Abstract

There is a long tradition of associating various social meanings with the address forms (AF) *tú* (T) and *usted* (V) in Spanish (as well as in other languages where such an opposition occurs). Those who have studied these forms have attempted to demonstrate their distribution (see Lambert and Tucker 1976), what they mean (Brown and Gilman 1960), and how they are employed (Brown and Levinson 1987). They have described wide variation in all of these aspects. In this dissertation, I account for this pragmatic flexibility of AFs by identifying how their social content is contributed to an utterance. It has been suggested that the social meanings associated with AFs are presupposed (cf. Blas Arroyo 1995; Fasold 1990), conventionally implicated (cf. Potts 2007; Tsohatzidis 1992) or conversationally implicated (cf. Pedroviejo 2004). In this dissertation I provide qualitative and quantitative evidence gathered via oral interviews and written questionnaires in Madrid and Manzanares (in Ciudad Real, Castile-La Mancha), Spain, that both conventional and conversational implicature play a role in AF usage. Ninety-two informants answered questions designed to test for the characteristics of these implicatures. The methodology used to determine the pragmatic properties of T and V in this study is innovative in two important ways. First, the quantitative use of native speaker informants provides more valid results than typical studies of pragmatic meaning which rely on the intuitions of the researchers or few informants. Second, the informants
were given the opportunity to provide the social content that they associated with these forms; these meanings were not predetermined by the researcher, as has often been the case in AF research. Using this methodology, I was able to identify several implicatures corresponding to the T and V forms and to determine whether they were conventional or conversational.

Following the model of conventional implicature described by Potts (2005; 2007), I demonstrate that the V form in Peninsular Spanish conventionally implicates social distance. Social distance is entailed by the form and cannot be canceled. Other content associated with this form, such as respect, are conversationally implicated. They are therefore cancelable and nondetachable.

The T form on the other hand does not entail any socially deictic content. All meanings typically associated with it, such as solidarity, arise through conversational implicatures calculated from the context and the opposition with the V form. These associations may also form part of the indexical field of AFs.

This dissertation explores an aspect of AFs that has, for the most part, been ignored in previous research. This model of the contribution of socially deictic content by AFs allows us to account for the pragmatic flexibility of these forms.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Address Forms

In this dissertation I will explore the manner in which second person pronominal address forms contribute to the meaning of an utterance in Peninsular Spanish. In using the term “address form” (AF) I include instances of any deictically-used second person personal pronoun (tú, usted, vosotros, ustedes and vos and others when applicable) and all corresponding morphology. In Spanish, second person deixis is expressed via pronouns (subject, object, reflexive, prepositional, genitive), verb morphology and possessive adjectives as shown below in (1) – (3).

(1) Tú te vistes bien.
(2) Te dije a ti que llevaras mi chaqueta porque no tenías la tuy.
(3) Su nombre, por favor.

According to Fillmore (1997), a deictic expression is one that either identifies the participants, the time, or the space of a discourse context. Address forms are indubitably deictic expressions; however they convey two types of deixis: person and social. Person deixis is used to signal the participants in a discourse. This can be accomplished in

---

1 A non-deictically used pronoun would be one that is not directed towards a specific person, such as in the following case of an impersonal second person form: debes comer bien para ser sano.
Peninsular Spanish by differentiating person, number, and possibly gender as seen in (4-5). The pronoun in (4) refers to multiple female addressees; the corresponding verb form refers to the plural quality of the addressees. The pronoun and verb form in (5) both refer to a first person singular speaker. Neither the singular AFs nor the plural *ustedes* form differentiate gender.

(4) Vosotras queréis ir a la playa.

(5) Yo quiero ir a la playa.

AFs are socially deictic expressions in that they “reflect or establish or are determined by certain realities of the social situation in which the speech act occurs” (Fillmore 1997: 112). According to Fillmore, the social information that can be reflected or established by deictic expressions such as AFs can include “age, sex, and social status of the conversation participants; the social relationships that hold between them; the degree of intimacy or formality of the conversation; and combinations of these factors” (114).

It is the socially-deictic property of AFs that has received most attention from linguists. There is a general claim in the literature on Spanish that *usted* expresses or reflects certain features of the interlocutors or situation and that *tú* expresses or reflects other features. According to traditional views (e.g. Butt and Benjamin 2000, Stewart 1999), (6a) would express that the referent of *usted* would be someone who the speaker either wanted to treat with respect or with whom he wanted to create/maintain social distance. (6b) would express that the referent of *tú* was someone whom the speaker either felt close or superior to (Fasold 1990). It is this existence of multiple AFs that has
sparked so much interest in the field. As Braun (1988) states, “address behavior is meaningful whenever speakers have to choose between several variants, all of which are grammatically correct in a given conversational context” (13). In Spanish, a choice must be made regarding AFs on nearly every occasion of addressing another person(s). Social features are reflected and/or established based on the choice made.

(6) a. Usted es muy amable.
    
    You are USTED very nice.

b. Tú eres muy amable.
    
    You are TÚ very nice.

Most authors discuss this difference of social meaning in terms of the T/V distinction. The term “T/V distinction” originated in the work of Brown and Gilman (1960). The T label is derived from the Latin second person singular TU and the V from the Latin second person plural VOS. They use T to represent the “familiar” or “informal” second person forms in a language and V to represent the “deferential” or “formal” second person forms. Generally speakers will use a V form when addressing interlocutors who has some sort of power over them, whether it be due to age, social class or sex (among many other possibilities). V forms may also be used between equally powerful interlocutors who wish to acknowledge each others’ power. A speaker will use a T form

---

2 It must be noted that plural AFs are rarely discussed in the literature. It is not clear whether they are assumed to behave like singular AFs, with vosotros behaving like tú and ustedes behaving like usted, or whether they require a separate analysis.
when addressing an interlocutor(s) whom they have power over or with whom they share a solidary relationship.

The abbreviation T will be used in this study to represent the pronouns tú, vosotros and vos, along with their corresponding morphology. V will be used to represent usted and ustedes, along with their corresponding morphology. Following Stein (2003), these abbreviations will not encompass the semantics of solidarity and power set forth by Brown and Gilman, but only the pronouns and their associated morphology.

Address forms (in Spanish and otherwise) have been studied extensively for many years (a thorough survey of the literature will be provided in the following chapter). AFs are shown in the literature to have many functions. They are said to index or create relationships. They can supposedly be manipulated in order to express politeness in various ways. AFs are said to express emotion. AF usage also varies across dialects as well as age and social groups. Previous researchers have worked on recording these various uses of AFs in an attempt to describe when or why speakers choose one form over another. However, no theory to date seems to be able to account for all the different uses of AFs. It is the purpose of this dissertation to provide such a unified theory. In order to do this I will work with the base of knowledge gathered by previous researchers as well as employ new data (to be described in Chapter 4) to offer a different perspective on the issue. My focus is neither to describe the variation in AF systems nor to distinguish the necessary circumstances for choosing one form over another. My focus is to describe how all the different uses of AFs that have been described in the literature are possible. I will develop a theory which can account for the pragmatic flexibility of AFs. In order to
do this I study the properties that all uses of AFs have in common in order to discern the mechanism by which they contribute socially deictic content to an utterance.

Using the pragmatic notions of conventional and conversational implicature I develop a theory which accounts for all uses of AFs. Through Potts’ (2005) model of meaning, I posit that AFs contribute conventional implicatures which convey a default socially deictic meaning. I will show that Peninsular AFs belong to the category of conventional implicature triggers know as expressives as described by Potts (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d, 2008). The various other meanings and uses attributed to AFs which do not coincide with the conventionally implicated meaning can then be accounted for via conversational implicature.

In sum, the questions I will answer in this dissertation are listed in (7).

(7) What is the social content associated with tū?

What is the social content associated with usted?

Is this content conveyed via conventional implicature, conversational implicature, or are they part of the at-issue content of the utterance?

This study is significant in that it will be one of the first to use quantitative and qualitative data to answer the question of how the distribution of AFs seen in the Spanish-speaking world is possible. The answer to this question will explain why these words are so powerful and why their usage varies as widely as it does. If we know how AFs contribute social meaning to an utterance, we will be able to account for their behavior.
While I begin this project with a focus on explaining AF usage in Castilian Spanish, it is hoped that the resulting model will be extendable to AFs in other dialects of Spanish and, with more research, to other languages as well.

1.2 Summary of the Chapters

In chapter 2 of this dissertation is an overview of many of the major contributions to the field of address form research, with a focus on dialects of Spanish. The intent of this chapter is to familiarize the reader with the body of knowledge that has been gathered by previous researchers in this area. The chapter is organized in terms of what questions the researchers were attempting to answer regarding AF usage. I first explore those works in which researchers have studied the geographic and social distribution of AFs, or the who? and when? of AF use. These researchers have correlated AF choice with specific characteristics of the speaker and/or the addressee, such as age and sex. They have also correlated AF usage with the situational context of an utterance.

Secondly, I delve into the history of research that has been completed on the social meaning associated with AFs, or the what? of AF research. In this research, investigators have attempted to explain what various AFs actually mean to the speakers who use them. Possible meanings include solidarity, contempt, and respect.

From here the description moves into the why? of AF usage in which researchers look into the motivation that speakers have to choose one form over another. Most of the research done in this area centers around the notion of politeness. Speakers are said to choose AFs in order to benefit either themselves or their addressee in some way. This
might be to make them feel included, at ease, flattered, or left out (among other possibilities).

A section is then devoted to the discussion of the variation that is found in the distribution of AFs as well as in the criteria for choosing among T/V forms.

Finally, I explore the phenomenon of address form switches. This is the phenomenon in which the speaker begins addressing a listener with a different AF than he previously had been using. This might be temporary and signal a variety of emotions, or it might be permanent and signal a change in the relationship between the interlocutors.

