	M	Secondary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
018	30	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Quichua, Spanish
019	31	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Quichua, Spanish
020	50	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
021	52	M	Secondary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
022	32	F	Secondary	Costa	Lower	Spanish
023	30	M	Secondary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish
024	22	F	Elementary	Sierra	Lower	Spanish

Figure 3.2 Summary of background information of adult informants.

As with the child population, there are limitations in the diversity of adult informants. Notably, all upper-class speakers are college-aged men. Among the lower-class speakers, 16 are women and 4 are men. Although I had intended to interview both parents for each child as often as possible, men's work schedules frequently made it difficult to coordinate an interview. Future work will attempt to broaden the base of participants for stronger comparative analysis. Nevertheless, the current sample is representative enough of speakers' attitudes to establish significant initial findings.

Age, gender, educational level, language and region were all established during interviews. However, class was not a self-assigned category. Rather, designation of class is based upon observations about where informants live in Quito, as the city is deeply divided by class. Nevertheless, these judgments are also informed by how people talked about themselves. Many residents of San Martín described themselves as *la gente pobre*, *trabajadores*, and *la clase*

popular. Similarly, people designated as upper-class speakers described themselves as *de clase alta*, or *media alta*.

3.2 Interviews

As previously discussed, child and adult interviews differed significantly. Interviews with children were generally conducted during recess at school in an empty classroom. Occasionally they were conducted at the child's home away from other family members when possible. The interviews were audio recorded, and we usually began by examining the recorder and demonstrating functions due to the children's curiosity about it. I would explain that I needed to record our "lesson" so that I would be able to remember it. The recorder was placed as unobtrusively as possible so as not to distract the child. Interviews with adults were generally conducted in their homes. As the interviews were often the first time we had spent a significant amount of time together, in order to establish comfort they usually followed long conversations in which we got to know each other and discussed the summer school program. We would then turn to the research and discuss general information about the project, such as that I was studying how people use and think about pronouns. Sessions were again audio recorded, with the recorder placed as unobtrusively as possible.

3.2.1 Child Interviews

Children were identified as an ideal group of informants for this study as they are still undergoing socialization into the sociocultural beliefs that influence pronominal choice (Ochs 1990: 287-298). They might therefore be more aware of, or have more difficulty managing, the social complexities associated with *voseo* as they learn to navigate the implicit decisions associated with the use of *vos*, *tú* or *usted*. I had initially planned to collect data through interviews and participant observation with the children in order to observe the use of *vos*

between peers. This was intended to elucidate differences between how the children used *vos* and the language ideologies they expressed in order to compare the pragmatics of how *vos* is actually used and the beliefs associated with it. However, as discussed in the introduction, the children's use of *vos* in the school environment was fairly limited. I prepared for this possibility by including interviews with them and their families about their beliefs about and uses of different pronouns, to still be able to collect data for comparison even if I was unable to observe substantial use of *vos*.

A second potential problem that was identified before research began was that the children would report what they believed I wanted to hear, instead of their actual beliefs. I attempted to avoid this latter bias by formatting my interview questions to be as non-leading as possible. I also planned to use a small puppet or other prop to speak with the younger children in order to distance myself as their teacher and as a researcher within our interaction.

Given the age range of the children, interview methods varied somewhat. A bright green frog puppet that I named "Señor Sapo" [Mister Toad[10]] was used as a prop "pupil" that was taught how to use *vos* by children aged 6-10, while I took on the role of the "pupil" with older children. These sessions were presented as a teaching game and generally lasted between 10 and 15 minutes. In both cases, children were asked to serve as a Spanish "teacher"—which in many ways they were. English versions of the openings to the scripts used for the child interviews are presented in Example 3.1 and 3.2.

Example 3.1[11] Opening of interview script for children 6-10

[10] Although the Spanish word for *frog* is *rana*, the frog puppet was named Señor Sapo because of my personal preference for the alliteration in Spanish.
[11] For full interview script, see Appendix A.

Georgia: Look, [child's name]! This is Señor Sapo (puppet waves its hand), one of my very best friends from the U.S. that came all the way to San Martín to learn to speak Spanish! Let's teach him to speak Spanish together!

Señor Sapo: Hello! Hola! Nice to meet you! I came to Ecuador to learn Spanish, but I need your help!

Child is given time to respond/talk to Señor Sapo .

S.S.: Well, the thing is, I'm a little confused. I've heard people saying "vos", but I don't know that word! Can you tell me what "vos" is?

Child responds.

G: How interesting! I want to learn more about "vos" too!

S.S.: Vos, vos vos! I like the way that word "vos" sounds. Do you think I can learn to use it as well as the kids in the school?

Georgia*:* Let's help Señor Sapo learn how to use "vos"!

S.S.: Can I use "vos" with my best friend?

The interview continues with questions about using vos in different interactional settings, as well about how to conjugate verbs for *vos*.

Example 3.2 Opening of the interview script for children aged 11-13

Georgia: [Child's name], can you help me? I came all the way from Michigan to practice my Spanish, but I still have a lot to learn!

Child is given time to respond/talk to me about learning Spanish

G: Well, the thing is, I'm a little confused. I've heard people saying "vos", but I don't know that word! Can you tell me what "vos" is?

The interview then continues with the same questions used with younger children. For both groups, questions about interactional settings focused on use with friends, use with parents and use with teachers in order to investigate the role of different relationships in determining pronoun choice.

The author during a "Spanish lesson" with Jessica[12], and Señor Sapo. Photo taken by a student, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador.

3.2.2 Adult Interviews

I used ethnographic interviews with the children's parents, and other adults, to gain a more complete perspective of *voseo* in San Martín in particular and Quito in general. These interviews emphasized questions about informant's backgrounds, their beliefs about *voseo* and their evaluations of uses of *usted, tú* and *vos*. Uses of *usted* and *tú* were included to compare to those of *vos.* This type of survey approach allowed me to perform an initial analysis of the factors that may influence a speaker's use or nonuse of *vos,* and to describe the distribution of

[12] All names given in this account are pseudonyms.

voseo. It also allowed me to examine some of the language ideologies that adults hold. These were of particular interest for families from San Martín, as they likely have influenced children's linguistic socialization.

As with the interviews I conducted with the children, the possibility existed that people would report what they thought I wanted to hear, rather than their actual beliefs. I similarly tried to avoid writing leading questions for these interviews by alternating between survey-style and open-ended questions to stimulate discussion. When appropriate, informants were asked to expand upon interesting aspects of their initial answers. Samples of the English versions of both types of question are shown in Example 3.3 and 3.4.

Example 3.3 Survey-style interview question

In your experience, *vos* is used with:
- everyone
- only with people one knows
- only with family members and friends
- with children
- with people of a lower social status
- when one wants to create distance
- other

Although the survey-style approach can be limiting, it was emphasized that interviewees could choose as many options as they wanted and propose other responses that they felt were more appropriate. These were often very productive questions as people frequently answered about how they felt that others use the specific pronoun in comparison with their own use, or voluntarily compared pronouns. For example, Ramón, a construction worker from a neighborhood near San Martín responded to a question about *usted* by telling me, "here, we…for example, if we're distant we say 'usted', if we're friends we use 'vos', and with my wife…we use 'vos'… with greater *confianza* [we use 'vos']" (Ramón Guamani, interviewed by Georgia

Ennis, Cooperativa Panamericana Sur, Quito, Ecuador, July 17, 2010). An except of open-ended interview questions are shown in Example 3.4.

Example 3.4 Open-ended interview questions

When would you use *vos*?

Are *usted, tú* and *vos* used differently here in Quito than in your hometown?

If speaker is from Quito, ask if pronouns are used differently in other parts of Ecuador

Questions like these produced a variety of responses that illuminate the different ways speakers think about *vos,* and often *tú* and *usted,* as well as what they may express in different contexts.

3.3 Position of the Researcher

My own position in regards to this study also influenced it in important ways, especially in San Martín. One of the most fundamental was that my initial plan to engage in participant-observation with the children during school was not possible because of my role as a teacher. As I discovered over the course of my interviews with children, teachers are generally treated as *usted*, and using *vos* at school is often punished. This created a significant limitation to the research I was able to carry out with the children. My initial relationship with the children's parents was also based on my role as a teacher, which had important implications for our interactions. In meeting most adults, I was both a researcher and their child's teacher. This lent a formality to our relationships that I tried to overcome by spending time before interviews getting to know each other. However, as an outsider, I was often not privy to the kinds of interactions between friends and family in which many of my informants described using *vos*.

It is also important to note that I am not a native Spanish speaker. I have been studying Spanish for five years and had spent approximately two months in Spanish-speaking countries before this study as a student and a volunteer, but conversations were sometimes difficult. This

was often a very humbling experience, but my informants graciously helped me through my linguistic difficulties. For instance, they patiently explained the vocabulary that I was unfamiliar with, especially the words in Ecuadorian Spanish that originate from Quichua. I have also frequently consulted with native Spanish speakers when transcribing and translating the interviews to assure that they are accurately interpreted.

3.4 Data Coding and Statistical Analysis

Transcripts were made of the recordings of all interviews. To compare responses about pronoun use, fairly broad categories for interactional settings and uses were identified; they are: "everyone," "strangers," "acquaintances," "parents[13]," "family," "friends[14]," "teachers[15]," "older people," "younger people," "to create distance," "someone of a higher-class," and "someone of a lower-class." As questions generally asked about the most frequent uses of a given pronoun and not each particular situation, there are not responses from every informant for every situation. Moreover, as there was considerable overlap in responses, especially between *tú* and *vos*, responses were coded for individual pronouns, as well as combinations, such as if both *vos* and *tú* can be used with family. This allows for analysis of the frequency of the main functions of the different pronouns. When responses vary between informants it also allows for the analysis of possibly significant variables in determining pronoun choice. Responses about whether a speaker uses *vos* or not were also coded for analysis. As children were not asked about every situation

[13] Although adults were not specifically asked about their pronoun use with parents, a number of them volunteered this information.
[14] Interview questions asked about use with "friends and family". However, many people distinguished between these two categories in their responses.
[15] This category applies only to the children's data.

that adults were, their information is only included for analysis when there is a correlation between categories, such as with friends[16].

Statistically significant relationships between the demographic variables of region, class, gender, age, language, educational level and pronominal choice were established using chi-square tests. Due to the small sample size, a p-value of <0.1 was selected to determine statistical significance. When there were not variations in informants' choices for a category, the frequency of the response among the informants is analyzed in the discussion.

[16] It will be noted if an analysis deals with only adults' responses, only children's, or if they are combined.

4.1 Verbal Paradigm(s) of Ecuadorian *Voseo*

As many authors have indicated, the verbal paradigm of *voseo* is perhaps best characterized by its variation between, as well as within, countries (Páez Urdaneta 1981; Simpson 2001; Torrejón 1986; Benavides 2003). Variations within morphology are also of particular interest as morphology often points to a speaker's social identity (Ochs 1990:293). Alfredo Torrejón (1986) utilizes a useful framework for describing the different verbal paradigms associated with *voseo*. Torrejón divides them into *voseo auténtico* in which the singular *vos* pronoun is used as the subject of verb forms derived from the second-person plural (*vosotros*)[17], and *voseo mixto*. The latter type is further divided into pronominal *voseo mixto* in which the *vos* pronoun is taken as the subject of a traditionally second-person singular (*tú*) verb, and verbal *voseo mixto* in which *tú* is used as the subject pronoun of a second-person plural verb (Torrejón 1986:678). Although previous research (Páez Urdaneta 1981) points to a fairly widespread presence of a form of *voseo auténtico* in Ecuador, I argue that *voseo mixto* has become the dominant form of *voseo* in Ecuadorian Spanish.

Páez Urdaneta indicates that Ecuadorian *voseo* does not present a uniform verbal paradigm (1981:95). Following traditional geographic divisions, he separates the country into the Costa, Sierra, and Oriente (referring to the eastern Amazonian region) and proposes that three systems of *voseo* are present in Ecuador: residual *voseo* in coastal zones, upper-class *voseo* in the Sierra, and rural and lower-class *voseo* in the Sierra. The possible use of *vos* in the Oriente is not discussed. The general verbal paradigms he describes is as follows:

[17] León argues that although *vos* and *vosotros* historically shared verbal paradigms, they are not derived from each other (1998:133).

Present	*vos tomás*	*vos comés*	*vos vivís*
Preterit	*vos tomaste*	*vos comiste*	*vos viviste*
Future	*(vos tomarás)*	*(vos comerás)*	*(vos vivirás)*
Imperative	*Tomá*	*comé*	*viví*

Table 4.1. Residual *voseo* of the Costa. Adapted from Páez Urdaneta (1981:95).

Present	*vos tomas*	*vos comes*	*vos vives*
Preterit	*vos tomaste*	*vos comiste*	*vos viviste*
Future	*(vos tomarás)*	*(vos comerás)*	*(vos vivirás)*
Imperative	*Tomá*	*come*	*viví*

Table 4.2. Upper-class *voseo* in the Sierra. Adapted from Páez Urdaneta (1981:95).

Present	*vos tomáis*	*vos comís*	*vos vivís*
Preterit	*vos tomaste*	*vos comiste*	*vos viviste*
Future	*vos tomarís*	*vos comerís*	*vos vivirís*
Imperative	*tomá*	*come*	*viví*

Table 4.3. Lower-class and rural *voseo* in the Sierra. Adapted from Páez Urdaneta (1981:97).

As these tables indicate, at the time of Páez Urdaneta's study, there was a great deal of variation in the verbal paradigms of the present tense. Ecuadorian *voseo* at this time would best be described as *voseo auténtico*[18].

However, in the current study, informants' responses indicate that the verbal paradigm of Ecuadorian *voseo* has been simplified in many ways, and has moved towards pronominal *voseo mixto*. Informants were asked to choose between a variety of conjugations and to select the option that sounded most natural to them. This section of the interview was frequently the most difficult for informants. One woman explained that although she uses *vos*, it is more used as a pronoun than with a verb (Carolina Morales, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito,

[18] The majority of forms provided by Paéz Urdaneta demonstrate the reduction of the diphthongized final syllable that generally characterizes *voseo auténtico* in Torrejón's study. The evaluation that this represents *voseo auténtico* stems from the stressed final syllable.

Ecuador, July 12, 2010). Of the 45 people interviewed, usable data was obtained from 42. Of these 42, only 1 child selected the forms *vos habláis* and *vos comís* of *voseo auténtico,* although he indicated that the *voseo mixtro* form *vos vives* sounded best to him (Danilo Oviedo, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 15, 2010). 97.6% (*n*=42) of respondents chose the *voseo mixto* forms *vos tomas* and *vos comes* in present tense conjugations, and 100% selected *vos vives* as the most natural form. The conjugations *vos eres* and *vos estás,* which are also derived from *tú* verbal conjugations, were selected by 97.7% of informants. Informants—regardless of class, region, age, gender or educational level—nearly universally supplied these forms. These results indicate that pronominal *voseo mixto* has become the dominant verbal paradigm. Significantly, it also indicates a widespread adoption of the linguistic norms of the upper classes in the Sierra. Although informants were not specifically asked about other verbs, respondents often supplied examples that widely indicate that the present-tense paradigm is derived from *tú* and that irregular stem changing verbs still undergo the vowel change (i.e. *vos quieres*). The verbal paradigm of *voseo* established by the current study is summarized below:

Present	*vos hablas*	*vos comes*	*vos vives*
Preterit	*vos tomaste(s)*	*vos comiste(s)*	*vos viviste(s)*

Table 4.4. Present and preterit verbal paradigm of Ecuadorian *voseo*.

Informants were not specifically asked about subjunctive, future, or conditional tenses, or regular imperative forms. These would be valuable areas for further research on the verbal paradigm of Ecuadorian *voseo*. Later surveys included questions about irregular command forms after unexpected forms were supplied by a number of informants. As sites of the most prominent morphological variation, detailed discussions of both the imperative and preterit follows.

4.1.1 The Imperative

Conjugation of commands was one of the most complicated aspects of the morphology of *vos* among informants. Páez Urdaneta reports that in Ecuador imperatives with *vos* may take the form of *vos* with a *vos* command form (i.e. *vos comé*) in which stress falls on the final syllable, in both the coast and among upper and lower-class speakers in the Sierra (1981:95). He also notes that commands may be formed as *vos* with a *tú* command (i.e. *vos come*), or as using a *tú* future form and clitic (i.e. *vos comeráste*) (Páez Urdaneta 1981:96).

Given the current widespread use of pronominal *voseo mixto* in the present and preterit tenses, it would be expected that imperative forms would follow the same structure. However, in the course of conducting interviews, a few different command forms emerged. Although the expected form of *vos* with a *tú* command with or without a *tú* clitic (for example, *vos ven* [come] or *vos ándate* [go]) was reported by 66.7% (*n*=30) of informants, other forms also emerged. Most notable were conjugations containing *vos* with an *usted* command form, such as *vos venga* [come]. This form was reported by 33.3% of informants. After performing a chi-square analysis on command conjugations, the results demonstrated that there is not a statistically significant relationship between command conjugations and the variables of age, gender, education, class, region, or language. However, this form only appeared among working-class informants, as no upper-class speaker reported this usage, instead preferring the standard form of pronominal *voseo mixto*: *vos* with a *tú* command form. Further study with a broader sample will be necessary to ascertain which factor(s) may influence the presence of a *vos* with *usted* command form in pronominal *voseo mixto*.

4.1.2 The Preterit

As outlined by Páez Urdaneta, preterit conjugations of *voseo* in Ecuador follow those of *tú* forms (1981: 95-96). However, he also indicates that *voseo* in other countries, such as Venezuela and Peru, is characterized by the addition of a final /s/ morpheme to the *tú* conjugation, (1981: 96; 98). Similarly, Simpson (2001) notes that in Cali, Colombia "there are some speakers who add an extra –s [to the *tú* form]: hablastes, comistes, vivistes," although she argues that it is uncommon (2001:28). This usage is, in fact, extremely widespread in Latin America, and represents a generalization of other verbal paradigms of *tú*, which mark person with a final /s/ morpheme (Penny 2002:161).

The addition of a final /s/ morpheme to the *tú* preterit conjugation in pronominal *voseo mixto* was relatively common among informants. During interviews, informants were asked which form they preferred: the standard *vos fuiste* or the nonstandard[19] *vos fuistes*. 45.7% (*n*=35) preferred *vos fuiste,* while 54.3% preferred *vos fuistes.* As *fuistes* was reported only by working-class informants, I initially hypothesized that conjugational differences are class related. Moreover, when I asked upper-class speakers what they thought of *fuistes*, I was told that it was associated with "the working class" or "the middle class and below, because someone that has studied in a high school or is of a higher class knows that it's wrong, and people around them know that it's wrong" (Luis Solano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). However, the more significant element of that statement is the apparent conflation of educational level with class.

Although my initial hypothesis was that it is class related, statistical analysis revealed a significant relationship between a speaker's educational level and presence of the final /s/

[19] By using *standard* and *nonstandard*, I refer to prescriptive ideas of correctness; I do not imply that one form is inherently more or less valid than the other.

morpheme. A chi-square test returned a p-value of 0.002 between the variables of educational level and preterit conjugations. However, it is worth noting that educational level and class closely coincided among my informants; lower-class speakers often had only an elementary education. Although education is the most significant variable for this form, broader conceptions of the relationship between education, class and speech have meaning for speakers. Age was the second most statistically significant variable. However, many of the informants surveyed were children still attending elementary school, creating a relatively large group of young informants with only an elementary education. A generally broader sample and the inclusion of informants with more varied educational levels in future studies will aid in the clarification of significant factors influencing the presence of a final /s/ morpheme in *tú* preterit conjugations.

4.2 Social Functions of Ecuadorian *Voseo*

Other regional studies of *voseo* have sought to elucidate the use of *vos* through descriptions of the social functions it performs, as well as through factors such as class and gender that influence its use (Simpson 2001; Torrejón 1986; Benavides 2003; Páez Urdaneta 1981; Pinkerton 1986). I will now turn to examining the primary functions of *voseo* in different interactional settings, providing comparisons with *usted* and *tú*, to begin to outline the relationships between them. Significant factors associated with pronoun use will further be related to Brown and Gilman's work on power and solidarity in influencing pronoun choice. This section demonstrates that *vos* is primarily used with friends and family members, to address younger speakers, as well as to indicate social superiority and establish distance. It also shows that many of these uses are shared with *tú*. As Páez Urdaneta does, I will also ultimately argue that *voseo* is regionally distributed, but that class also influences in general how second-person singular pronouns are used.

4.2.1 Pronoun Use with "Everyone" and Strangers

During adult interviews, the first option given to informants in survey style questions about the uses of *usted, tú* and *vos* in Quito was "con todo el mundo" [with everybody]; that is, if the pronoun is suitable for general use. Information from children is not available, as a comparable category was not included in their interviews. Between the three pronouns, only 12 adults (50% of the sample, n=24) indicated that they felt one of the three could be used in such a generalized way as to be used with everyone. Significantly, no informant chose *vos* as a pronoun that is used with everyone. It should be noted that even when a particular pronoun was chosen as used with everybody, these statements were qualified as personal preference or particularized uses were later assigned to other pronouns.

Of the 12 adults that chose a pronoun as generally used with everyone, ten chose *usted* (83.3%, n=12), while only two indicated that *tú* is this broadly used (16.7%). Mariana, a 54-year-old housekeeper that has lived in Quito for 34 years, explained that for her, "*usted, usted, usted* is used with everybody, everybody as *usted*" (Mariana Vasquez, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, Asistencia Social, Quito, Ecuador, June 29, 2010). However, she also underscored that *tú* and *vos,* especially, are used by the upper classes to mark a lack of respect for their employees, members of the lower classes and indigenous people. Moreover, all informants that indicated that *usted* is, or should be, used with everyone are lower-class speakers. Conversely, the two informants that indicated *tú* could generally be used with everyone are male, upper-middle-class and upper-class speakers. However, both of these men qualified their response in that they cannot use *tú* with their parents or older people, although they generally use it with everyone. Chi-square tests were performed between pronouns used "with everyone" and the demographic variables of age, class, education, gender, region and language. Age, gender, education, and class

all emerged as having a statistically significant relationship to use of *usted* or *tú* with everyone. Class and educational level in turn demonstrated p-values of 0.002, making them the most statistically significant. As both speakers that chose *tú* are currently attending university, and all informants that chose *usted* have elementary or secondary educations, the statistical association with education is unsurprising. However, many lower-class informants like Mariana, highlighted class – rather than education – in discussing the choice of which pronoun is used most generally. Further, the importance of educational levels may reflect economic biases in access to higher education, as well as the limited number of university students in the study.

Although a broader, larger sample would strengthen the analysis, applying Brown and Gilman's power and solidarity semantics can help elucidate the likely functions of *usted* and *tú* in this case. As the two speakers that indicated *tú* are young, educated, middle- and upper-class men, they are less likely to find themselves in positions where they are either socially inferior or unsolidary, except with older speakers. Conversely, nine of the ten lower-class speakers who selected *usted* as best used with everyone were women, perhaps indicating that working-class women do not see themselves as socially superior or solidary in as many situations.

The interactional setting *with strangers* also evidences the importance of the solidarity semantic in pronominal choice in Quito. Children are again not included, because were not asked about pronoun use with strangers. However, of the 24 adults interviewed, 13 (54.2%, n=24) selected *usted* as primarily used with strangers. Chi-square analyses were not performed, as the selection of *usted* with strangers was constant across backgrounds. However this could indicate a limitation of the data, as adults were also not explicitly asked if *tú* or *vos* are used with strangers. One upper-class informant chose *usted* as most used with strangers. The two that indicated that *tú* is generally used with everyone did not indicate if this category also included strangers.