Chapter 3 serves as an introduction to the concepts of conventional implicature and conversational implicature. These notions will serve as the basis for answering the question of how? AFs contribute their meaning to utterances and, in doing so, how their usage can vary so widely in terms of both distribution and meaning. Conventional implicature is introduced from the point of view of Grice (1989). This leads to the updated description developed by Potts (2005) that will be used in this study. According to Potts, conventional implicature triggers contribute conventional implicatures. These conventional implicatures are independent of the main idea of the utterance. They can serve as commentary about the main idea or about the situational context of the utterance. This commentary is nearly always from the point of view of the speaker. Potts describes several categories of conventional implicature triggers, one of which is called expressives. AFs appear to fall into this category of conventional implicature.
In the same chapter I also provide a brief history of the notion of conversational implicature. The main contributors to this theory that I discuss are Grice (1989), Horn (e.g. 1984), and Levinson (e.g. 2000). Conversational implicature is meaning that arises through combination of the words used and the context in which they are used. The most significant difference between conversational and conventional implicature is that conversational implicatures only arise in certain contexts, while conventional implicatures arise anytime their trigger is used.

Chapter 3 concludes with a history of pragmatic approaches to the study of address forms. There have been a handful of researchers who have attempted to account for AF usage in terms of conventional implicature, conversational implicature, as well as presupposition. Their attempts are discussed and critiqued.

In Chapter 4, I discuss the various means by which previous researchers have gathered the data on which they base their claims about AFs. The most common methods have been the oral interview, the written questionnaire, observation and literary analysis. I discuss the benefits or drawbacks of each of these methodology types.

Chapter 4 also lays out the methodology used to obtain the data utilized in this study. The data were gathered during the summer of 2009 in Madrid and Manzanares, Spain. The data were obtained through the use of both oral interviews and written questionnaires. The questions asked were carefully designed with several goals in mind. Several questions were used to elicit the social content that these speakers associated with the AFs. In this way all of the meanings were obtained free of undue influence from the researcher. Many of the questions were designed to specifically test for various
characteristics of conventional and conversational implicature. Finally, the interviews
contained questions designed to elicit the informant’s opinions and thoughts about AF
usage. This was done to allow full opportunity for the speakers to elaborate on the
associations they made for each form or when or why they chose to use one form over the
other.

The methodology used in this study is innovative in at least two ways: it is one if
the first studies in which pragmatic tests are performed on AFs and it is one of the few
studies in which pragmatic tests are performed at a quantitative level. It is the first study I
am aware of in which both of these feats are achieved. Several types of tests have been
included in this study. Some of these, such as cancelation, have been demonstrated to be
effective in identifying conversational implicatures (e.g. Grice 1989). Others, such as the
indirect quotation test have been used to identify the elements of an utterance that are part
of the main idea of that utterance (Bach 1999).

In Chapter 5 I present the data gathered in Spain through a total of 39 oral
interviews and 53 written questionnaires. The data are organized by implicature type,
with the responses to tests of conventional implicature discussed first, followed by those
of conversational implicature.

The significance of the data is discussed in Chapter 6. In this chapter all of the
social content that the informants of this study associated with AFs is discussed. Each
one is designated as being contributed by either conventional or conversational
implicature, according to the results of the interviews.
In chapter 6, I demonstrate that the concept of distance can be reflected or imposed by the V form by way of conventional implicature. Distance is defined in this chapter and follows from the AF model based on social distance developed by Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992). Her views are combined with more traditional definitions of social distance, such as that of Park and Burgess (1924). All other meanings associated with AFs, such as respect or contempt, are contributed by way of conversational implicature. I demonstrate that all of these meanings can be calculated when distance is used as the starting point. When not purposely implicated by the speaker, these associations can be seen as making up an indexical field, as described by Eckert (2008).

The T form will be shown to differ significantly from the V form in that it is not a conventional implicature trigger and therefore contributes no socially deictic meaning to an utterance in and of itself. All meanings associated by speakers with the T form, such as friendship and disrespect, arise via conversational implicature. These can also be calculated when distance is used as a baseline for AF choice.

The dissertation concludes with Chapter 7. In this chapter I discuss the implications of this research. I propose a model from which all AF social content can be calculated. In this model the T form serves as a default in that it contributes no social content in and of itself. The V form entails social distance and other meanings arise based on the interplay of the two forms.

Finally, I discuss some of the shortcomings in this research and express my hopes for future research in this field.
1.3 Conclusion

This dissertation looks at address forms in Spanish from a perspective that few have taken. Many have contributed invaluable insight as to the who?, when?, what?, and why? of AF usage by native speakers. By researching address forms in terms of how?, we come closer to a full understanding of these forms.
Chapter 2: Previous Research on Address Forms

2.1 Introduction

Address forms have been an extremely popular topic of study in many languages to date. There are far too many studies to include an exhaustive survey here; therefore I will attempt to provide an overview of the various trends in AF research that have been most prevalent. I will discuss the questions that previous researchers have been trying to answer and the results they have obtained for these various questions.

Previous investigations revolve around trying to answer a small set of questions about AF usage. Researchers have investigated the distributions of who uses which forms and to whom each form is directed. They have studied contextual factors in order to determine which forms are more likely to be used in certain situations, times and places. They have tried to define the pronouns in terms of what they express or contribute to an utterance. Researchers have also looked into the diachronic progression of the use of these forms. Finally, investigators have looked into what people actually do when they choose one form over another. Often more than one of these goals is included in any particular study. Taavitsainen and Jucker (2003) sum up all of these questions, saying that researchers are trying to “uncover the relevant criteria that govern the choice of one form over the other” (2).
In this review of the literature I will discuss several key threads in AF research. I include those studies in which investigators have attempted to account for AF choice via social factors, such as the age or sex of the interlocutors or the situational context as well as those which claim that AFs index certain social meanings. I will discuss the viewpoint that AFs are actively employed by speakers to seek certain means, such as placating an interlocutor. Finally, I will include an overview of the research completed in one particular area of AF usage: switches from one AF to another.

While my focus is on Peninsular Spanish, studies of other varieties are also included to provide additional insight and information when deemed appropriate.

2.2 Address Forms and Social Factors

Many researchers have attempted to describe AF usage by correlating the choice of AF to a variety of social factors which run the gamut from dialect to age to situational context. These researchers have shown that patterns do exist between these social characteristics and the AF chosen.

Descriptions found in Spanish language textbooks or grammars intended for non-native speaker are a valuable place to start because they attempt to summarize usage norms in a simplified way. A typical beginner level Spanish textbook definition says that “tú is a familiar way to say you. Usted is a formal way to say you” (Gahala 2000: 32). The author also provided the following example of use:

¿Cómo estás? is a familiar greeting. Use with: a friend, a family member, someone younger. ¿Cómo está usted is a formal greeting. Use with: a person you don’t know, someone older, someone for whom you want to show respect. (32)
Another definition states that

Tú and usted both mean you. Tú is the familiar form of address usually used with children, family and friends; Usted is used to show respect or to indicate a more formal relationship with the person addressed. Customarily, usted is used to address teachers and elderly people, as well as adults you don’t know well.

(Samaniego et al 1993: G4)

They also state that usted must be used to address anyone who would be addressed with a title such as señor or doctora.

According to Butt and Benjamin (2000)

Tú is used for anyone with whom one is on first-name terms. Tú is therefore required between friends, family members, when speaking to children or to animals, generally between strangers under the age of about thirty, and in some prayers…However, tú/vos should not be said to persons in authority or to older strangers or elderly persons unless they invite its use. (130-131)

Continuing with geographical studies, we begin to get a glimpse of the dialectal variation that exists in the use of AFs. An essential work is that of Carricaburo (1997). Carricaburo provides an overview of what options are available in various areas by describing the AF systems employed in the Spanish speaking world. For Spain she reports an increased use of the T form and of reciprocal usage regardless of form. Reciprocal usage is used to describe situations in which the two speakers address each other with the same form- usted/usted or tú/tú- as opposed to nonreciprocal usage in which one speaker addresses the other with the V form while being addressed with the T
form. She claims that for young people, the age of their interlocutor is the most decisive factor in choice. She attributes a greater use of *usted* to women, as they are more likely to use the V form than men.

Lipski (1994) also details the use of AFs in Latin America and includes information regarding additional AF choices such as *su merced*, sometimes used in countries such as Colombia and the Dominican Republic.

In addition to these summative works, there is a multitude of AF research that has been completed in specific areas or social groups. These studies allow us to see the use of AFs on a smaller scale and in great detail. The majority of investigations to be discussed here are of this type and those most relevant to this study will be included. The review will begin with studies completed in Spain. Further studies from South America, the Caribbean, Mexico, the U.S., and Japan will be discussed in order to provide more insight into the distribution of AFs.

In their study completed in Madrid, Spain, Alba de Diego and Sánchez Lobato (1980) found age to be the most decisive factor in AF choice. 70% of those interviewed claimed that age influenced their decision (20% did not answer the question). The researchers also determined social status to be an influential factor in the use of AFs.

Another study completed in Spain was that of Moreno Fernández (1986). This study was completed in Quintanar de la Orden, a rural community in the province of Toledo. The investigator took into account the social characteristics of the hearer as well as of the speaker in this study. He concluded that women under 50 years of age were more likely to employ the use of *tú* than men under 50, and that all informants under 20
years old mostly used tú. He also noted a correlation between education level and AF use in which those with higher education levels or of a higher social class were more likely to use tú. With regard to the social characteristics of the addressee, Moreno Fernández found four types of interlocutor that were likely to trigger the use of usted: the elderly, strangers, professionals and people “of respect.”

In his study of AFs in which he compares Peninsular (Alicante) to Mexican (Mexico City) Spanish, Schwenter (1993) found similar patterns in both locations: the use of tú rose as the social class or age of the hearer lowered, tú was used more often when addressing women than men, and grandparents were the least likely of family members to be addressed as tú. He also concluded that, regardless of the age, sex, social class, or relationship of the interlocutor, tú was used more often in Spain than in Mexico.