Nevertheless, use of *tú* or *vos* with strangers was not a specific situation that was volunteered by any informants, and many people (16, or 66.7% of adults) explicitly stated that *tú* or *vos* cannot be used with strangers. In general, with the increased social distance entailed in not knowing a person, solidarity decreases to the point that *tú* and *vos* are widely considered inappropriate.

4.2.2 Pronoun Use with Friends and Acquaintances

Questions about which pronouns are used with friends were one of the main shared categories between adult and child interviews. Adult interviews included use with friends as an option for both *tú* and *vos*. 22 adults (91.7%, *n*=24) indicated that at least one is used with friends. It should be noted that during adult interviews, questions grouped family with friends ("con familiares y amigos") as options for both *tú* and *vos*. However, during their interviews most people indicated whether this grouping was suitable or inappropriate – for instance, if *vos* is only or more frequently used with family. Thus in analyzing responses, family and friends were treated as separate categories. Children were explicitly asked if *vos* can be used with their close friends, and whether using *vos* and *tú* with friends are the same. Each interview was reviewed and answers extrapolated from all the questions, so that if a child indicated she uses *vos* when she and her friend are getting along and *tú* when they are fighting, it was counted that both *tú* and *vos* are used with friends. Combining adults' and children's responses to questions about pronoun use with friends provides information for 43 people (95.6% of informants, *N*=45).

The use of pronouns that Páez Urdaneta reported in 1981 appears to continue in the present group of interviews. He proposed that between friends, *tú* and *vos* alternate, although *vos* generally expresses greater intimacy or *confianza* (Páez Urdaneta 1981:98). The majority of informants confirmed this general framework. 34 people, or 79.1% of those that provided information about use with friends (*n*=43), indicated that *vos* and *tú* are used with friends. Four

(9.3%, *n*=43) said that only *tú* is used with friends, while the other five (11.6%, *n*=43) indicated that only *vos* is used with friends. Although chi-square analyses were performed between pronoun use with friends and age, gender, class, region, educational level, and language, no background variables produced a statistically significant relationship. The alternation of *tú* and *vos* with friends thus appears to be generalized across these variables.

As the alternating use of *tú* and *vos* is fairly widespread, the more interesting element is the way different classes employ these pronouns with friends. Lower-class speakers generally reported that using *vos* with a friend indicates greater *confianza*, such as it did for Rosa, who explained, "If I use [vos] with a friend that I run into...[I say] "Ah! *vos*, how's it going?", but only [with] a friend of many years, of *confianza*" (Rosa Sedano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 15, 2010). A number of children also indicated that closeness is expressed through *vos*, and a few volunteered the sentence "vos eres mi mejor amigo" [you (vos) are my best friend] as an example when asked if *vos* can be used with their close friends. All four upper-class speakers also indicated that *vos* could be used with friends, but it had a very different pragmatic function than for the lower-class speakers. Instead of expressing intimacy or *confianza*, *vos* was used between the young, upper-class men as a way of indicating a joke, that they were giving each other a hard time, or acting tough. These pragmatic differences in what *vos* expresses when used with friends depending on class are discussed in greater detail in section 5.

Pronoun choices with acquaintances illustrates that pronoun use with friends shows a stronger tendency towards alternation between *tú* and *vos*, with *vos* most likely expressing greater *confianza*. Of the 12 adults that indicated pronoun choices for acquaintances, nine (75%, *n*=12) chose *tú*, while one (8.3%) chose *vos*, and two (16.7%) chose *tú* and *vos*. Again, within the

sample, these uses appear to be generalized, as chi-square tests did not return statistically significant relationships for age, gender, class, region, educational level, or language. However, the greater preference for *tú* with acquaintances, while both *tú* and *vos* can be used with friends, may indicate that *vos* is reserved for closer relationships with greater feelings of solidarity.

4.2.3 Pronoun Use with Parents and Family

Children were asked about their use of *vos* with their parents; they were then asked to clarify which other pronouns they use with their parents after it was established whether or not they use *vos* with them. Adults were more generally asked about their use of *tú* and *vos* with family members, but 11 (45.8%, *n*=24) of the 24 volunteered specific information about their use of pronouns with their parents. Nearly half of the adults included information about pronoun use with parents, therefore their responses were coded for analysis with the children's data. This approach provides information from 71.1% of all informants (*N*=45).

Páez Urdaneta argues that the tendency for pronoun use between parents and children in Quito is of reciprocal *tú*, while children rarely use *usted* with their parents, and occasionally parents use *vos* with their children (1981:98). However, the interviews conducted for the present account indicate a very different pattern of pronoun choice. Although there is a fair amount of variation, parents are most often treated as *usted*, while parents often anecdotally indicated that they use either *vos* or *tú* with their children.

Of the 32 adults and children that provided information about pronoun use with their parents, the majority (23, or 71.9%, *n*=32) reported that they use *usted*. Five (15.6%) indicated that they use a combination of *tú* and *vos* with their parents, while three (9.4%) said they only use *vos*, and one (3.1%) said he only uses *tú*. Chi-square tests did not produce statistically significant results between pronoun use with parents and any of the demographic variables. As

such, the widespread use of *usted* and the variability between *tú* and *vos* appears to be generalized and not tied to any of the specific background features analyzed in this study. Further study could serve to parse out the presence, or absence, of significant background factors in pronoun choice with parents. Turning again to Brown and Gilman's power and solidarity semantics, use with parents seems to point to the importance of the power differential in determining pronoun choice–due to asymetrical power relationships, parents may give *tú* or *vos*, while they receive *usted*. As I discuss in section 5, many informants indicated that complex, and sometimes very personal, issues of respect and intimacy are tied to their pronoun choices.

Children were asked only about their use with parents, not the family in general. Therefore, only information provided by adults is analyzed. As previously stated, "with family and friends" was provided as a single category during interviews, but distinctions were made frequently enough for separate analysis. Of the 24 adult informants, 22 (91.7%, n=24) chose use with family members as a primary function of *tú* or *vos* in Quito. Of these, 63.6% (14, n=22) indicated that both *tú* and *vos* are used with family members. 18.2% (4, n=22) responded that only *tú* is used with family members, while the other 18.2% indicated that only *vos* is used with family members. Chi-square tests were performed between pronoun use with family and the variables of age, gender, class, educational level, region and language. All but gender returned p-values of < 0.1. Given that statistically significant relationships were provided for almost all background variables, it is difficult to highlight which ones are the most important in determining pronoun use with family members. As with friends,, *tú* and *vos*, or a combination of the two, are used with familial relationships and most likely indicate social solidarity.

4.2.4 Pronoun Use with Teachers

As has been briefly discussed in previous sections, children's use of *vos* in their school was limited, particularly with adults. This is reflected in their interviews. Of the 21 children that were interviewed[20], 18 (85.7%, *n*=21) rejected the use of *vos* with their teachers, and indicated that *usted* was the only appropriate pronoun to use with their instructors. However, three children (14.3%, *n*=21) did say that they could use *vos* with their professor; two were of the youngest children interviewed (ages 6 and 7) while the other was 12 years old. Although age thus seems like it would be the most important variable in determining pronoun choice, the other three children under 7 reported using *usted* with their teachers. Further, chi-square tests by age, gender, and language[21] did not provide statistically significant p-values of <0.1 using Fisher's Exact Test, although age produced a significant p-value of 0.060 using the Pearson Chi-Square. However, I argue that use of *usted* with teachers is fairly generalized, and that the small sample size makes it more difficult to determine whether age plays a significant role in a child's ability or decision to discriminate between *usted* and *vos* with their teachers. Age, nevertheless, may be an important factor in a child's emerging competency with culturally influenced pronoun choices.

The framework of the power semantic is also useful for analyzing pronoun choice with teachers. The asymmetrical relationships of both social power and age between teachers and students would predict that children are most likely to use *usted* in the classroom, while their teachers have a choice between using a formal or informal pronoun with them. Michelle, one of the oldest students interviewed, eloquently highlighted some of these issues when asked if *vos*

[20] Adults were not asked about pronoun use with their teachers. However, one of the university students volunteered that he generally only uses *usted* with his professors, because he does not feel comfortable using *tú*, and especially not *vos*, with them.

[21] Statistics for class, region and educational level were not computed, as these demograpgic variables are the same for all children in the study.

can be used with a teacher. She explained that it cannot, because it indicates "a bad upbringing, [because] older people are treated as *usted* and that is polite […] if I used *vos* with them it would be impolite, because the teacher can show us *confianza* [by using *vos*], but it's not the same [for us]" (Michelle Aguilar, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 20, 2010). However, Páez Urdaneta has argued that *usted* is used reciprocally between teachers and students – although it is unclear at what educational level (1981:98). Unfortunately, I do not have data for an analysis of pronouns used by teachers with their students.

4.2.5 Pronoun Use with Older and Younger Interlocutors

As the previous quote from Michelle emphasizes, one of the main uses of *usted* is with people older than the speaker. Half of the 24 adults interviewed indicated that one of the main functions of *usted* is to address older conversational partners[22]. No informant indicated that *tú* or *vos* would be a more preferable way to address an older speaker. As such, associations with background variables were not calculated, as this use was constant across interviews. However, there is a notable exception in examples of practice that is discussed in more detail in section 5. One woman emphasized that many upper-class employers frequently use *vos* with their staff or other lower status people to indicate their superiority, even if they are of an age when the only appropriate pronoun would be *usted*. Nevertheless, the appropriate pronoun to address an older speaker is still widely believed to be *usted*, even if this is not always expressed in practice.

Conversely, 13 of the 24 adults indicated that to address a younger person *tú* or *vos* are generally used. Seven of these (53.8%, *n*=13) said that *tú* is used with younger speakers, while four (30.8%) reported that either *tú* or *vos* may be used; only two people (15.4%) chose that

[22] Children like Michelle occasionally referenced pronoun use for older speakers, but it was not specifically asked for, nor a response widespread enough to compare to adults. Further, discussions of pronouns used with younger speakers were not included in child interviews.

younger people are exclusively treated as *vos*. Moreover, this was an area of great pragmatic subjectivity. A few parents reported that they occasionally also use *usted* with their children when they are being particularly loving. Moreover, some informants distinguished between the use of *vos* with just their children or other related children, and *tú* with more distant children. Both age and gender produced p-values of <0.1, indicating a statistical association between these background variables and pronoun use with younger people. Informants between the ages of 17 and 35 indictated that only *tú* is used with younger people, while informants between the ages of 36 and 55 chose *vos*, *tú*, or both as used with children. Male informants chose either *tú* or *vos*, but not both, as used with younger people; however, this may also stem from the lower numbers of men in the study.

Pronoun choice with an older or younger interlocutor both fit within the power semantic. Older speakers generally appear to receive the formal *usted* because of their social position. Other dimensions of power, such as class, also inform this and in actual practice pronominal choice may not be as nearly as straightforward as the statistical analysis of interview responses indicated. Similarly, *tú* and *vos* generally appear to be used with younger people, following their status as holders of less social power in comparison to adults. However, these are only general tendencies, in which daily practice may evidence different uses, such as the mother that uses *vos* to tell her children to move when they aren't paying attention to her ("¡vos muévete!"), but *usted* ("muévase usted mijito") when she wants to lovingly tell them to do the same (Rosa Sedano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 15, 2010).

4.2.6 Pronoun Use with Someone of a Different Class and to Create Social Distance

A few adults expressed very strong beliefs and feelings about how pronouns are used to express class differences and social superiority, but this was not an area most people focused on.

I will provide a brief summary of the quantitative data, but will examine pronoun use and class more thoroughly when discussing beliefs in section 5. Of the 24 adults, only seven (29.2%, *n*=24) indicated that *tú* (chosen by two people), *vos* (chosen by one person), or both (chosen by four) are used to address members of a lower class. Further, this was expressed primarily as a belief or based on the personal experiences of the working-class informants, who reported that their employers use *tú* or *vos* to mark their superiority, while expecting *usted* in return. Conversely, only one of the upper-class speakers indicated that *tú* and *vos* can be used to talk down to someone from a lower class, although he also said that this has begun to change. Of the adults, two indicated that a primary use for *usted* was to address someone of a higher class.

The final interactional use of *usted*, *tú* and *vos* that was analyzed in interviews was to create social distance; this was discussed by eight of the 24 adult informants. Of the eight adults that overtly indicated pronouns are used to express social distance, one said that this is expressed through *usted*, two chose *usted* and *vos*, and five indicated that this is expressed by *vos*. Given that this use was discussed by a relatively small group of the adults, chi-square tests did not produce statistical associations with any of the background variables. However, drawing on other uses outlined in previous sections and the semantics of power and solidarity, these seemingly conflicting uses of *usted* and *vos* come into focus: when used with an intimate that would normally be treated as *tú* or *vos*, *usted* establishes a formality or social distance. Similarly, the use of *vos* to indicate distance draws on its informality. As one woman explained, the intimacy of *vos* can also indicate that the level of respect is being lowered to express anger or distance. *Usted* can thus be used to establish distance through its associations of formality, while *vos* can be used to establish distance through its associations with intimacy.

4.3 Factors Influencing *Voseo*

Class is one of the most important ways that informants talked about *vos*. Primarily identifying *vos* with working-class sectors of Quito or rural areas, many people explicitly or implicitly expressed that class is very influential in a person's use of *vos*. Nevertheless, use of *vos* and class did not have a statistically significant association, as the middle- and upper-class informants also reported using *vos* in certain situations.

Regional identity was another, although less prominent, marker that informants used to talked about *voseo*. Further, although Páez Urdaneta signals that two class-based sociolects of *voseo* are present in Ecuador, he argues that they are an expression of the same phenomenon of regional *voseo* centered in the Sierra (1981:147). In analyzing the presence of *voseo* among adult informants, none of the demographic variables of age, class, educational level, gender, region and language provided statistically significant associations [23]. However, in analyzing informants' responses about the use of *vos* in their birthplace, a statistically significant relationship only emerged with region, returning a p-value of 0.035 (n=24). This indicates that the use of *vos* in a speaker's birthplace depends on the region, thus suggesting that *voseo* is distributed regionally in Ecuador.

Of the 24 adults, four informants (16.7%, n=24) answered that *vos* is not used in their birthplace, while the remaining 20 (83.3%) indicated that it is. Of the four who answered that it is not used, three were from the Costa, while one was from the Sierra. Three of the 20 that said it is used were from the Costa, while the rest were from the Sierra. Although it is somewhat contradictory to the regional proposition that three of the adults from the Costa responded that

[23] Although some coastal speakers reported that they had adapted to the use of *vos* by living in the Sierra, a statistically significant relationship was not found between length of time lived in Quito and use of *vos*. Further study will be necessary to determine significant factors that influence a person's use of *vos*, or to determine if it is based solely on personal preference.

vos is used in their birthplace, examining their specific birthplaces elucidates this contradiction. Two of three grew up in the province of Esmeraldas, where Páez Urdaneta proposes *vos* is present among all social classes (1981:95). The third is from Milagros in the province of Guayas. Although Páez Urdaneta does not deal specifically with this area, it belongs to the general area of the coast where he argues that residual *voseo* is present only among the lower classes (1981:95). The regional nature of *voseo* is thus not sharply delimited between Sierra and Costa, but it is much more common in the Sierra.

4.4 Conclusion

This section has analyzed the quantitative data gathered during interviews with adults and children. The first part examined the morphology of Ecuadorian *voseo*, and argued that pronominal *voseo mixto* has become the dominant verbal paradigm; it also highlighted significant variations in command and preterit conjugations. The second part examined general uses of *usted, tú* and *vos* in different interactional settings, but it also noted important exceptions. *Usted* was most frequently reported as used in general and with strangers. Among friends and acquaintances *tú* and *vos* alternate, but *vos* expresses greater intimacy and *confianza*.Within the family, *tú* and *vos* also alternate, although children tend to use *usted* with their parents. Children also generally use *usted* to address their teachers. An older person is generally treated as *usted*, while younger speakers are addressed as *tú* or *vos*, though there is a slight preference for only using *vos* with one's children or other young relatives. A higher status speaker can use both *tú* and *vos* to address someone from the lower classes, while *usted* is likely received, and social distancing can be expressed through either *usted* or *vos*. Table 4.4 summarizes these results. The final section argued that Ecuadorian *voseo* is a regional phenomenon primarily centered in the

Sierra, and not class-based. This is especially significant when compared with speakers' beliefs; many people envision *voseo* to be much more strongly linked to class or race than to region.

"Con todo el mundo" [everyone]:	Usted/Tú	**With strangers:**	Usted
With acquaintances:	Tú/Vos	**With friends:**	Tú/Vos
With family:	Tú/Vos	**With parents:**	Usted
With an older speaker:	Usted	**With a younger speaker:**	Tú/Vos
With teachers:	Usted	**With a social superior:**	Usted
With a social inferior:	Tú/Vos	**To express distance:**	Usted/Vos

Table 4.4 Uses of *usted, tú* and *vos* by interactional setting.

This analysis has established an important underpinning of the objective aspects of *voseo*: its morphological features, use in different interactional settings and regional distribution. Yet, it has only briefly touched upon the beliefs and the subjective experiences that constitute a large part of my informants' understanding of their social worlds. In order to elucidate some of the meanings and beliefs expressed through *vos*, section 5 turns to an ethnographic analysis of Ecuadorian *voseo*.

5. Social Implications of Ecuadorian *Voseo*

Although there are general patterns of pronominal usage that emerged during interviews, these patterns do not always fully describe the beliefs associated with *voseo*. While previous sections dealt with more objective issues of pronoun use in Quito – the verbal paradigm of *voseo*, pronoun choice in different interactional settings, and the distribution of *vos* within Ecuador – this section turns towards more subjective issues. Through the lens of social indexicality and language ideology, it deals with beliefs about *vos*, and about the people that are said to use it. It also examines some of the social pragmatics associated with *vos* and attempts to explain the primary—and sometimes conflicting or contradictory—meanings of *voseo* in different settings.

Voseo is principally a regional phenomenon in Ecuador, but discourses about *voseo*'s relationship to class and ethnicity are frequently foregrounded at the expense of beliefs about region. Further, there are important differences in how *vos* is used that coincide with class. As this section endeavors to deal with the implications of *voseo*, it highlights variations in responses, foregrounding important distinctions and examples of practice that may not always fit with the general patterns established in the previous section. This is not to say that these general frameworks are not valid or important, but rather that lived social experience is sometimes more complex than the generalized patterns of pronoun use indicated by informant. This analysis intends to highlight the way *vos* is thought about, and to bring the practices and beliefs of actual people into focus.

I met with Eduardo, one of the young, upper-class men I interviewed, on an uncharacteristically sunny afternoon in Quito's tourist district, formally known as La Mariscal and informally known as Gringolandía. Though I had offered to visit their homes individually, he and his friends that I was going to interview that day had decided to meet me there. La Mariscal

is at a mid-point in the city, about an hour by public transportation from Asistencia Social, a working-class neighborhood in southern Quito, where I lived, and reasonably close to the wealthier area of northern Quito where they live. Eduardo's answers to other interview questions had been fairly brief and straight to the point, but when we got to *vos* he very clearly indicated how difficult it is to unfold its meanings. After I asked him to describe with whom *vos* cannot be used, he told me "I believe [it can't be used] with anyone…at least, I don't use it with anyone, except with friends, but otherwise, no. But it's a difficult question…if you ask everybody here, it's difficult for them to tell you specifically with whom you use *vos*, because it always varies" (Eduardo Cueva, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). When I asked him if pronouns are used differently in other parts of Ecuador, he continued, "It depends a lot on the person, it's not the region specifically, but rather depends on the people….but almost never…it's not very common that *vos* is used here in Ecuador, according to me at least." Although this was not among the most frequent of responses to questions about *vos*, it gets at some of the fundamental issues and complexities of Ecuadorian *voseo*.

For many speakers *vos* is not immediately thought of as regional, but as having to do with people and, as other interviews will illustrate, certain kinds of people. Moreover, his response coincides with the more limited use of *vos* in the upper classes. Though the four young, middle- and upper-class men I interviewed use *vos*, it is a much less common form for them and the implications of its use are different from those of the working-class. Eduardo's responses also strikingly illustrate the divide in beliefs between classes, as a man that lives in a working-class barrio, located at most an hour or two away from the wealthy city center, told me, "Almost everybody uses [vos]…well, not everybody! [But] all of Quito uses it" (Ramón Guamani, interview by Georgia Ennis, Cooperativa Panamericana Sur, Quito, Ecuador, July 17, 2010).

5.1 Social Indices and Language Ideologies

Language is not neutral. It points to and creates a speaker's social world and it does this in many ways. For instance, when a linguistic form, like the pronoun *vos*, becomes linked with one or more social identities, it becomes indexical of them (Irvine and Gal 2000). That is, through cultural associations its use is thought to say something about the identity and the fundamental qualities of the person that uses it. In Ecuadorian Spanish, *vos* is an index of multiple, and overlapping, social identities.

Class was one of the primary ways that the use of *vos* was talked about during interviews. For many people, *voseo* points to the lower classes. Sometimes informants expressed this explicitly, although they frequently indicated more subtle associations. For instance, Gloria, a working-class woman originally from the coast, directly linked *voseo* to the lower classes. Like other parents I talked to, I met Gloria because her daughter was attending The Quito Project's summer program at José Enrique Raza Bolaños elementary school. Unlike many of the other parents, however, I saw Gloria everyday because The Quito Project had hired her to unlock the classrooms each morning and care for the school grounds. On the last day of classes, I walked home with her and her daughter to a small house built of cinderblocks, set atop one of the high, grassy hills that surround the main street in San Martín, where she and her husband live with their three young children. Although Gloria and I had known each other for more than five weeks, she had always seemed very shy and we did not talk much except to say good morning as I walked to my classroom. Seated in her house, however, she was one of the most open people I talked with, freely and thoroughly explaining her beliefs.

Gloria pointed to a number of the indices of *voseo*, but the first, and strongest, was tied to class. In detailing the uses of *usted* and *tú* in Quito, she described that in the Costa *tú* is the main

form of address, but that in the Sierra people are more reserved and polite and mostly use *usted*. However, when the conversation turned to *vos*, she explained, "The thing is that there are different classes, there are two classes in the Sierra, [….] those from the upper class use *usted* more, those from the lower class use *vos*" (Gloria Salazar, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 5, 2010). She continued, "It's rude, […] for example, in the market they [the vendors] always use *vos* […] it's 'vos, vos, vos', they say 'vos' to everybody…they never say 'usted' to anyone." Even though Gloria indicated that she now uses *vos* occasionally, and that her children and husband also use it, one of her main associations for *voseo* was with the lower classes. Moreover, this index to the lower class was expressed as a negative trait. While *usted* indexes the upper classes and politeness, *vos* indexes impolite, lower-class speech.

This negative association likely stems from judgments about an indiscriminate, public use of *vos*, which emerged as one the main behaviors associated with lower-class *voseo*. When I first met Alison in her family's home near San Martín, she was in the midst of studying for her high-school graduation exams. It was a sunny Saturday morning when her younger sister and brother met me at the school to show me the way to their house. Characteristically for Quito, during the nearly hour-long walk to their home in a neighboring barrio the weather abruptly turned. By the time we were all eating lunch together, we could barely hear each other over the rain pounding on their tin roof. We all sat talking until the rain let up enough to record the interviews. Like Gloria, Alison directly linked *vos* to class, but in a slightly different way. Asked if using *vos* is positive or negative, she replied, "If you say it the first time you meet someone, it doesn't come off well. First, you need to have a little *confianza* and like that use *vos*. *Vos* isn't used a lot, but people from […] the lower levels, are going to use *vos* the first time [they meet someone]"

(Alison Ramos, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 12, 2010). Using *vos* in the first encounter is seen as too intimate, but this is a social mistake only someone from the lower classes would make. She continued, "In the literature it's said that *vos* is only for the common people [la gente vulgar], [and] only *usted* should be used." Linking her judgments about *vos* to "the literature" reinforced the authority of her beliefs. As an educated young woman, it also positioned her as separated from this use of *voseo*. Even though Alison indicated that she uses *vos*, she also knows how to use it appropriately, only with friends *de confianza*. In these sorts of systems of belief, *voseo* becomes iconic (Irvine and Gal 2000) of the lower class, expressing an inherent trait of a group that does not know enough to speak correctly.