In a more recent study completed in Spain, age was shown to be a consistently important factor in determining whether T or V should be used (Ramón 2009). In this same study it was shown that the choice also depends on factors outside of either interlocutor such as “tipo de bar,” “con quien esté,” “el ambiente,” “cómo se dirija a mí” or “tipo de tienda.” Many investigators have looked at the relationship between such situational contexts and AF choice, determining that the surroundings do have a role in this choice. These surroundings might include place, time, or relationship between interlocutors and seem to fit well under Erickson and Schultz’ definition of context as “constituted by what people are doing and where and when they are doing it. (1981: 148)

Blas Arroyo (1995) stated that a lack of study of contextual factors was the greatest weakness in AF research. He claimed that AFs are indexical of the context of
interaction. In Blas Arroyo (1994), he stated that contextual factors such as the type of
activity in which the participants are engaged and the cultural expectations of the
participants can have an effect on the language used. He studied the use of AFs in seven
different contexts. The contexts he studied were: in a bar, a student/professor interaction,
a hierarchical work relationship, on the street, a salesperson/customer interaction, a sales
manager/customer interaction, and a professional (doctor, lawyer, etc.) /client interaction.
He determined that these contexts, as well as other social factors, played a role in AF
choice in Valencia, Spain. He found an overall greater usage of usted (57.6% of tokens).
He found context of interaction to be the most significant factor in AF choice, with
student/professor and “on the street” contexts seeing the least use of usted. He found that
men used usted more often than women in almost all contexts. Exceptions to this were
the oldest age group and in the contexts of hierarchical work relationships and with
professionals such as doctors and lawyers. Regarding age of the speaker, he found that,
except for the 25-40 age group, the use of usted increased with the age of the speaker. He
found that usted was more often used when addressing a man.

In Blas Arroyo (1995) he examines one interaction between a car salesman and a
customer. He looks at the varying use of T vs. V forms throughout the conversation
between the two. He determines that it is not just one factor that determines the use of tú
or usted, but rather the combination of many factors in the context including the topic,
purpose, setting and tone of the interaction.

Lambert and Tucker (1976) completed an influential study on AF usage among
youths in Colombia and Puerto Rico as well as French Canada. In Colombia they found a
fairly regular patterning of reciprocal *usted* usage between children and non-family adults such as their principal or priest. Beyond this arena however the patterns are not as definitive. Many of the patterns seem to depend on the sex of the interlocutors. Males were more likely to use *usted* with each other and *tú* with females. Females tend to use more *tú* regardless of the sex of the interlocutor. They also found that Jewish children held more reciprocal *usted* and non-reciprocal relationships than did Catholic children.

In Puerto Rico Lambert and Tucker found “an extremely variable and complex system of address etiquette” (116). Patterns were most consistent among the nuclear family, in which case the use of *tú* predominated. Usage was more variable in other contexts. They link a higher frequency of non-reciprocal uses with the more rural setting of Arecibo and more reciprocal uses with the more modern city of Ponce. They also claim that the instability of the system may be being caused by a change in progress in which the AF system is being simplified.

Rey (1994) reports his findings regarding Nicaragua, Honduras and Colombia. He looks at AF usage in 5 different domains or contexts: family, neighbors, workplace, street and party. Overall patterns show the most use of V-forms when addressing grandparents, parents, in-laws, male neighbors, coworkers of all ranks, professionals (except younger sales people in Nicaragua), and older people in general.

Jaramillo (1990) provides us with a look into AF patterns in the Spanish spoken in the United States via a study completed in New Mexico. She studied usage patterns with respect to the domain of interaction and the role-relationship between the interlocutors. She reports conservative use of *tú* vs. *usted* in this area of New Mexico, with the former
being used among friends and some family members and the latter being used among professional relationships, towards parents and grandparents and between ceremonial family members (i.e. between *compadres*- the parents and the godparents of a child). She does report evidence however that the use of *tú* among family members has seen a recent increase, as lamented by one woman who claimed “Now there is no respect. Before there was more love in the family” (19; translated).

Many investigators, including Placencia and Garcia (2007), Stewart (1999) and Wainerman (1976), maintain that AF choice may even differ with the same addressee, depending on the situational context. As an example of this, a man might refer to his coworkers with V forms at work, but with T forms in a social context such as a restaurant or bar (Stewart 1999). This is discussed further in the section on AF switches below.

Through studies like those described in this section, many social factors have been shown to correlate with the choice of AF. These include dialect, relationship, age and sex. The age and sex of both the speaker and the addressee play a significant role in the selection of T or V form. Situational context has also been shown to play an important role in AF choice; speakers tend to prefer one form over another in certain contexts, such as using V forms during a work meeting or T forms in a bar.

2.3 The Social Meaning of Address Forms

An area that has received much attention in the field of address form research has been the investigation of the social meanings indexed by AFs. According to Ochs (1992), indexical meanings are those meanings expressed by an utterance that are not referential or logical. In the case of AFs, these meanings relay social information about the speaker
and/or addressee as well as the social relationship between them. By defining the social meanings indexed by AFs, many investigators have attempted to determine what AFs mean.

According to Braun (1988), there are several types of meaning to contend with. First, there is the “lexical meaning” of AFs. There are AFs in many languages that serve both an AF and a lexical function. Such a form is the German Herr, which can mean both master, as a lexical item, and sir, as an AF. Most AFs of this type have a lexical meaning similar to master, comrade, friend, or relative. She states that many AFs initially developed from these types of words and still contain remnants of the literal meaning. Even if speakers are unaware of this meaning, it can be traced diachronically. The Spanish usted is one such word. Its origins lie in the possessive vuestra combined with the noun merced (Your Grace) and was used to address those of a higher social status (Penny 2002).

Pronominal AFs, such as tú (and usted, now that the lexical meaning has been essentially lost), typically do not carry this type of lexical meaning. Their only identifiable meaningful features, therefore, are those marking gender or number (Braun 1988).

Braun goes on to say that “literal meanings should not be regarded as the primary content of forms of address” (257) and, in fact, this type of meaning is of no interest to us here. Lexical meaning is of no interest simply for the fact that it is no longer recognized in the V form and the T form does not contribute lexical meaning.
A second type of meaning discussed by Braun (1988) is “referential meaning.” If using referential meaning to define an AF such as tú, one would say that tú means the person you are talking to in any given utterance. This meaning cannot be primary because the form tú is used to address many different people. In addition, the person you are now addressing as tú you might address at other times by their name, a nickname or even usted. Again, this type of referential meaning is of no interest to us in this particular study. I am not concerned with how the referent of an AF is picked out or recognized; I am only concerned with the social meaning contributed by an AF, to be discussed below.

Braun’s third type of meaning, social meaning, is what is of interest to us and what has been of interest to the vast majority of scholars in the area of AFs. According to Braun (1988: 258),

While a ‘literal meaning’ may be missing and referents may vary, there is always some social meaning encoded in an address variant. The social component consists of speaker-addressee-relationship, speaker’s evaluation of addressee (and situation), and of speaker’s social background, as expressed in the use of a given form of address. The social meaning thus lies in the information about the dyad, which is voluntarily or involuntarily provided by speakers when uttering a certain form of address.

Many social meanings have been attributed to the T and V forms of Spanish. I begin with a look at the dictionary of the Real Academia Española. In this very succinct description of the V form, it is associated with courtesy, respect and distance. This definition is seen below in (1).
(1) **Usted.** (De vusted). 1. pron. person. Forma de 2.ª persona usada por tú como tratamiento de cortesía, respeto o distanciamiento

**Usted.** (from vusted). 1. pron. person. Second person form used instead of ‘tú’ as courteous, respectful, or distancing address

A note of interest in this definition is that the V form is said to be used *in place of* the T form. The definition offered of the T form in the same dictionary does not associate it with any social meaning (2). These definitions will prove to be highly significant in that they demonstrate almost perfectly how these AFs contribute the social meaning to an utterance. We shall see through the course of this dissertation that the V form entails social meaning and the T form does not, just as these definitions suggest.

(2) **Tú.** (Del lat. *tu*). 1. pron. person. Formas de nominativo y vocativo de 2.ª persona singular en masculino y femenino.

**Tú.** (from lat. *tu*). 1. pron. person. Nominative and vocative second person masculine and feminine singular.

Many researchers have attempted to account for the meanings of AFs under an encompassing theory of address. The most widely cited model of the meaning of AFs is that proposed by Brown and Gilman (1960). Most of their research was conducted on German, Italian, French and Spanish. According to their theory, AFs index the relationship that exists between the speaker and the addressee. A speaker decides whether to address an interlocutor with a T or a V form based on the dimensions of power and solidarity. A speaker would address one who has some form of power over them with a V form. Brown and Gilman define power as “the degree (one) is able to control the
behavior of another” (254). They might have power based on a number of different factors which include age, class, sex, occupation, and many others. A speaker would address someone whom he has power over with a T form. Speakers sharing some sort of solidary relationship (be it going to the same school, being in the same family, being the same age, etc.) will address each other with the T form. Speakers who do not share a solidary relationship and have equal (or no) power over each other will address each other with a V form. Brown and Gilman explain that the use of T forms seems to be on the rise across languages and ascribe this change to a rise in the importance of the solidarity dimension. They contend that solidarity has become a more important factor than power in deciding which AF to use and that this change has led to an increase in the use of T forms and reciprocal AF use as well as a decrease in asymmetric uses.

Many researchers have been inspired by the theories developed by Brown and Gilman and have provided evidence to support or contest their views. Among those researchers whose work seems to align with that of Brown and Gilman are Bentivoglio (2003), Carricaburo (1997), Ford (1995), Moreno Fernández (1986), Paulston (1975), Pountain (2003), and Schwenter (1993). These authors have found evidence to support the existence of the power and solidarity semantics and many have used their evidence to add to the theory’s range of explanatory power.

In his research on AFs in Spain and in Mexico, Schwenter (1993) showed that the power and solidarity semantics were at work, however they were at work differently in each location. It was shown that in Alicante, Spain, the power semantic reigned supreme as the most important factor in choosing an address form. This was shown through
surveys conducted with native speakers, the results of which showed that the most important factors in choosing an AF were age, sex and social class. In contrast, the results obtained from the surveys conducted in Mexico City, Mexico showed that speakers there relied highly on the solidarity semantic in deciding which AF to use in a given situation.