The indexical relationship between *vos* and the lower class was also expressed more subtly in some interviews. Emilio, a university student from a wealthy family provided an excellent illustration of this. Introduced through a mutual friend, we met for his interview in his cousin's apartment in a fashionable neighborhood in northern Quito. Although he did not overtly link the use of *vos* to the lower classes, it's role as an index for them was clear in his response to a question about differences between pronoun use in Quito and other parts of Ecuador. He turned first to differences in Quito, explaining, "[*vos*] is used much more in the south, in southern Quito it's used more. [In] the north [of Quito], it's almost not used" (Emilio Hernandez, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Carolina, Quito, Ecuador, July 10, 2010). He continued, "Within the country *vos* is used more in rural areas." Emilio did not explicitly link the use of *vos* to the lower classes the way Gloria and Alison did, but this statement functionally does the same thing. The south of Quito is widely considered to be the poorer, working-class area of the city. *Vos*, in representing this section of the city, also points to the working-class people that live there. Regarding the second part of his response, rural areas in Ecuador tend to be marginalized and poor, and thus

may also relate to the association of *vos* with the lower classes. However, this could also reflect that the rural highlands tend to be strongly associated with indigenous populations, which was another of the main social indices linked to *voseo*.

As with class, the linking of *voseo* with indigenous speakers was often more subtle, as it was when one woman described users of *vos* as "people…*del campo* [from the country]" (Gabriela Rojas, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 16, 2010). However, like class, this relationship between form and social identity could also be very overt. Valentina makes a living selling *papi-pollo*, grilled chicken and fried potatoes, from a small store in the front of her home in the afternoons. She lived in a coastal city until she was 11, but has lived in Quito for more than thirty years. Unlike many people, she does not mind if strangers use *tú* or *vos* with her, and encourages her children and grandchildren to use these forms with her so that they feel that they have *confianza*. Despite her somewhat unusual comfort with *tuteo* and *voseo*, she still expressed many of the same beliefs about who uses *vos*, and directly linked the use of *vos* in Quito to indigenous people. She explained, "The *indigenas* use [vos] a lot, and so we learn it, because they're also moving around here in Quito…we learn these words that they use, so *vos* is used more here" (Valentina Arroyo, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Blas, Quito, Ecuador, July 20, 2010). In Valentina's explanation *voseo* comes directly from the Quichua inflected Spanish of indigenous migrants. Other people may have learned to use it, but *vos* directly points back to the speech of indigenous Ecuadorians.

Other interviews highlighted a similar connection between *voseo* and indigenous people, while simultaneously linking its use to some seemingly inherent aspects of their nature. Felicia, who had grown up in Latacunga, which is located in an area of the Sierra strongly associated with indigenous villages, summarized these connections. Linking *voseo* with indigenous people,

she explained, "[…] the *indígenas*, for example, they're direct, they don't say 'tú' to you, or even 'usted', no, they treat you like that, directly, [using] *vos*" (Felicia Gamarra, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, Pueblo Unido, Quito, Ecuador, July 20, 2010). Again, this judgment about *voseo* associates the pronoun, the people that use it, and something about their being. In this case, that they are fundamentally direct. The idea of the "directness" of indigenous speakers was repeated in a number of interviews. However, Gloria provided a slightly different analysis of the reasons indigenous people use *vos* more. After she mentioned indigenous use of *vos*, I brought up the other opinions I had heard about it:

> **Georgia:** Some people have told me that *indígenas* are more direct, or things like that, and because of that they use *vos*?
>
> **Gloria:** I don't know…they…for me, it's not that they're direct, but that they're simpler. They haven't studied pronouns and all of that, so they only use *vos* with everybody. [Gloria Salazar, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 5, 2010]

Rather than emphasizing directness as an inherent trait, Gloria's answer has more in common with the type of belief Alison expressed about the lower classes. Namely, that in these discourses, certain groups lack access to adequate education, and because of that they do not know how to speak appropriately. Moreover, these connections between the linguistic form, the people that use it and some aspect that it is believed to express become naturalized: *voseo* evokes that indigenous speakers are "direct" or "simpler" in the same way that it evokes the lower classes' "rudeness" or lack of education.

These social indices carry a negative evaluation of the nature of speakers who use *vos*, but it can also be a more neutral index of the way that people speak in the Sierra, and in turn, a

social index of a person from the Sierra. Although this was a less prominent relationship, it emerged in a number of interviews. Like the other indices, it was expressed both explicitly and implicitly. For instance, some migrants to Quito from coastal regions identified *vos* as a form that they are not comfortable with nor are accustomed to using, and that they strongly associate it with speech in the Sierra. Gloria, who follows the coastal preference for *tú*, again directly expressed this association. In referring to her daughter's use of *vos* told me, "She speaks more like someone from the Sierra, she uses *vos* more, and she uses it more with me. It's the same with her brothers. They're losing [the use of] *tú*" (Gloria Salazar, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 5, 2010). Positioning her children's use of *vos* as a way of speaking "like someone from the Sierra" explicitly links regional background and pronoun choice. In this way, *vos* can also point to a specific regional identity.

For speakers that use *vos* regularly, this association could also be more implicit, and even more specific. Ramón, a construction worker who was born in Quito, described that there are many ways to speak in Ecuador, linked to regions. Sitting in his family's narrow, sunlit kitchen while he finished his breakfast, he explained, "[…] in Cuenca, in Santo Domingo, in Guayaquil, there, they don't use *vos*. They have another way" (Ramón Guamani, interview by Georgia Ennis, Cooperativa Panamericana Sur, Quito, Ecuador, July 17, 2010). Although Cuenca is located in the highlands and would presumably follow the same linguistic patterns as Quito[24], Santo Domingo is located near the coast, and Guayaquil is the country's principal port. For Ramón, using *vos* directly points to the way that people in Quito speak, in opposition to other cities. He continued later, "Almost everybody uses [vos]…well, not everybody! [But] all of Quito uses it. That's why I say in Cuenca, in Santo Domingo, they use other words. They say

[24] In interviews with upper-class speakers, Cuenca was mentioned as a place where *vos* is used more than in Quito.

'¡oye!' [hey!], that's how the *monos*[25]–we say 'monos'–they say, '¡Oye, oye, ven acá![26]' They have another language." Ramón's statement sets up a number of oppositions based on language. In his view, there is a way of speaking in Quito that is typified by using *vos*, and this form separates Quito from other cities, as well as from the people that live in them. In a single word, *voseo* can encapsulate more generally what someone from the Sierra is, and more specifically what someone from Quito is.

Social indices are important aspects of how speakers understand the relationship between language and their social landscape. As speakers naturalize the links between a form and its indexical object, language ideologies are created (Irvine and Gal 2000). The reasons that people offered to account for a group's use of *vos*—regional identity, lack of education, directness, rudeness—attempt to explain what *voseo* means in the social world. Social indices then inform and reinforce language ideologies. One of the consequences of social indices in language is that they also inform standard language ideologies about "correct" speech (Lippi-Green 2004), and which variations in language are appropriate and which are not. Alison's invocation of a "literature" that says the correct way to speak is to use *usted*, and Gloria's judgments that using *vos* with everyone is rude, reflect and fortify standard language ideologies about what kind of language is appropriate in a specific context.

Children supplied one of the most vivid illustrations of *voseo*'s place in standard language ideology. During their interviews, I asked each child if *vos* can be used with a teacher, and nearly all of them told me no. Ana, a twelve-year-old girl, explained it in terms that draw on the language ideologies introduced in adults' interviews. She said, "Most [children] don't say

[25] *Mono*, from the Spanish word for *monkey*, in Ecuador is a derogatory term used to refer to people from the coast, particularly Afro-Ecuadorians.
[26] Hey, hey! Come over here!

[vos] to the teacher, just some kids that have bad manners [que son malcriados]" (Ana Camacho, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 30, 2010). Saying *vos* to a teacher reflects a bad upbringing, a lack of education into norms about what is appropriate. Other children repeated this view in very similar terms. María, one of Ana's classmates in my sixth-grade class, explained that *vos* cannot be used with a teacher, "because it's impolite [de mala educación]" (María Aguilar, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 30, 2010). Another common way in which children talked about *vos* was in terms of respect. When I asked seven-year old Nicole to explain why she said *vos* could not be used with a teacher, she answered very succinctly, "Because they're our teachers [nuestras señoritas], we have to respect them" (Nicole Yaranga, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 21, 2010). A child's use of *vos* with a teacher implies the absence of respect. These views are structured by cultural beliefs—that is, language ideologies—about what is the appropriate way to engage with the world and the social actors that one encounters there through language.

The children's understanding of how to engage with the world is also shaped by how transgressions to the standard language ideology are treated within the school. Some of the children interpreted my question of "why can't you use *vos* with your teacher?" as "what are the consequences of using *vos* at school?" Jessica, who had just finished kindergarten the month before, answered the question in this way, explaining that Señor Sapo cannot use *vos* with the teacher "because she'll hit you, […] and then she won't let you into the classroom" (Jessica Tovar, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 21, 2010). Other children recounted similar punishments for using *vos* at school. Cristina, the younger sister of one of my sixth-grade students, described,"sometimes [the teacher] sends us to the principle, and he says that *vos* is never used and that we can't come [to school] that Monday" (Cristina Castillo,

interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 7, 2010). Cristina also indicated that her teacher sometimes uses physical punishment to discourage the use of *vos*, continuing, "sometimes she pulls the students' hair." These children's experiences at school profoundly shape their understanding of what is correct and what is appropriate. That is, they reflect and reinforce in a very concrete way the standard language ideology that links rudeness and a lack of education to the use of *vos* with inappropriate partners. As Cristina's older sister explained, to use *vos* with a teacher "sounds ugly, 'usted profesora' sounds pretty" (Eva Castillo, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 4, 2010). These are not inherent connections, but rather part of the process of language socialization, in which children learn to decode associations between linguistic forms and social meanings (Ochs 1990). However, these are not the only ways that people understand *voseo*, which can also serve very different functions in situations where it is considered an appropriate form of speech, and where it can carry other indexical associations.

5.2 Implications of Pronoun Choice: *Vos de confianza, vos de enojo*

Voseo does a number of things. As an index it can point to the lower classes, to indigenous speakers, or to regional background. As part of standard language ideology, the naturalization of images of speakers that use *vos* as uneducated and rude shapes how it is perceived in public sphere interactions, such as at school. However, the use of *vos* also carries implications for the relationships between speakers in the private sphere, where many speakers consider its use appropriate. Returning to the example provided by Alison, even in systems of belief where *vos* points to uneducated, lower-class speech, there is also a "correct" way to use it: when there is *confianz*a between speakers. This is reflected in other interviews, in which the association of directness or lack of a proper education was tied to not knowing how to use *vos*

appropriately, within the limits of certain social relationships. These limitations in use highlight how linguistic forms can also become indices of social relationships, and how their presence points to the nature of the interaction. Choosing one pronoun over another performs social labor, as it can both inform and create meanings about the relationships between speakers (Friedrich 1979).

During interviews in San Martín and surrounding barrios, two basic appropriate uses for *vos* emerged: *vos de confianza* and *vos de enojo*. Ramón described to me that when there is more *confianza* between speakers they use *vos*. While detailing the uses of *usted*, he explained, "We…for example, if we're distant we say 'usted,' if we're friends we use 'vos,' and with my wife…we use 'vos'… with greater *confianza* [we use 'vos']" (Ramón Guamani, interview by Georgia Ennis, Cooperativa Panamericana Sur, Quito, Ecuador, July 17, 2010). Conversely, Rosa a 44 year-old housewife from a small coastal province, told me that *vos* can also be used to express anger and establish distance in the conversational exchange, laughingly telling me "[I use *vos*] with my children…and with my husband when I'm angry!" (Rosa Sedano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 15, 2010). *Vos* thus seems to perform multiple pragmatic functions, depending on the context in which it is said.

The beliefs surrounding pronoun choice within the family were one of the most complicated aspects of the social implications surrounding *voseo* that emerged during interviews. Generalized uses came into focus in analyzing responses, but these general patterns do not always explain what *voseo* means to a particular speaker, or what variations express. For instance, general patterns of usage indicate that children use *usted* with their parents, while their parents use *tú* or *vos* with them. However, what this use of *usted* means is tied to much more complex issues of personal identity and familial relationships. Luis, one of the young, upper-

class men explained—like most other people—that he uses *usted* with his parents to enact respect. However, he also signaled that he would like this to change, in order to indicate that he has come of age. Responding to who *tú* cannot be used with, Luis simply replied, "I can't say "tú" to my parents or my friends' parents" (Luis Solano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). I then asked him why, and he explained, "I've tried, but I can't, because I tried to show that now I'm of age and I can say to him 'Dad, let's use *tú*,' or to my mom, but I couldn't because they're already used to [*usted*]…Maybe it's that I don't feel very comfortable, [but] I just couldn't, so I continue with 'usted,' 'usted,' 'usted.' I couldn't get used to it." Luis's analysis of his pronoun use with his parents first illustrates that *usted* is also part of language ideologies about how relationships and interactions between people are inflected by appropriate pronoun choices. Further, it demonstrates that language can point to social relationships, and the nature of those relationships between speakers; in this case, Luis wanted to be able to begin to use *tú* with his parents in order to mark that he had changed and become an adult. Gloria provided a contrasting example of pronoun use with parents, which nonetheless similarly indicates how pronouns inform and reflect relationships between speakers. During our conversation, I mentioned that I had noticed her daughter using *vos* with her, unlike in many other families I had visited. Her explanation referenced her own upbringing and a conscious decision she made in raising her children:

> I haven't taught my children to say "mamá" to me. Everyone here teaches their children that respecting their mother is "mami this, mami that," but they say "Gloria" to me, they say "tú" to me, they say "vos"…they treat me as an equal. […] But this is unusual [here]. They always scold me because I don't teach my children…With my mom I always felt a barrier, [because] I had to treat her like

> that [as *usted*] with…respect, and I couldn't tell her anything and I couldn't confide anything to her, [and] I didn't like it, so I always wanted my children, when I had children, to treat me like a friend, an equal. [Gloria Salazar, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 5, 2010]

As in Luis's description of his pronoun use with his parents, the use of different pronouns with parents indicates something fundamental about the relationship between child and parent. Gloria, in teaching her children to use *tú* and *vos* with her, wants them to feel that they are on an equal level with each other, in much the same way that Luis wanted to reposition himself as an equal to his parents by using *tú* with them as he became an adult.

Just as children's use of *usted*, or of *vos* and *tú* with their parents points to the nature of their relationship, *vos* can also point to feelings of *confianza* within the family or with close friends. Although Luz had emphasized that *vos* was associated with indigenous peoples' "direct" manner of speech, repositioned within the family, *vos* indicated something very different. Fumbling somewhat in how to explain *voseo* to me, she described, "I use it like that, that is to say, to use 'vos' amongst my family, and for example… I have to–to say, like, familiarly, respectfully–I mean, to say that, 'usted.' But 'vos' is to say to the family, 'we're here with each other'" (Luz Castillo, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Blas, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). *Vos*, then, within the appropriate setting can also point to familial connections and closeness. Valentina reiterated this point when describing with whom she uses *vos*, explaining, "I use *vos* more here in my home, with my children…with the father of my children, with my sisters, with my nieces and nephews, with my grandchildren, I use *vos* with them. More with the family" (Valentina Arroyo, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Blas, Quito, Ecuador, July 20, 2010). Both of these narratives of use center around the home and the family. Moreover, they reposition

vos as a positive index of the relationships between speakers. This index of intimacy can also be extended to mark a relationship with a close friend. Valentina went on to explain that she can also use vos with "friends when we have known each other for a long time–not with everyone, only with people I know, once I have *confianza* with them." It is this association with speech between intimates that makes perceptions of seemingly indiscriminate uses of *vos* by indigenous or lower-class speakers so unacceptable. As one woman explained, "when I speak with a friend, [vos] is positive […] to say 'I'm really close with you,' [but] to use it with anyone is something negative that is not acceptable" (Marisol Quevedo, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 4, 2010). This again positions *vos* within a language ideology that informs a speaker's conceptions of what is appropriate and what is not in language; there are limits to how and when *vos* can be used because it is linked so directly to expressing closeness—*confianza*—between intimate speakers.

For many speakers, *vos* is used to express *confianza* within the home or family, but it can also express something very different—anger or annoyance—for the same speakers. Seated at her dining room table with her granddaughter curiously watching while sitting on her lap, Marisol had just finished explaining that *vos* can be a way to affirm friendship. However, she quickly turned to explain that it is also a way to express her anger with her family. Confused by these two seemingly conflicting uses, I attempted to have her to clarify how they coincided:

> **Georgia:** So when do you use *vos*?
>
> **Marisol**: When in reality I'm annoyed, when they [my family] don't pay attention to me, I say "vos".
>
> **Georgia:** So when you're angry?
>
> **Marisol:** Yes.

> **Georgia:** But it can express *confianza* or affection too?
>
> **Marisol**: Yes…with friends. [Marisol Quevedo, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 4, 2010]

Although Marisol appears to separate her use of *vos* with her family and with her friends into two very distinct manners of constructing meaning, the use of *vos* was not always so sharply delimited. Ramón's wife, Violeta, illustrated that *vos* can be used in a number of situations with her family, "I say 'vos do this,' in commands, [or] when we're fighting, 'you [vos] yourself are at fault,' and with affection I say 'vos' to them" (Violeta Carrillo, interview by Georgia Ennis, Cooperativa Panamericana Sur, Quito, Ecuador, July 17, 2010). These may first appear to be incompatible ways for *vos* to be used. However, these opposing uses within the family actually point back to the belief that the only appropriate context for *voseo* is with intimates—*vos* is still a pronoun that requires the *confianza* felt between family or friends to be used appropriately to express anger.

Children added an interesting dimension to how *vos* can be used to express anger. During their interviews, I asked them about how they use pronouns with their friends: if *vos* can be used with their best friend, if it sounds the same to use *vos* and *tú* with them, and which pronoun they use when they are fighting. Their answers varied a great deal, and children often had difficulty elaborating on their responses. However, children who indicated that they use *vos* when they feel close to their friends often responded that they would use *tú* when they are angry. Eva, a twelve-year-old girl in my sixth-grade class, explained what she would say during a fight with her friend fairly simply, "*vos*, and *tú* as well. If I have a fight with a friend, I say 'why are you [tú] angry with me?'" (Eva Castillo, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, August 4, 2010). Eva's decision to use *tú* when she was angry with a friend that she would normally use

vos with perhaps indicates that she is reframing their relationship in the context of the fight, to reflect that the intimacy of *vos* is not appropriate. Amanda, one of Eva's close friends and classmates, seems to support this interpretation in her response to whether or not *vos* can be used with a close friend; she explained, "yes [it can], when we're fighting, and we want to become friends again" (Amanda García, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 22, 2010). This illustrates that *vos* can also be used to reframe the relationship between speakers to again be one of *confianza*. However, other children, like some of the adults, indicated that they would use *vos* when they are upset. Alison's younger sister told me that *vos* can also be used with friends "when you're really angry, and you yell at them 'you [vos] are mean!'" (Janet Ramos, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, San Martín, Quito, Ecuador, July 12, 2010). As with adults, *vos* can serve different functions within intimate relationships: to mark and recreate intimacy or to express anger. However, this still requires that *vos* is used between speakers that have a close relationship. It thus frames interactions as occurring within that context. Once inside this frame, *vos* can be used to express the internal states of the speaker, while simultaneously drawing on all of the different associations of *voseo*.

5.2.1 Upper Class Implications of *Voseo*

The previous sections have argued that *vos* performs many types of social action: it can point to a supposedly inherent aspect of class or ethnic identity when it transgresses certain norms, and it can also indicate regional identity. Further, it frames interactions as occurring between intimates, and can be used to express *confianza* or *enojo.* Yet, the previous analyses were for the most part restricted to discussions of associations and beliefs circulating in San Martín and surrounding neighborhoods. That is, they focused on the beliefs of working-class individuals about how *vos* is, should or should not be used, within a somewhat limited

environment. With the exception of children's beliefs about pronoun use in school, the greatest social power differentials discussed occurred within families, concerning how children should address their parents. In these working-class narratives, class emerged as a salient way of conceptualizing the use of *vos*, but they dealt with iconic images of the lower classes as not educated enough to know how to use *vos* appropriately. However, there are other uses of *vos* that were elucidated during interviews that, although still tied to class, express something quite different than the previously discussed meanings.

Inter-class use of *vos* has been a complicated and varied aspect of *voseo* in other regional studies. For instance, Simpson argues that in Cali, Colombia, members of the lower class believe that *vos* is not used by the upper classes, because *vos* tends to be used only between friends and family (2001:29). Pinkerton notes that in Guatemala, *vos* is frequently perceived as a way for the dominant classes to address indigenous peoples (1986:690). However, Páez Urdaneta argues in his study of Ecuador that upper-class youth tend to use *vos* as a form of identification with other social classes (1981:97). Although use between classes was not the focus of many of the interviews I conducted, inter-class solidarity was not a use of *vos* expressed by any of my informants. Rather, in describing inter-class interactions, working-class speakers focused on *vos* as a disrespectful form directed at them by members of the upper classes. In these situations, *voseo* was strongly associated with its use by upper-class speakers to talk down to their employees or to the lower class. Mariana, who has worked as a cook or housekeeper for most of her life, vividly described the links between pronoun use and class inequality. Throughout her interview she focused on the ways that members of the upper classes mistreat their employees and lower-class interlocutors. Mariana explained that in Ecuador as a whole people are divided into three classes, and that members of the lowest class, "la tercera clase," are treated with a

profound lack of respect by the upper classes. This is expressed through the use of *vos*, or derogatory terms such as *longo*[27], with them (Mariana Vasquez, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, Asistencia Social, Quito, Ecuador, June 29, 2010). Other working-class informants reiterated Mariana's critique of class relations, emphasizing that their employers will use *tú* or *vos* with them to mark their superiority, while expecting *usted* in return—much like parents do with their children. As explained by members of the working-class, outside of the appropriate context between intimate speakers and inflected by class tensions, *vos* takes on an association with paternalistic, pejorative, upper-class speech. Although they did not linger on this use of *vos*, the young, upper-class men also indicated that *vos* can be used to address someone of a lower social status. One explained that both *tú* and *vos* can be used to address indigenous and lower-class people to "indicate a degree of superiority," but that this has begun to change (Kevin Vargas, interview by Georgia Ennis, July 28, 2010. La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador).

These associations have important implications for a speaker's use of *vos* to express anger or annoyance, both within the intimate frame and outside of it. Kevin, a young, upper-middle-class university student, explained some of his associations with *vos* in terms that illustrate its pejorative functions. Describing the connotations of *voseo*, he explained, "When [people] begin to fight […] I've heard in the street that they say, 'What do you mean "vos"?' so that it's understood to mean, 'Who are you calling "vos"? You can't come up and say "vos" to me!' as if because they're calling you 'vos,' you would be someone inferior, or of a lower class" (Kevin Vargas, interview by Georgia Ennis, July 28, 2010. La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador). In Kevin's account, the use of *vos* to express anger references the connections to pejorative uses of

[27] *Longo:* a derogatory term primarily applied to indigenous people, it originates from the Quichua word for "young". Mary Weismantel argues that it is so socially fraught that the only comparable term in English is *nigger* (2001: xxxiv)

vos to indicate social inferiority. Not only that, it enacts this relationship, so that the object of *vos* becomes the social inferior in the exchange. Speakers from San Martín did not explicitly reference these connections to class conflict in describing their own use of *vos* to express anger, but they may lie beneath its use, as indirect indices (Ochs 1990). As Luz explained, "with most people, when they get angry *vos* comes out; […] it's like saying that respect is being diminished" (Luz Castillo, interview by Georgia Ennis, San Blas, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). This may point back to beliefs about the use of *vos* by the upper classes to express superiority to the lower classes. *Voseo*'s association with inter-class tensions and a lack of respect adds another layer, which likely informs its use to index a speaker's anger with intimate interlocutors, as well as in settings where its use already violates beliefs about appropriate terms of address. That is, the insult becomes two-fold when it is used to address a more socially distant partner: it purposefully references the transgression of language ideologies about appropriate uses of *vos*, as well as the social inferiority of its object.