Without going into great detail, Pountain (2003) discusses the applicability of Brown and Gilman’s theory in the areas of advertising, idiomatic AF uses and variation. He explains that a T form used in advertising is meant to convey “an attitude of matiness” (153) while a V form shows respect for the customer who essentially has power over the vendor. He hints at the idea that the changes in T/V usage patterns described by Brown and Gilman can explain dialectal variation in AF use. I would venture to say that Pountain believes that different dialects are at different stages of change regarding the prevalence of solidarity in the application of the semantics in the address form decision making process. This view has been corroborated by several others to be discussed below.

Paulston (1975) finds the semantics at work in Swedish, however she hypothesizes that there are actually two Swedish T forms (expressed by the same word *du*): one denoting solidarity and one denoting intimacy. She states that the two are in the process of merging.

In his 1986 study completed in Madrid, Moreno Fernández found that the two semantics were used but that solidarity was prominent, supporting Brown and Gilman’s claim that use of the solidarity semantic over the power semantic was on the rise.
Bentivoglio (2003) applied Brown and Gilman’s theory to letters written in the 16th century (sent from America to Spain) and found that shifts in AF within the same letter could be attributed to changes in dimensions of solidarity. She states that these changes might include shifts from a formal to an intimate context which would indicate greater solidarity. In these cases there was often a shift from a V to a T form. As an example of such a case she provides an excerpt from a letter written from a brother to his sister. In this letter the brother switches forms several times and Bentivoglio claims that the T forms are used when he “fully reveals the tender feelings (he) had for his sister, whose name – *Juana* - he had given to his own daughter” (185). A shift from a T to a V form might indicate a change from a familiar to a distant context, in this case less solidarity. Bentivoglio provides the example of a letter written by a husband to his wife in which he generally uses T forms while describing his affection for her. At the end of the letter he switches to V forms while telling her that she needs to sell the house and prepare to leave. Bentivoglio claims that the change in AF coincides with this change in context and helps demonstrate the husband’s change in disposition.

Ford (1995: 3) describes how, in French, a V form may be used “to build a barrier between speakers.” A T form might be used to create a feeling of intimacy. She also links the ideas of power and solidarity with the notion of politeness (to be discussed further below) claiming that the V form is the polite form because, by showing deference (lack of power or distance on behalf of the speaker) it does not impede upon the listener.

Carricaburo (1997) uses the power and solidarity semantics as the basis for her descriptions of AF usage in Spanish. She also discusses several of the other common
descriptions of the T and V forms in various parts of the world. She states that “el tuteo o el voseo sirven para expresar la familiaridad, la informalidad…, y el acercamiento psicológico o afectivo… menor autoridad o mayor juventud” (9) and that usted “expresa la formalidad o el poder…mayor autoridad o jerarquía o más edad” (9). Usted is also used to “mantener una distancia…y puede expresar también distancia psicológica o distanciamiento momentáneo” (9).

Of course, Brown and Gilman’s theory has its critics as well. By far the most common complaint about the theory is that it is not powerful enough to encompass all of the nuances that are involved in choosing an address form. Among those who have discussed the inadequacy of the theory are Blas Arroyo (1995), Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992), Lambert and Tucker (1976), Muhlhausler and Harre (1990) and Wainerman (1976). All of the above authors have accepted components of Brown and Gilman’s theory but have shown through their research that there is a need for modifications. Many of these necessary modifications are regarding the solidarity component of the theory. Blas Arroyo (1995) claims that there is actually no need for a solidarity dimension, that speaker behavior can be explained by means of power vs. no power. Wainerman (1976) says that the definition given for solidarity by Brown and Gilman is not sufficient because it does not account for many uses of the T form. For example it does not account for the use of reciprocal T by two people who do not like each other. However Wainerman does agree with Brown and Gilman’s hypothesis regarding the rise of solidarious forms and she is able to evidence this hypothesis with her Argentinean data.
She concluded that the T form was used more often in Buenos Aires than in the more conservative town of Catamarca.

Several authors, including Wainerman (1976) and Blas Arroyo (1995) claim that the theory is insufficient because it cannot account for “unexpected” usages of address forms. These usages include, for example, T forms used to express disdain or contempt, switches in forms that signal changes in the emotions of the speaker or V forms used in intimate settings and will be discussed further below.

Other researchers have criticized this theory for not being universally applicable (Kielkiewicz-Janowiak 1992, Song ms.). Song claims that solidarity is not a factor in honorific choice in Korean. If it is a factor, it is outweighed by power in every situation.

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) suggests a semantic that she claims is simpler and therefore more universally applicable. She claims that all uses of AFs can be explained via “distance.” All uses would fall somewhere on a scale of more to less distance between the speaker and the hearer. The factors determining distance will differ from society to society and may include age, sex, class, etc. She claims that the notion of distance can account for the fact that V forms can “express both respect and formal reserve” and T forms can express both “intimacy and contempt” (1992: 29).

It has been claimed that AFs do not only define relationships, but that they also are capable of constructing them. Korean honorifics create as well as encode hierarchical relationships between speaker and addressee “in terms of age, social status, kinship, and in- and out-groupness” (Song 2008: 214).
Castro (2001) claims that AFs have different meanings that vary depending on the social class of the speaker or the listener. She describes different possible meanings of tú, vos and usted among people of different social classes in Honduras. Some of the class-based differences she found include vos expressing anger for the middle class but not for the lower working class, vos expressing friendship for the lower working class but not the middle class, and usted expressing love in the middle class but not the lower working class.

As can be seen through these examples, there are a variety of definitions in existence for the address forms of Spanish. Investigators have attempted to account for them in various ways. The most common claims are that they are expressions of power, solidarity, respect, distance, intimacy, formality, and contempt.

2.4 Address Forms as Manipulable Constructs

Many researchers claim that speakers are able to manipulate AFs in various ways. According to these researchers, AFs may be used in order to protect the face of the interlocutor (see below for more information regarding Brown and Levinson’s face-saving model of politeness). AFs may also be used strategically in order to gain some sort of benefit for the speaker e.g. by flattering the addressee in order to get what they want out of them.

The model of politeness most often cited and/or argued over in AF research is that of Brown and Levinson (1987). These authors attempt to explain the distribution of AFs in terms of politeness. Their model of politeness centers on the notion of face. According to them, a person has two types of face: positive and negative. Negative face represents a
person’s desire not to be impeded upon by others. Positive face represents a person’s desire to be approved of by others. Politeness strategies develop in order to protect (or save) a person’s positive and/or negative face in times when they might be threatened by a Face Threatening Act (FTA) such as when asking for a favor, giving a command, or interrupting another person. These FTAs might attack either the negative or the positive face of the person to whom they are directed. If the person committing the FTA chooses to do so, he may attempt to mitigate the FTA’s effects by counteracting it with some act of politeness. An act that saves negative face is an act of negative politeness. An act that saves positive face is an act of positive politeness. Brown and Levinson discuss AFs as they pertain to their theory. According to them an AF can be a threat to a listener’s positive face if used incorrectly. For example, using a T form when the listener expected a V form would threaten his positive face and may signal disapproval or lack of appreciation for him or his status.

When AFs are used “appropriately” they represent acts of politeness. The use of a V form is said to be an act of negative politeness because it places a sort of distance between the speaker and the hearer, thereby allowing the hearer not to be impeded upon. The use of T forms represents an act of positive politeness. All AFs (not just T/V forms) are strategically used, according to the authors, in order to mitigate FTAs. They provide an example that illustrates that a switch from a T to a V form coincides with an FTA. In their example, the informant claims to switch from a T to a V form when making a request from his interlocutor.
Other theories of politeness had been developed prior to Brown and Levinson’s, such as Lakoff’s conversation maxim theory (see Lakoff 1973) and Blum-Kulka’s social norm theory (see Blum-Kulka 1987). Still others have come along after, such as Spencer-Oatey’s rapport management theory (see Spencer-Oatey 2000). However Brown and Levinson’s model remains the most widely utilized and critiqued. In the realm of address forms, many arguments can be found for and against it.

Researchers who have adopted Brown and Levinson’s politeness model for AF theory include Carrera de la Red and Alvarez (2004), Blas Arroyo (1994), Haverkate (1994), and Ford (1995). Carrera de la Red and Alvarez (2004) were able to correlate the use of AFs within four 16th century documents with Brown and Levinson’s face-saving theory. Blas Arroyo (1994), Haverkate (1994), and Ford (1995) use Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness to explain the distribution of AFs in various dialects. Most of these researchers claim that politeness is not sufficient to account for all the uses of AFs. These include Pountain (2003) and Taavitsainen and Jucker (2003). Others, such as Ferrer and Sánchez Lanza (2002) adopt different models of politeness. Still others claim that no politeness theory will account for AF usage because no form is inherently polite or impolite (Pedroviejo 2004).

Finally, Kasper (1990) claims that the politeness model is far too pessimistic. She says that there are not nearly so many face threatening acts as Brown and Levinson claim and that speakers cannot possibly be spending all their time simply trying to avoid threatening someone’s face.
2.5 Address Form Variation

While most studies of AFs tend to explore a particular dialect, there have been several in which the variation in AF usage has been explicitly treated. These studies are extremely valuable in that they highlight the fact that many of the generalizations assumed for AFs are not necessarily true in all dialects or languages. In fact, according to Fasold, “it would be foolhardy to try to predict exactly what address form will be used at any given time, even if you know exactly what the relationship is between the speaker and the person he or she is talking to” (1990: 16).

Dialectological works, such as those of Carricaburo (1997), Lipski (1994) and Páez Urdaneta (1981) give an idea of how much variation there is in AF use across dialects of the Spanish language. For example, while the general claim is that usted is used with strangers, those older than you or those in a higher social position than you, in some areas, such as parts of Colombia, usted is used to refer to family members as well. In other areas, such as parts of Costa Rica, usted is the only AF used by many people (Carricaburo 1997).