•••

The group of upper-class speakers I interviewed is much less diverse than the group of people I interviewed in southern Quito. As such, it is much more difficult to establish larger patterns of use and belief among the upper classes, because the views of four young men are likely not representative of the social experience of all upper class speakers[28]. Nevertheless, it is valuable to discuss the use of *vos* present within this group, as it served a very different purpose for them than the other uses of *vos* that have been discussed, while simultaneously drawing on many of the previously analyzed indices.

[28] This is not to imply that the present account represents the social experience of all working-class Ecuadorians, but that the larger, more diverse group of informants allows for a greater discussion of commonalities that emerged in interviews.

Instead of expressing intimacy, *confianza* or anger, *vos* was used between the young, upper-class men as a way of indicating a joke, that they were giving each other a hard time, or acting tough. During their interviews, all four of my upper-class informants reported that they rarely use *vos*, and even then it is only with friends. At a party hosted by a mutual friend, I was sitting in the kitchen around two a.m. with a group of mostly college-aged, upper-class men. I had discussed my research earlier in the night with a few a few of them, and they all had told me things like 'we don't use *vos*' and 'that's how people from the lower classes speak.' However, as I sat there and listened to them joke with each other about their sex lives—or lack there of—*vos* was used a great deal, such as to say "and *vos*? What have YOU done?" Later, during interviews, this was the sort of use confirmed by the young men, who described that they use *vos* when they're "screwing around with friends" or when they want to give a statement "a little more emphasis" (Luis Solano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010; Kevin Vargas, interview by Georgia Ennis, July 28, 2010. La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador). Luis explained his social group's use of *vos* as a discursive strategy to create a humorous frame when talking with friends. He described, "*Vos* isn't as defined as *tú* or *usted*. It's different than in Argentina, [where] *vos* is a very common pronoun. Here it isn't common…but you use it, I would use it—I don't use it very much—but when I use it, I think it almost comes out as a joke, to use when we're joking, and with whom? With friends" (Luis Solano, interviewed by Georgia Ennis, La Mariscal, Quito, Ecuador, July 28, 2010). Luis's comment about the use of *vos* references a number of things. It echoes his friend Eduardo's affirmation that *vos* is not common in Ecuador. However, like working-class speakers' evaluations that most people use *vos*, this reflects only the practices and beliefs of a particular social group. It also references that *vos*

creates the sense that what is being said is a joke; that is, as it is not commonly used, it demarcates the tone between the speakers as one of humor.

Voseo in this context draws on and overlaps a number of the uses of *vos* that working-class speakers foregrounded. First, *vos* still has an appropriate setting: between friends, people with *confianza*. It is through this first meaning *vos* functions as a direct index for young, upper-class men. Their use of *voseo* directly references the relationship between speakers (Ochs 1990). However, it is also informed by indirect indexicals (Ochs 1990; Hill 2001), relationships and references that the young men did not overtly acknowledge in discussing their own use, but which nonetheless are part of their understanding of *vos*. Luis, again, provided an excellent summary of many of the beliefs expressed by his friends. When I asked him if the image of *vos* is positive or negative, he responded:

> Maybe when you use vos is…when you want to show informality, and sometimes, it can be taken as…not as an attack, but as a very direct way of speaking. I think that vos belongs to the middle classes and downwards. Originally, it carried a neutral connotation, as a pronoun, [but] culture has made it–it gives it another meaning, and everything depends on how I say it.

This narrative of *voseo* has a great deal in common with discourses circulating in San Martín. While Luis explicitly recognized that *voseo* carries culturally constructed associations, he also repeated these associations as beliefs he holds. Like many other people, he linked direct speech to the lower classes and, presumably, to a lack of education about the correct way to speak, which stands in contrast to the informality and directness of *voseo*. The humorous frame of *voseo* for young, upper-class men is drawn from these indirect indices, as well as their underlying associations with *vos* as a condescending way to address a social inferior. In describing use

between friends, these links are not overtly positioned as inflecting their use of *vos*, but they actually inform it a great deal. In this setting, *vos* directly says ‘we’re close friends, so I can address you in this way,’ but it also expresses an unspoken switch in conversational footing that demonstrates a lack of respect through underlying associations with both upper-class condescension, and ‘uneducated,’ lower-class speech.

5.3 Conclusion

Voseo is more than the use of a pronoun, it is a set of beliefs and associations that are enacted and drawn upon each time it is used. This section has attempted to detail the subjective beliefs that circulate about *voseo*. However, in doing so it has drawn lines between different narratives and cultural categories when meanings likely bleed into each other. Further, I do not argue that these are the only ways that *vos* is used and understood in Ecuador, or even for the people that shared their experiences with me. In presenting this information, I have tried to faithfully represent and interpret the complexity that informants expressed to me about how they understand their own, and other’s, use of *vos*.

Ecuadorian *voseo* serves many overlapping and contrasting functions. Within contexts that are perceived as appropriate, it marks the relationship between speakers, and can express closeness or anger—and for young, upper-class men, humor. However, when *vos* is used outside of appropriate contexts, the transgression is believed to point to supposedly inherent qualities of lower class or indigenous speakers. Although these are largely perceived as negative aspects of a speaker’s nature, *vos* can also serve as a more neutral index of regional identity.

6.1 Conclusion

One of the fundamental underlying arguments of this account has been that language is never neutral. Something as seemingly commonplace as a pronoun can be a signal of personal intimacy, while it may be simultaneously fraught with social evaluations or judgments. In Ecuador, *voseo* encapsulates a multitude of overlapping, conflicting and contested meanings. It structures particular interactions among speakers and it acts as a social marker, reflecting widely held beliefs about social categories, hierarchies and power. At one level, *voseo* can simply be described as the situations in which the pronoun is used, but this largely ignores the multitude of coinciding meanings associated with it. Drawing upon the many meanings associated with *voseo*, the choice to use *vos* performs a social action each time that it is uttered.

I have argued a number of things in this account. In order to examine the functions and implications of Ecuadorian *voseo*, this study draws on two months of fieldwork in Ecuador and information gathered through 45 interviews, which were conducted in Quito with adults from different regions and classes, as well as a number of children from a local elementary school. These interviews provide information on how residents of Quito use and think about *vos* in conjunction with *usted* and *tú*. Based on the analyses of this data, one of my main arguments has been that *voseo* is a regional phenomenon. Nevertheless, I also argue that interviews and observation indicate people tend to associate *vos* more strongly with class and race than region.

Part of what my study has hoped to accomplish is to distinguish between objective assessments of the distribution of *voseo* and how residents of Quito imagine *voseo* to be distributed. The intention here is not to demonstrate that the informants are misguided or prejudiced, although some informants' beliefs do carry judgments of members of specific social groups, such as Ecuador's indigenous populations. Rather, I hope to shown that the discrepancies

between beliefs about use and actual usage and distribution provide insight into the ways that these speakers think not only about *vos* in particular, but also about social relationships and hierarchies in a region marked by social inequality.

In closing, I will briefly return to each of the questions that guided this study, as well as highlight future areas for research. Although unfolding the answers to them has not followed such an orderly pattern, these questions included: 1) In what situations can *vos* be used? 2) What is the morphology of *voseo* in Ecuadorian Spanish, and are different paradigms associated with different social indices? 3) Who is thought to employ *voseo* and what social features are associated with its use? 4) Finally, and perhaps most importantly, what do users of *vos* think it marks in their relationships and about themselves?

In what situations can *vos* be used? Answering this question has largely entailed a quantitative analysis of uses of *vos* as compared with *tú* and *usted*. Drawing on responses to survey-style and open-ended interview questions, I have argued that *voseo* has a set place within the Ecuadorian pronominal system, although it frequently alternates with *tuteo* within the situations in which *vos* is considered appropriate or is typically used. Both *tú* and *vos* are primarily used in situations of *confianza* or social solidarity—with acquaintances, with friends, and with family members. I have argued, however, that *voseo* expresses greater intimacy between socially solidary speakers. Conversely, although *vos* may index social solidarity, it can also be used to indicate social distance and relationships of unequal social power when it is used with social inferiors, such as children or members of a lower class. Further, although *voseo* is present among all classes, it may express something very different about a situation depending on the speaker's class. Upper-class speakers indicated that *vos* is only used with friends when they are joking around, or to address someone of a lower class. Working-class speakers, in

contrast, focused on how *voseo* may indicate personal intimacy, as well as that the upper-classes use *vos* to denote their superiority when addressing someone of a lower class.

One of the underlying issues of *voseo* is that there are many situations in which people believe it cannot be used. Moreover, transgressing these specific situations powerfully shapes how people perceive the transgressor. Generally, *vos* is not thought to be appropriate to use with strangers or with people when there is not *confianza* between speakers—that is, a lack of social solidarity makes *voseo* an inappropriate and even offensive linguistic form. Although many working-class speakers indicated that they use *vos* within their homes or with their close friends, they often expressed very negative attitudes about *vos* and the people who use it outside of appropriate contexts. *Vos* is a part of a standard language ideology, which delimits appropriate contexts for use, so that inappropriate uses of *vos* are considered overly forward, and are thought to indicate a "direct" nature or a lack of education; these characteristics are in turn linked to indigenous speakers or the lower classes. Due to power differentials, *vos* is also not typically considered appropriate for children to use to address their parents or other adults, which would indicate a poor upbringing. I thus argue that *vos* exists in a complex distributional balance—informed by issues of social power and solidarity—with other second-person singular pronouns.

What is the morphology of *voseo* in Ecuadorian Spanish, and are different paradigms associated with different social indices? Based on the present data, Ecuadorian *voseo* appears to follow a pattern of pronominal *voseo mixto*, in which the *vos* pronoun is coupled with a *tú* verb form. In 1981, Páez Urdaneta identified differences in conjugation between upper and lower-class speakers in the Sierra, as well as coastal speakers. My research, however, shows evidence of only one verbal paradigm in use in Quito. This suggests that in the

time since 1981, Ecuadorian *voseo* has adapted to the verbal paradigm formerly employed just by the upper classes in the Sierra.

Given that no significant regional or class-based sociolects were found within the verbal paradigm of *voseo*, verbal conjugations were not shown to be deeply associated with certain kinds of speakers. However, variations in the preterit conjugation, in which a final /s/ morpheme was added by some speakers to the standard *tú* conjugation—for example, "vos fuiste" versus "vos fuistes"—were associated with certain kinds of speech. Upper-class speakers indicated that the latter usage points to a lack of education among lower-class speakers who have not learned to speak correctly. Preterit variation did have a statistically significant relationship with educational level, which likely indicates that the addition of a final /s/ morpheme is linked to lower educational levels. Another important variation that emerged during interviews with working-class speakers was different ways of forming commands with *vos*. Some speakers signaled that they would say "vos venga" using the *vos* pronoun with an *usted* command form, while others preferred "vos ven" following the standard pattern of pronominal *voseo mixto* using *vos* with a *tú* command form. However, statistically significant relationships were not found with this usage and any of the demographic variables examined. Moreover, it did not appear to be tied to beliefs about who would use this form. Belief is then much more strongly associated with context and use, rather than different verbal expressions of *voseo*.