In some studies, two or more dialects have been compared and found to differ in their usage (Lambert and Tucker 1976; Rey 1994; Schwenter 1993; Solé 1970, Wainerman 1976). Wainerman (1976) concludes that some dialects are more “conservative” in their AF usage than others. More conservative dialects are defined as those in which V forms are used more often than in other dialects and in which more non-reciprocal pronoun usage is present. Non-reciprocal pronoun use occurs when 2 people
address each other with different forms. For example, one addresses the other with a V form, but is addressed with a T form in return.

In her study comparing Argentina, Peru and Puerto Rico, Solé (1970) finds that factors affect the choice of AF differently in each region. For example, V forms are more prevalent in Argentina among family members than in Peru or Puerto Rico. In Puerto Rico and Argentina those who are one generation older than the speaker are generally addressed with a V form while in Peru T forms are used to address even those who are two generations older.

Rey (1994) compared dialects in Colombia, Honduras and Nicaragua. He found differing uses of the V form in each dialect. For example, he reports that the V form is used towards females in the workplace more often in Nicaragua and Honduras than in Colombia. He found the most V form usage overall in Honduras and the least in Nicaragua. He attributed these differences to the level of industrialization/modernization that the country had experienced.

Variation can also be seen by comparing previous studies. It can be seen that there is not always agreement as to which AF will be used between two interlocutors or in a certain context. For example, according to Moreno Fernandez (1986), the profession of the interlocutor is not considered an important factor in AF selection in Quintanar de la Orden in Castile-La Mancha, Spain. However, as mentioned above, profession has been shown to be a factor affecting AF selection in other dialects (Alba de Diego and Sanchez Lobato 1980).
In their study of encounters between store clerks and customers, Ferrer and Sánchez Lanza (2002) found dialectal differences in contextual influence on AF choice. They found that the T form vos was used more often by clerks towards customers in Buenos Aires, Argentina than in Quito, Ecuador.

Moreno (2004) and Garzone (2007) claim that these dialectal differences exist because different societies have different norms and practices. One society may consider that a person aged 40 should be referred to with a V form, while another might tend to think that V forms are not appropriate until the age of 60. The AFs themselves may have different pragmatic values. A V form might be considered polite in a specific context in one dialect, while the T form might be considered more appropriate in the same context in another dialect.

2.6 Address Form Switches

Under the category of AF switches I will discuss both temporary and permanent changes in the AF used by a specific speaker toward a specific hearer. This includes both switches from a T form to a V form and switches from a V form to a T form. This facet of AF usage is often brought up as an argument to various AF theories in an attempt to show that these theories are not sufficient in that they cannot account for these switches. Some of these arguments were mentioned above. Recall for example Wainerman’s (1976) argument that if the T form was supposed to express solidarity, disdainful uses of the form could not be explained.

According to Brown and Gilman (1960), if a particular AF is used out of the norm for that context it is because it is being used to highlight the speaker’s emotional state at
that time. They claim that “The general meaning of an unexpected pronoun is simply that
the speaker, for the moment, views his relationship as one that calls for the pronoun
used” (273). By using an unexpected T form, a speaker can momentarily express anger or
contempt toward the addressee (Brown and Gilman 1960). By using an unexpected V
form, a speaker can show that he views the addressee in that moment as an outsider. An
unexpected V form may also be used to show respect. A V form can also be used in a
mocking fashion as shown through their example from the play Tamburlaine the Great
by Christopher Marlowe. In this example a captor addresses his captive using a V form.

I will not follow Brown and Gilman (1960) in referring to AFs in these
circumstances as “unexpected” but will instead refer to them as “temporary switches.”
The motivation behind this is that these switches may not necessarily be unexpected.
Indeed, reports of such temporary switches are common. Mayer (1975) discusses
emotional uses of both the T and V forms in Russian; speakers may switch forms in
anger. Keevalik (1999) reports that, in Estonian, fluctuations between AFs can produce
insult or sarcasm, depending on the context. Both Carricaburo (1997) and Haverkate
(1994) discuss examples of temporary switches from T to V on the part of parents
disciplining their children in Spanish. Recall also the example mentioned above in which
Bentivoglio (2003) discussed temporary switches as reflecting changes in context.

Sole (1970) discusses temporary switches in Puerto Rico, Peru and Argentina and
states that they reflect an “exaltación emotiva que es pasajera” (189). She reports that, in
addition to parents addressing their children as usted in moments of anger, children using
usted with their parents can be seen as a sign of insubordination in Puerto Rico. In
Buenos Aires, a switch from T to V forms might signal a moment of extreme affection. She also reports that switches to usted can be used to express sarcasm or irony, in which case they have “efectos completamente contrarios a los usuales” (190). Sole claims that switches to T forms might occur when the speaker is “en momentos de enajenación de la realidad,” (190) such as drunkenness, extreme emotion, hostility or delirium.

Castro (2001) describes temporary switches of AFs in Honduras and claims that they are quite common. She states that temporary switches fulfill two functions in the Spanish of Honduras: to attract the addressee’s attention and/or to express emotive or attitudinal meanings. Speakers will temporarily address their interlocutor as usted for a variety of reasons. These reasons include: trying to obtain something from the listener, trying to make the listener feel important, and to show they are being serious. Likewise, there are many reasons for a temporary switch to vos such as to offend the listener, show anger or show that the listener has no authority over the speaker.

An example of a temporary switch that seems to express anger in Peninsular Spanish can be seen in the film Hable con ella, directed by Pedro Almodóvar (2002). The scene is of an interview being conducted on a talk show. Both parties had been addressing each other as usted throughout the interview. During the scene the host, begins using the T form at the same moment that she becomes visibly angry because the guest, Lydia, will not answer her question.

In the dialogue, H stands for host, L stands for Lydia, T forms are marked with $t$ and V forms are marked with $v$. 
H- ¿Usted cree que todo eso era un montaje para promocionarse él, y que cuando lo siguió la, dejó?

L- Ya advertí en el camerino que no iba a hablar de este tema.

H- Pero hablar es bueno, mujer, hablar es bueno y hablar de los problemas es el primer paso para superarlos. Porque al Niño de Valencia…

L- ¡Y dale!

H- Lydia, Tesoro, no seas ordinaria. Déjame terminar la pregunta. Porque al Niño de Valencia…

L- Ya advertí en el camerino que no quería hablar de este tema.

H- Tú en el camerino no me advertiste nada.

---

H- Do you think it was all just a set-up to promote himself, and when he’d done that, he left you?

L- I already said in the dressing room that I wouldn’t talk about that.

H- But it’s good to talk, Honey, it’s good to talk. And talking about problems is the first step in overcoming them. Because El Niño de Valencia…

L- Here we go again!

H- Lydia, dear, don’t be silly. Let me finish the question. Because the Niño de Valencia…

L- I already warned in the dressing room that I didn’t want to talk about this.

H- You did not tell me anything in the dressing room.
This example shows that a switch in AFs can accompany a change in emotion. I believe that the switch in AF is a strong indication of the host’s emotion. She does not switch AFs until she gets very angry after being rebuked twice by Lydia. It is as if she is trying to put Lydia in her place by creating a barrier between them, as if to say “I am the host and you are not. You do not get to decide what we talk about.”

Other temporary switches might not necessarily coincide with a change in emotion, but rather a change in context. Uber (2004) reports that in the business world one might use V forms during meetings but T forms in other situations. A similar example is reported by Castro (2001). In this case, doctors in a hospital in Honduras who typically address each other with the T form address each other with the V form when they are in front of patients. This type of contextual shift can also be seen among professor/student relationships. In such a case a student and professor might address each other regularly with the T form, but address each other using the V form in certain situations such as during an exam or dissertation defense.

Castro (2001) also claims that the topic of conversation may influence the choice of AF used in Honduras. She provides evidence that the tú and the usted forms are more likely to be used in conversation about work than in other conversations. Vos is the pronoun most often used in conversations regarding other topics.

Bratt Paulston (1975) shows that AFs can express emotion even without an actual “switch.” She discusses her observation of store clerks at work in Sweden. These clerks generally address their customers with the V form, however on a day when they were particularly busy and therefore not in the best of spirits, they addressed their customers
with the T form. In this case it would seem that the T form was able to express their bad mood to a customer even though they may not have ever addressed that particular customer before. The customer might have expected to be addressed with a V form regardless. Thus, the fact that the T form was contrary to expectation allowed it to express the emotions of the clerk.

As seen through the studies discussed above, temporary switches of AFs are very meaningful and can express a variety of emotion or perform a variety of functions. Their employment appears to be frequent, not only in Spanish, but in other languages as well and cannot be ignored in any theory of address.

Another case of a change in AF concerns the “permanent” change from one form to another. When I say “permanent,” I refer to a situation in which a speaker changes from one habitual form to another without the intention of reverting back to the previous form.

Generally permanent switches involve the passage from a V form to a T form, although there are exceptions. According to Uber (1985) a switch in the opposite direction would most likely be temporary and would express anger or a similar emotion, as described above. In some languages, such as Swedish and Russian, the switch from a V to a T form is a ceremonial event in which the interlocutors might even celebrate with a drink (Mayer 1975; Bratt Paulston 1975). In Peninsular Spanish the switch is often preceded by a request for permission to use the form such as that seen below in (3-4).

(3) ¿Le puedo tutear?

Can I address you USTED as ‘tú’?
¿Nos tuteamos?

Shall we address each other as ‘tú’?

Typical descriptions of Spanish state that speakers will make the switch from V to T as their relationship becomes closer in some way, be it that they become friends or just that they see each other often. Generally one person will initiate the change. This is typically the older person or the person who, for whatever reason, might be perceived as having some sort of authority (power) over the other. For example, one informant in a study completed by Ramon (2009) stated that when addressing professors he or she would always use usted unless he or she had been granted permission to use tú by the professor. The informant claimed that “el paso nunca lo daba yo” (Ramon 2009: http://www.slideshare.net/jramon/t-o-usted?type=powerpoint). In all dialects, a moment of transition from V to T forms can occur, however exactly when this change occurs seems to vary from dialect to dialect, as discussed below.

Uber (2004) reports that V forms should be used at the onset of a business encounter, but that T forms may be used once relationships are further established. An informant in the survey conducted in Spain by Ramon (2009) claims that, if usted is used upon being introduced to a new co-worker, one or the other interlocutor will immediately propose the use of tú.

Uber (1985) traces the progression of AFs across the development of personal relationships in Bogotá. She claims that, as relationships change, the choice of AF changes as well. In the case of Bogotá, two speakers may address each other as usted during the beginning stages of their relationship. As they become closer they may begin
to address each other with the *tú* form. If they were then to become even closer they would switch to *usted* which according to Uber has two functions: non-solidarity and solidarity. *Tú* falls in the middle.

In Blas Arroyo (1995) an interaction is described between a car salesman and a customer. The author traces the switch from *V* forms to *T* forms on the part of both participants in the conversation and claims that the AFs index the changing context and relationship between the interlocutors. The use of the *V* form is initiated by the salesman and this use is reciprocated by the customer. When the customer begins to ask specific questions about a particular car, he switches to the *T* form. He first uses the plural – *tenéis* - followed by the singular - *tú*-. Blas Arroyo claims that that this use of the plural form is a way of transitioning gradually between *T* and *V* forms. The salesman does not reciprocate the *T* form immediately and this fact is attributed to a “mayor distensión entre los interlocutores en esta fase del diálogo” (246) and is said to reinforce “la posición superior que … ocupa la persona que encarna la figura del cliente (246).” The salesman does not switch to the *T* form until later on in the discussion when the two are finalizing the details for payment and picking up the car. Blas Arroyo claims that this indexes the fact that the two have both achieved their goal – the client has bought a new car and the salesman has sold a car.

Song (2008) describes the use of honorifics in Korean. She explains that, upon meeting, people will often address each other using their full name in addition to a polite honorific suffix. If their relationship becomes closer they will begin to use first names and an honorific suffix or kinship terms such as *enni/nwuna* (older sister) to address each
other. This change shows that the relationship has gone from a distant one to an intimate one.

Address form switches can be temporary or permanent and can occur for different reasons. In general, temporary switches seem to be emotionally charged and sometimes intended to offend the addressee. Permanent switches generally index a change in the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. This change is most often from a “distant” relationship to a friendly relationship, and therefore from a V to a T form.

2.7 Conventionalization/Socialization of Address Forms

Hanks (1990) claims that “reference is a socially significant phenomenon” (4) and that the felicitous use of deictic forms, such as AFs, “rest(s) on an immense stock of social knowledge” (7). In other words, speakers require an intimate knowledge of their world and the social norms within it to be able to use these forms correctly. The ideas of Hanks are well documented by evidence from many languages. The knowledge requirement he mentions has been noted by many authors. According to Song (2008), honorifics cannot be correctly used in Korean without intricate knowledge of the social hierarchy system. Ardila (2003) states that the amount of knowledge required to use AFs correctly in any language makes it extremely difficult for non-native speakers to do so. Criado de Val (1973) explains that one needs to have a great awareness of social customs in order to properly employ AFs in discourse.

The conventionalization of AF usage is evident in the fact that the usage differs across dialects to the point that misunderstandings can occur when two systems clash. An example of this is provided by a native speaker who was upset that a friend from
Colombia addressed him with the V form saying “me molestaba que me hablara de usted porque parecía que no me tenía confianza lo que me contestó me sorprendió (sic): me dijo que era todo lo contrario, que porque me estimaba mucho y me tenía cariño y admiración me hablaba de usted” (username “Perrodelmal” 2006: http://forum.wordreference.com/showthread.php?t=89933).

2.8 Conclusion

As shown by this survey of previous research, the usage of AFs is widely varied, as are the kinds of analyses of AFs. We did however see some overall trends. To name a few, in most places the T forms are used more between family and friends. V forms are generally still used toward strangers, older people and often towards those in a higher position in work or social class. Young people use more T forms than do older people. Women tend to use more T forms than men.

We have seen in this review that much has been accomplished in the study of AFs. The patterns of use in particular regions and social groups have been described by the likes of Carricaburo (1997) and Lambert and Tucker (1976). AFs have been shown to be deictic markers of certain qualities in the addressee or the relation between the speaker and the addressee as seen in the works of Brown and Gilman (1960) and many others. The situational context also plays a role in AF choice, as suggested by researchers such as Blas Arroyo (1994, 1995). Brown and Levinson (1987) and others have found that AFs can be manipulated strategically by speakers in an effort to flatter their addressee and/or to get what they want in a particular situation. It has been argued that AF switches play an important role in communication in their ability to index emotional changes or
changes in the status of a relationship (see for example Castro 2001). Authors such as Song (ms.) and Ardila (2003) tell us that AFs cannot be properly used without an intimate knowledge of the system in which they are used, making their use a difficult skill to master by non-native speakers and at times causing misunderstandings between speakers of different dialects.

The amount of variation and pragmatic flexibility of AFs that has been documented is very wide-ranging. The missing piece, however, is an explanation of how all the uses and meanings of AFs described above are possible. The goal of this dissertation is to develop such an explanation. I intend to show that this wide variety of uses and meanings can be accounted for if we explore what type of words tú and usted are and just how it is they go about contributing their meaning to an utterance. To do this, I employ the originally Gricean notions of conventional and conversational implicature, to be described in the following chapter.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework: Conventional and Conversational Implicature

3.1 Introduction

In order to describe how AFs contribute socially deictic information to an utterance, I rely on two concepts: conventional implicature and conversational implicature. By employing these concepts I will show that AFs contribute socially deictic information through two different mechanisms. The V form conventionally implicates one meaning in all contexts. The opposition of the forms can then be manipulated by speakers in order to produce conversational implicatures which only arise in certain contexts. Both of these mechanisms are discussed in this chapter. In some cases there is not a purposeful implicature on the part of the speaker. These cases will be explained using notion of the indexical field, which will also be discussed in this chapter.

3.2 Conventional Implicature

According to Potts (2005), “many expressions harbor content that does not reduce to at-issue entailments, presuppositions, intonational meanings, or conversational implicatures (9).” I contend that part of the social content of address forms falls into this class of meaning, which Potts calls conventional implicature. Potts (2005) fits conventional implicature (CI) into a larger model of meaning. Potts’ model differs from previous models, including that of Grice, in that he considers CIs to be a part of “what is said.”
According to Grice (1989), CIs are not part of “what is said.” He claims that they, like conversational implicatures, do not contribute to the propositional content or truth value of an utterance. Under his theory, conversational implicatures add to the meaning of an utterance but do not rely on the meaning of any word in that utterance to do so. The meaning associated with a conversational implicature comes from the context of an utterance. For example, if A were to ask B for the time and B were to answer with (1), B’s answer would not make sense unless the context, combined with the utterance, allowed A to calculate the answer to his question.

(1) I just passed Champaign.

Nothing about these words on their own gives any hint at the time of day. However if A and B were in a car together, driving west from Columbus, Ohio, and both knew what time they had left that morning, A could determine the approximate time of day based on B’s response. This calculated answer would be the conversational implicature of B’s utterance. It is not part of “what is said” because B did not physically say “It is noon.” In fact, he could have produced the same conversational implicature using completely different words such as, “I’m getting hungry.” The conversational implicature is not part of the truth value of the utterance because if A were to deny the truth of B’s utterance, he would be denying the fact that they had just passed Champaign, not that it was noon, as seen in (2).

(2) B-I just passed Champaign.

A- Not true, we are only in Indianapolis.

A- #Not true, it is not noon, it is 2 o’clock.
Conventional implicatures, in Grice’s view, are similar to conversational implicatures in that they are not part of what is said. They are different in that they do not rely on the meaning of particular words. Therefore, while the trigger for the conversational implicature above was the combination of the utterance and the context in which it was said, the trigger for a conventional implicature is a particular word and the context in which it is said does not play a part in its understanding. Grice offers the example of therefore as a CI trigger. Therefore contributes a meaning of causality to an utterance without the speaker having to commit themselves to this causality. According to Grice, if a speaker were to utter “He is an Englishman; he is, therefore, brave” (1989: 25) he cannot be said to have claimed that this man’s being brave is a consequence of his being English. Many people have disagreed with this view of CIs, among them Potts (2005).

Potts claims that CIs are part of what is said and fits them into a model of meaning that has been updated from Grice’s. This model is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Entailments (compare to <em>what is said</em>)</th>
<th>Context-Dependent Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-Issue Entailments</td>
<td>Conventional Implicatures</td>
<td>Conventional Presuppositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(the main content of what is said)</em></td>
<td><em>(compare to hard-core presuppositions as seen in Kadmon 2001)</em></td>
<td><em>(compare to contextually-dependent presuppositions as seen in Kadmon 2001)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional Implicatures</td>
<td>Conversationally-triggered Presuppositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(compare to contextually-dependent presuppositions as seen in Kadmon 2001)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional Implicatures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Potts’ Model of Meaning
Bach (1999) also said that (supposed) CIs are part of what is said. Bach and Potts
differ in that Bach believes that any supposed CI can be considered propositional content
(Potts’ at-issue entailment) or a speech act and claims that utterances which might be
considered by some to be CI triggers, such as but or even, are merely ACIDs - Alleged
Conventional Implicature Devices. While agreeing that most of these ACIDs are not to be
considered CI triggers, Potts maintains that CIs do exist and that lumping CIs in with at-
issue entailment would not do them justice. He is adamant that CIs are distinct from at-
issue content. He also discusses how they cannot be collapsed with presupposition or
conversational implicature.

According to Potts, CIs “are secondary entailments that cooperative speakers
rarely use to express controversial propositions or carry the main themes of discourse”
(Potts 2007a: 476). CIs have the following four characteristics which merit the existence
of a separate distinction (3):

(3)

1. They are part of the conventional meaning of words
2. They are commitments, and thus give rise to entailments
3. They are commitments made by the speaker of the utterance by virtue of
   the meanings of the words that he chooses
4. They are logically and compositionally independent of what is said, i.e.
   independent of the at-issue entailments

These four characteristics describe the set of meanings contributed by supplemental
expressions (such as appositives and parentheticals) as well as expressives (such as
attributive adjectives and honorifics); therefore these are the phenomena that Potts claims to account for with his theory. None of the ACIDs described by Bach (1999) seem to fall into these categories and are not considered to be CI triggers by Potts either.

Characteristics 1 and 2 justify the placement of CIs on the entailment side of Potts’ model of meaning. Characteristics 3 and 4 distinguish CIs from at-issue entailment. Characteristic 4 also distinguishes CIs from presuppositions.

Characteristics 1 and 2 represent the key point at which Potts’ model diverges from that of Grice. He claims that, since CIs are (as Grice stated) so dependent on specific words, they must be part of what is said. Potts says that “CIs are inherently linguistic” (2005: 26). He claims that a CI is actually a second (or third or fourth…) proposition in an utterance. If the CI trigger is taken away, so is that proposition, and thus the same thing is not being said. This is shown below in (4a-b). In (4a) Mary is expressing both the idea that Mark is from Iowa and that she has negative feelings towards him. In (4b), only the proposition that Mark is from Iowa is being expressed.

(4) a. Mary- “That bastard Mark is from Iowa.”

b. Mary- “Mark is from Iowa.”

In this case, the fact that Mark is from Iowa is the at-issue entailment and the conventionally implicated content is that Mary has negative feelings about him.
This dependence on specific words can also be shown through an indirect quote test\(^3\). If Matt were to tell us what Mary said, he would likely use the following utterance (5).

\[(5) \quad \text{Matt- “Mary said that Mark is from Iowa.”} \]

The listener would have no idea (unless he had heard Mary, or already knew her feelings) that Mary had expressed those negative feelings. If Matt were to use (6), negative feelings would be conventionally implicated, however, due to the property of speaker orientation (property 3 above), the listener still would not know that Mary had expressed negative feelings toward Mark. They would assume that Matt was the one who had the negative feelings toward Mark. The property of speaker orientation will be discussed further below.

\[(6) \quad \text{Matt- “Mary said that that bastard Mark is from Iowa.”} \]

In order for Matt to let the listener know both of the ideas that Mary had expressed, he would either have to employ quotative intonation on the word *bastard* in order to show that it was a direct quote (Potts 2005) or he would have to replace the word with a paraphrase of the CI content that it expresses, as seen in (7) or (8).

\[(7) \quad \text{Matt- “Mary said that Mark is from Iowa and she thinks he is a bastard.} \]

\[^3\text{Bach (1999) used indirect quotation tests to show that CI triggers contribute to the content of an utterance. He, however, used this information to back up his claim that CIs do not exist since he is arguing against the more traditional theory of CIs in which they are considered not to be part of “what is said.”} \]
(8) Matt- “Mary said that Mark is from Iowa and it seems like she really doesn’t like him.

Without the words “that bastard” the listener does not get quite the same effect as Mary intended with her initial utterance. Even a paraphrase doesn’t quite get at that CI content. Hence, the CI content relies on the conventional meaning of “that bastard” to be expressed and is part of “what is said.”

If CIs are part of what is said, and therefore entailed, they should not be cancelable. This in fact seems to be the case. Take the statement in (9). Assuming the term bastard is being used negatively and not taken with its literal meaning (illegitimate child), the statement is not felicitous.

(9) #That bastard Mark, who isn’t such a bad guy, is from Iowa.

A complication in this cancellation test lies in the fact that CI content, as seen above, is not easily paraphrased; it is ineffable. Because of this, it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide a continuation that would have the potential to cancel all of the content of the CI. Simply repeating the CI trigger does not work either, as seen in (10).

(10) #That bastard Mark, who isn’t a bastard, is from Iowa.

With CIs now on the side of entailment (what is said), characteristics 3 and 4 distinguish them from other phenomena that are also entailed by an utterance (at-issue entailments and conventional presuppositions). Characteristic 3 refers to a CI as being attributable to the speaker of an utterance. According to Potts, the proposition expressed by a CI can be attributed only to the speaker of the utterance (it is speaker oriented) and only at the time and place when the utterance is made. Take example (11) below:
(11) Megan: My stupid phone doesn’t have any bars.
In such an example, we cannot (without further information) extend the content conveyed by _stupid_ to any other time or place. The word _stupid_ contributes a CI that expresses the negative feelings the speaker has (at least at that moment) for her phone. Now imagine if she were to follow up that utterance in a manner similar to (12):

(12) But I do love this phone.
Even if the speaker really does love her phone, this utterance will not cancel out the negative feelings she had for it in the moment she uttered the first part of the phrase.

Imagine (13):

(13) At that moment my stupid phone wasn’t getting any bars. At that very moment I loved my phone more than ever.
This could only be understood as sarcasm. Either the “stupid” would be sarcastic, signaling that she actually did not want to be getting any bars at that moment, or the second sentence, signaling that no; she in fact did not love her phone more than ever at that moment.

Now imagine if another person were to indirectly quote this statement to a third party in such a way as the following (14).

(14) Melissa: #Megan said that her stupid phone doesn’t have any bars.
To whom would a listener attribute the negative feelings toward the phone? One could only attribute them with any certainty to Melissa, the utterer of the sentence. Unless the listener had also heard Megan’s statement, or if Melissa had used an intonational pattern suggesting that she was quoting Megan, they would have no idea how Megan felt about
the phone. According to Potts (2005), *stupid* could be interpreted as a quote if it were
given “a special intonation contour,” (160) in which prosodic focus is placed on the word
*stupid*.

This property of always being speaker-oriented distinguishes CIs from at-issue
content, which could be oriented to anyone. In the above example, the at-issue content is
that the phone doesn’t have any bars. This is the part of Melissa’s quote that the listener
could, without a doubt, be sure that Megan said. According to Potts, this content must “be
attributed to the grammatical subject of the verb of saying” (2007c: 477).

Because the content of the CI is attributed to the speaker, and the at-issue content,
in this case, is attributable to the subject of the verb of saying, Melissa’s utterance (16) in
the following conversation would be considered a faithful rendition of Megan’s statement
in (15).

(15)  Megan: My phone doesn’t have any bars.

(16)  Melissa: Megan said that her stupid phone doesn’t have any bars.

In response to critics such as Amaral et al. (2007), Potts later relaxes his views
somewhat on the feature of speaker orientation. Amaral et al. bring to attention several
examples in which CI triggers (as described by Potts) express content that cannot be
attributed to the speaker. See for example (17), taken from Amaral et al. (CI trigger
emphasized).

(17)  My father screamed that he would never allow me to marry *that bastard*
Webster.
Amaral et al suggest that speaker orientation is merely the most common or default case because the content contributed by the CI expresses point of view.

In Harris and Potts (2009), an investigation is made into the possibility of non-speaker-oriented readings of certain CI triggers, specifically expressives and appositives. Through experimental tests and a corpus analysis, the researchers conclude that speaker-oriented readings are definitely preferred, but that there are some cases in which non-speaker-oriented readings prevail. The orientation of the reading was found to be influenced both by the syntactic structure of the utterance as well as contextual factors.

Characteristic 4 (independence) is extremely important since it describes just what distinguishes CIs from presuppositions. According to Potts, every theory of presupposition centers on the idea that there is a dependency between the presupposition in question and the at-issue content. The at-issue content in “My stupid phone doesn’t have any bars” relies on the truth of the presupposition that phones should have bars to work. If this presupposition were not true, the utterance would not make any sense. The listener would wonder why the speaker cared whether or not the phone had bars. However the at-issue content does not rely on the CI contributed by *stupid* in any way. If Melissa knew that Megan did not actually think her phone was stupid, she could still make sense of the utterance without difficulty because the CI does not affect the truth or falsity of the at-issue content.

This property of independence is also what makes any utterance containing a CI trigger multidimensional, meaning that these utterances carry two distinct meanings, each able to be denied or accepted independently of the other (Potts and Roeper 2006; Potts et
Continuing with the same example, one could accept the idea that the phone doesn’t have any bars without accepting the belief that the phone is stupid and vice versa. One could likewise accept the truth of both ideas or neither of them. In Potts (2008) we see that the two meanings can not only be denied or accepted independently, but that they can also be questioned independently. Using our example about Megan’s phone, this might emerge as the conversations seen in (18) or (19)

(18) Megan: My stupid phone doesn’t have any bars.
    Melissa: I know the phone is stupid, but why doesn’t it have any bars?

(19) Megan: My stupid phone doesn’t have any bars.
    Melissa: I see that it doesn’t have any bars, but why would you say it was stupid?

This characteristic of multidimensionality is common to all theories of CI as well as expressives, which will be discussed in more detail in the following section (Potts 2008).

3.3 Expressives

As mentioned above, Potts (2005) claims that expressives are conveyers of CIs and that the content conveyed by them displays the 4 characteristics associated with other CIs. In the category of expressives he includes epithets (such as *damn*), attributive adjectives (such as *that jerk*), and honorifics. Expressive content, according to Potts, reveals the emotional state of the speaker but is not part of the at-issue entailments of the utterance. In this section I will trace the development of Potts’ theory of expressives, specifically with regard to honorifics and AFs.
In Potts and Kawahara (2004), it was claimed that Japanese honorifics as well as antihonorifics are expressives. As expressives, they provide information about the context of the utterance, in this case, the attitudes of the speaker toward the addressee and toward the people he is talking about. The characteristics of expressives discussed in this article are nondisplaceability, independence, immediacy and descriptive ineffability. The term nondisplaceable is used to describe the idea that expressives never fall under the semantic scope of operators such as negation. They provide the following example seen in (20) in which the antihonorific *domo* is not affected by the negation *anai*. The speaker views the noise as annoying regardless of whether the teacher knows that the children are noisy or not.

(20) ajo sensei-wa [gaki-*domo*-ga urusai] –koto-o shir-anai.

that teacher-TOP kids-*antihon*-NOM noisy -fact know-not

The teacher does not know that the kids are (annoyingly) noisy.

Expressives are independent in that the meaning they contribute is always completely independent of the at-issue content expressed in the utterance. Because of this characteristic of independence, any utterance containing an expressive is considered to be multidimensional. Potts (2007b) claims that the multidimensionality seen in honorifics is of the deepest kind in which each meaning carries completely unrelated content. Because of this independence, Potts often glosses his examples with both a descriptive meaning and an expressive meaning, as seen in (21) taken from Potts and Kawahara (2004).

(21) Sam-ga o-warai-*ninat*-ta.

Sam-NOM subj.hon-laugh-subj.hon-past
i. Sam laughed.

ii. The speaker honors Sam.

Potts and Kawahara describe the immediacy of honorifics as follows: “Honorifics achieve their intended act simply by being uttered; they do not offer content for inclusion into the common ground so much as inflict content upon it” (5). They claim that the content inflicted upon the common ground comes in the form of a secondary speech act. In this case, one that “establish(es) a relationship with the interlocutor” (in Potts and Kawahara 2004:5 From Tsujimura 1978:223).

Finally, Potts and Kawahara claim that honorifics are descriptively ineffable because they are impossible to paraphrase. This leads to the situational explanations offered by textbooks and teachers as to when a particular honorific should be used. It also makes translation of honorifics difficult.

According to Potts (2005), expressive content is conventionally implicated. Using Japanese honorifics (as well as a variety of other examples), Potts demonstrates how expressives display the four characteristics of CIs seen in (3) and repeated here as (22).

(22)

1. They are part of the conventional meaning of words
2. They are commitments, and thus give rise to entailments
3. They are commitments made by the speaker of the utterance by virtue of the meanings of the words that he chooses
4. They are logically and compositionally independent of what is said i.e. independent of the at-issue entailments
Potts agrees with Löbner (2002) that the meaning contributed by all expressives is part of their lexical make-up. In Constant et al (2009), he and Potts claim that expressive content “is intimately connected with specific lexical items (16).”

Potts alleges that the content expressed by CI triggers constitutes an entailment because this content is not deniable or cancelable. While he does not provide an example specifically containing honorifics, one could expand his theory to say that the speakers’ view of the subject of the honorific as socially superior to him cannot be refuted. That is to say, the speaker of (23) (taken from Potts and Kawahara 2004) could not follow the statement with (24).

\[(23) \quad \text{Sam-ga} \quad \text{o-warai-ninat-ta.} \]

- Sam-NOM subj.hon-laugh-subj.hon-past
  - i. Sam laughed.
  - ii. The speaker honors Sam.

\[(24) \quad \#\text{But I do not view Sam as socially superior to me.} \]

Likewise, another speaker could not challenge this person’s view of Sam as being socially superior at the time of the utterance. As Potts says, “a sincere utterance of (an expressive) cannot be challenged or turn out to be false” (2005: 157).

Regarding the speaker-orientation of the meaning contributed by honorifics, Potts provides the following example shown here as (25)

\[(25) \quad \text{John-wa} \quad \text{[Mary-no okaasan-ga koojyoo-de hataraiterassharu koto-wo] shitteiru.} \]
John knows that Mary’s mother, who is socially superior to me, works in a factory.

In this case, even though the speaker is telling us about something that John said, we only know for sure that it is the speaker who is referring to Mary’s mother in an honorific way. We know nothing about John or even Mary’s feelings towards Mary’s mother.

While Potts does not provide an example specifically linking honorifics with the independence property, we can see in the example shown in (23) that the truth of the at-issue content that Sam laughed and the truth of the CI content that Sam is honored by the speaker have no bearing on each other. Sam may not have actually laughed, but the speaker is still showing honor towards him in this utterance. The speaker might be being sarcastic or deceitful in his use of the honorific form, but this does not affect the truth value of the proposition regarding Sam’s laughter.

Potts and Roeper further expand on Potts’ theory of expressives in their 2006 article. It is in this article where the first mention of the possibility that AFs might be CI contributors is made. Here the authors briefly mention the possibility of T and V forms contributing expressive content, saying that they offer information about the relationship between the interlocutors from the point of view of the speaker. T and V forms, like other expressives, would therefore “express a momentary attitude linked to a situation” (182).
In Potts (2007c) Potts further details his theory of expressives as well as expands on the idea that T and V are an example of such a category. Here he provides six specific properties of expressives as seen in (26)

(26) 1. Independence
2. Nondisplaceability
3. Perspective dependence
4. Descriptive ineffability
5. Immediacy
6. Repeatability

The first four of these properties were discussed specifically with regard to honorifics in Potts and Kawahara (2004). The final two had been hinted at or discussed regarding other forms of expressives in various publications. It is in this article that, using examples from German and claiming to account for “languages like German, Russian, and French … and other languages with this distinction in their pronominal system” (190), Potts (2007c) discusses these characteristics of expressives with relation to the T/V system.

He states that T/V pronouns express content that is independent of the at-issue content and provides the example seen in (27a-b) showing that the same at-issue content can be expressed even with varying AFs.

(27) a. Ich ruf’ dich an.
I call you. FAMILIAR on
I’ll give you a call.
b. Ich rufe Sie an.

I call you. FORMAL on

I’ll give you a call.

He also states that the at-issue content can be argued independently of the content expressed by the pronoun.

In addition, AFs are not bound by operators such as quantifiers and are therefore nondisplaceable. In Potts’ example, repeated here as (28), the quantifier nur does not apply to the familiarity expressed by du in that the utterance could not be interpreted as meaning “only the addressee I am familiar with did his homework” but only as “you, the addressee who I am currently speaking to and happen to be on familiar terms with, did your homework.”

(28) Nur du hast deine Hausaufgabe gemacht.

Only you. FAMILIAR have your. FAMILIAR homework done

Only you did your homework.

Using the example repeated here in (29a-b), he demonstrates both the nondisplaceability and perspective dependence of AFs, claiming that the content expressed by the AFs are to be identified with the speaker in each situation.

(29) a. [School teacher to a waiting parent]

Das Kind sagt, dass Sie seine Mutter sind.

The child says that you. FORMAL its mother are
b.  [Son to his father, a school teacher]

Karl behauptet, dass du seine Hausaufgabe verloren hast.

Karl maintains that you have lost his homework.

Regarding descriptive ineffability, Potts is unsure as to whether or not these AFs are as indefinable as other expressives such as *damn*, but does say that descriptions for their use are extremely complex and not comprehensive.

The immediacy of AFs is evidenced through their “ability to change the expressive setting of a context” (2007c: 191). An example of such a change is discussed in which the use of the “wrong” pronoun, in this case T instead of V, shocks a group of people into silence. He likens the utterance of an expressive to an “emotive performance” (2007c: 180) in which the speaker’s attitude toward the at-issue content or the situation is immediately expressed upon pronouncing the CI trigger. This immediacy also contributes to the fact that CIs are not cancelable; once their triggers are uttered, their work is done.

According to Potts the repeatability quality presents a challenge in this area because of the fact that AFs and/or their morphology must be repeated in many languages. He claims that, as opposed to Japanese honorifics, repetition of T and V forms in the languages at hand “does not deepen the sense of familiarity, nor … iteratively humble the speaker while elevating the addressee” (2007c: 191).
Potts (2007c) suggests that the CIs contributed by T forms is an attitude of familiarity with the addressee and that the CI contributed by V forms is one of formality. He does not explicitly discuss this in any detail.

Kim and Sells (2007) have applied Potts’ theory to honorific forms in Korean in order to determine whether or not their content is conventionally implicated. They claim that, in order for an utterance to be felicitous in Korean, the speaker must provide certain information about the context of the utterance. This information includes the speaker, the hearer, the location, the time, and the proper honorific information. It is honorifics that provide the latter. They claim that honorifics supply this information in the same way as expressives and apply Potts’ theory of expressives to show this. They state that these honorifics contribute an emotive meaning “paralleling but separate from regular propositional meaning” (325). They show that Korean honorifics do not fall under the scope of operators such as negation. They also state, as Potts had previously (2007c), that their repetition strengthens the emotive content expressed and that they are descriptively ineffable because they cannot be paraphrased adequately.

3.4 Critiques of Potts’ Theory

Some critiques have been made of Potts’ work, as introduced above regarding speaker-orientation (Amaral et al. 2007). In addition, critiques have been made of the characteristics of descriptive ineffability, repetition and nondisplaceability. Some researchers have also complained that there is no need for a CI category, using theories of presupposition to account for these meanings.
In addition to their skepticism of the inevitable speaker-orientation of CIs, Amaral et al. (2007) contend that the model requires more pragmatics than Potts discusses in his 2005 book. They claim that no theory could accurately account for CIs without discussing how CIs relate differently than at-issue entailment to the context of any utterance and propose a new definition of at-issue entailment in order to work toward this goal. Their definition is seen in (30).

(30) The felicity of an utterance necessitates that its at-issue content be relevant to the question under discussion.

They claim that this definition allows us to get at the real difference between CIs and at-issue content, namely, that CIs do not have to be relevant to the question under discussion. They may be “asides or interesting but thematically inessential comments on the at-issue content (732).”

Another point brought up by Amaral et al. is that CI content and at-issue content are not necessarily always completely independent. They provide examples in which discourse anaphora occurs between CI and at-issue content such at that seen in (31). In this example, the anaphoric it relies on the content of the supplementary relative who took an exam, for its referent. The content of it is therefore not independent of the content of the supplemental, which is a CI trigger, according to Potts. They claim that this type of interaction must be taken into account by a theory of CIs.

(31) Stan Bronowski, who took an exam, passed it with flying colors.

Aside from the critiques lodged in Amaral et al. (2007), the majority of criticisms to Potts’ theory of CIs appear in the open peer review journal Theoretical Linguistics. In
this journal Potts contributes an article focusing on his theory of expressives which is commented upon by several authors. The majority of these criticisms are in regard to the characteristics of descriptive ineffability, repetition and nondisplaceability, as well as the possibility of accounting for expressives under a theory of presupposition.

Geurts (2007), Jay and Janschewitz (2007), and Schlenker (2007) argue against the characteristic of descriptive ineffability. They claim that there are many words whose definitions “fall short of the full signification of their definienda” (Geurts: 210) and that many so-called CI triggers, such as bastard, are easily defined. He defines bastard as an “unpleasant or despicable person” (210). Jay and Janschewitz claim that some people are simply more adept than others at defining