Who is thought to employ *voseo* and what social features are associated with its use? This study has argued that *voseo* is a regional phenomenon, as its usage varies across different parts of Ecuador, and it is most prevalent in the Sierra. I have also argued, however, that the ways in which residents of Quito think about *voseo* are far more complex. People do associate *voseo* with speech from the Sierra, and for some, it encapsulates their regional linguistic identity.

Yet, for most informants, *voseo*'s role as part of a regional sociolect was not their first or strongest association with it. People did not simply associate the use of *vos* with particular regions; rather, they associate it with particular social groups. Specifically, interviewees from different regions and across different classes tended to associate the use of *vos* with lower-class or indigenous speakers who do not know how to speak correctly. In describing their associations with *voseo,* informants often alluded to the directness and simplicity of speakers that use *vos* outside of its prescribed contexts of social solidarity. Conversely, some speakers also associated *voseo* with the upper classes and forms of demeaning speech used to indicate the social inferiority of the recipient of *vos*.

I have thus argued that through standard language ideology, *voseo* has primarily become indexical and iconic of lower-class, uneducated speech. That is, *voseo* is thought to represent some inherent aspect of a speaker and point to a specific social background, even for informants that use *vos*. The negative aspects of these associations emanate from qualities perceived to be innate to speakers who use *vos*. Speakers are marked and represented by their lack of education, their rudeness, their directness, or their invocation of superiority when they use *vos* in certain contexts. These are important ways that people divide up their social experience and explain transgressions to the social norms inscribed in language ideologies about appropriate use.

What do users of *vos* thinks it marks in their relationships and about themselves? Answering my final research question is perhaps the most difficult, because this information was often not overtly expressed. Although *voseo* frequently carries negative connotations when it transgresses social norms, *vos* is also used by many of my informants for certain functions. For many working-class speakers, *vos* appears to serve as a positive index of familial identity or of personal intimacy, at least when used within appropriate contexts. This, in turn, is what makes

transgressions to appropriate contexts so offensive to some—*voseo* crosses a social boundary and points to a level of intimacy that may not exist. With fitting interlocutors, the choice to use *vos* can indicate the closeness of the speakers, which allows them to address each other using the most socially intimate form. These relationships are not always symmetrical, as parents are generally able to use *vos* with their children, while their children are expected to reply using *usted*. Moreover, within intimate relationships, *voseo* is not limited to expressing affection; once inside the communicative framework already established by *voseo*, *vos* can be used to express affection as well as anger, depending on the mood of the speaker. I thus argue that one of the primary functions of *voseo* is to mark the intimacy of a relationship for speakers that use *vos*.

There are things beyond personal intimacy, however, that *voseo* may also express in a relationship. Upper-class informants indicated that *vos* is not commonly used within their social group. However, when it is used, it still occurs among socially solidary speakers, but with very different connotations. Within this framework of social solidarity, *vos* points to the joking nature of the interaction or emphatic speech. By using an uncommon form, the young, upper-class men overtly highlight the informality of their interactions; yet, through indirect indices they also draw upon the more negative connotations of *voseo* that indicate a lower level of respect, rudeness or a lack of education. This switch in conversational footing, in turn, frequently creates humor. This use refers back to all of the available associations of *voseo*, while it simultaneously continues to construct them. Ecuadorian *voseo* is ultimately an exceedingly complex form, fraught with a number of social considerations and meanings.

6.2 Future Questions

Based in a significant amount of data, this study has contributed to the literature on *voseo*, and holds particular value as a regional study of the interactional uses and morphology of

vos, as well as of cultural meanings and beliefs about *voseo*. Nevertheless, a broader and more comprehensive comparative analysis will require informants with more varied backgrounds, as well as longer periods of fieldwork. This will aid in determining whether the arguments I have put forth are applicable to other parts of the country and other social groups.

First, speakers from other socioeconomic backgrounds and regions—particularly the Costa and Oriente zones—will help develop the structure of the verbal paradigm of *voseo* in Ecuador. A significant area for future research is to investigate how widespread pronominal *voseo mixto* is in other parts of Ecuador. Further, future research in this area should focus on establishing the conjugations for other major verb tenses. Broadening the socioeconomic and regional base, as well as diversifying in gender and age across the classes, will also be of particular importance in future work to compare general patterns of use in different interactional settings.

I have argued in detail in other parts of this account about the beliefs—the social indices and language ideologies—that inflect a person's use of *vos*. However, the group of upper-class speakers included is admittedly limited. The question then remains, how do other members of the upper classes conceive of *vos*? How do they use it, or believe themselves to use it? How does this compare to the uses and beliefs that the present account has established? Similarly, how do these uses and beliefs compare to those of other parts of Ecuador?

Ultimately this is an account of a particular place, and a particular group of people. It has attempted to trace Ecuadorian *voseo* through my informants' objectives uses of *vos*, as well as through their subjective evaluations of *voseo*. Very profound social indices and ideologies that inform and are informed by *voseo* emerged during the analysis of the interviews, however there are still considerable areas of belief and social use that remain to be described.

References Cited

Bateson, Gregory

1972 Steps to an Ecology of Mind. New York: Ballantine Books.

Benavides, Carlos

2003 La distribución del voseo en Hispanoámerica. Hispania 86(3): 612-623.

Brown, Roger, and Albert Gilman

1960 The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. *In* Style in Language. Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. Pp. 253-276. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.

Friedrich, Paul

1979 Structural Implications of Russian Pronominal Usage. *In* Language, Context, and the Imagination: Essays by Paul Friedrich. Anwar S. Dil, ed. Pp. 63-125. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hill, Jane

1998 Language, Race, and White Public Space. American Anthropologist 100(3): 680-689.

Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal

2000 Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. *In* Regimes of Language. Paul Kroskrity, ed. Pp 35-83. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

León, Ana Emilia

1998 American ‘voseo’: Archaism or neologism?. Lingua americana 2(1): 130-147.

Lippi-Green, Rosina

2004 Language Ideology and Language Prejudice. *In* Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-first Century. Edward Finegan and John R. Rickford, eds. Pp. 289-304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morse, Richard M.

1955 Language as a Key to Latin American Historiography. The Americas: A Quarterly Review of Inter-American Cultural History 11(4): 517-538.

Ochs, Elinor

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

Páez Urdaneta, Iraset

1981 Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo. Caracas: La Casa de Bello.

Paley, Julia

2001 Marketing Democracy: Power and Social Movements in Post-Dictatorship Chile. Berkley: University of California of Press.

Penny, Ralph

2002[1991] A History of the Spanish Language. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2000 Variation and Change in Spanish. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pinkerton, Anne

1986 Observations on the *Tu*/*Vos* Option in Guatemalan *Ladino* Spanish. Hispania 69(3): 690-698.

Simpson, JoEllen.

2001 The American Voseo in Cali, Colombia: An Ethnographic Study. Romansk Forum 14(2): 25-31.

Torrejón, Alfredo

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

Weismantel, Mary J.

2001 Cholas and Pishtacos: Stories of Race and Sex in the Andes. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Williamson, Edwin

1992 The Penguin History of Latin America. London: Penguin Press.

Appendices:

Appendix A: **Adult Interview Questions**

Entrevista #: Fecha:

Lugar de la entrevista:

Nombre: Sexo:

Edad:

1. Máximo nivel de estudios alcanzado:
   - Primarios Universitario
   - Secundarios Posgrado
   - Doctorado

2. Profesión:

3. Idiomas hablados:

4. Lugar de nacimiento:
   - ¿Cómo es?

5. Lugares en los que usted ha vivido además del lugar de nacimiento:

6. ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva en Quito?

7. ¿Por qué vino a Quito?

Vamos a hablar sobre el lenguaje. Si hay preguntas a las cuales no quiere responder, por favor dígamelo.

8. Según lo que usted ha observado, se usa el “usted” con:
   - todo el mundo
     con desconocidos
   - con gente de mayor edad
   - con gente de mayor estatus social
   - cuando quieren establecer distancia
   - otro: _____

9. ¿Hay personas con que suele usar sólo el “usted”?

10. Según lo que usted ha observado, se usa el “tú” con:
    - todo el mundo

- sólo con gente conocida
- sólo con familiares y amigos
- con gente de menor edad
- con gente de menor estatus social
- otro:

11. ¿Con quién NO se puede usar el “tú”?

12. Según lo que usted ha observado, se usa el “vos” con:
    - todo el mundo
    - sólo con gente conocida
    - sólo con familiares y amigos
    - con gente de menor edad
    - con gente de menor estatus social
    - cuando quieren establecer distancia
    - otro: _____

13. ¿Con quién NO se puede usar el “vos”?

14. a. ¿Es el uso del “usted”, del “tú” o del “vos” diferente en Quito que en su lugar de nacimiento?
    b. ¿Es el uso del “usted”, del “tú”, o del “vos” diferente en Quito que en otros partes del Ecuador?

15. ¿Se usa el “vos” en su lugar de nacimiento?

16. ¿Hace uso del “vos” en algunas ocasiones?
    - sí
    - no

17. Si usa el “vos”, ¿por qué lo usa?

18. Si usa el “vos” ¿en qué situaciones lo usa?

19. Si no usa “vos” ¿por qué no?

20. ¿Cree usted que el uso de “vos” tiene algún tipo de connotación para los hablantes de Quito?

21. Si sí, ¿es positivo o negativo? ¿Puede describírmelo?

22. ¿Cuál le suena mejor?

    - vos comés/vos comes
    - vos hablás/vos hablas

- vos vivís/vos vives
- vos estáis/vos estás
- vos sos/vos eres
- vos fuiste/vos fuistes
- vos ven/vos venga

¿Me puede dar un ejemplo de una oración con el vos?

Comentarios adicionales:

Appendix B: Child Script & Interview Questions

Georgia: ¡Mira, (nombre del niño)! Éste es Señor Sapo, uno de mis mejores amigos de los Estados Unidos que vino todo el camino hasta San Martín para aprender a hablar el español. ¡Vamos a enseñarle hablar el español juntos!

SS: Hi! ¡Hola! ¡Mucho gusto! ¡Buenas tardes! Vine a Ecuador para aprender el español, ¡pero necesito tu ayuda!

Al niño se le da tiempo para charlar con Señor Sapo

SS*:* Pues, bueno. Lo que me pasa es que estoy confundidito. He oído a la gente diciendo "vos", ¡pero no sé esta palabra! ¿Me puedes explicar qué es el "vos"?

El niño responde

G: ¡Qué interesante! ¡Quiero aprender más sobre "vos" también!

SS: ¡Vos, vos vos! Me gusta el sonido de esa palabra "vos"…. "vos… ¿Puedo aprender a usarlo bien como los niños de la escuela? ¿Me lo puedes enseñar?

G*:* ¡Vamos a ayudar a Señor Sapo a aprender a usar "vos"!

[Preguntas]

(Al niño se le da tiempo para contestar entre cada pregunta)

SS*:* *(a Georgia)* ¿Qué piensas de esto?

G*:* ¡Pienso que (nombre) fue un/a maestro/a excelente! Ahora sabemos cómo usar el vos!

Nombre: Padre(s):

Edad:

1. ¿Puedo usar el “vos” con mi mejor amigo? ¿Por qué? ¿Cuándo?

2. ¿Puedo usar el “vos” con mi mamá? ¿Por qué? ¿Cuándo?

3. ¿Con mi profesora?

    a. ¿Por qué puedo usar el “vos” con mi profesora?

    b. ¿Por qué no puedo usar el “vos” con mi profesora?

4. ¿El vos es igual al decirle “usted”?

5. ¿Suena el mismo usar el vos y el tú con mi mejor amigo?

6. ¿Y si nos peleamos?

7. ¿Quién va a usar el “vos” conmigo?

9. ¿Puedes usar el “vos” conmigo (Georgia)?

10. ¿Cuál te suena mejor?
    - vos comés/vos comes
    - vos hablás/vos hablas
    - vos vivís/vos vives
    - vos estáis/vos estás
    - vos sos/vos eres
    - vos fuiste/vos fuistes
    - vos ven/vos venga
    -

    ¿Me puedes dar un ejemplo de una oración con el vos?

Comentarios: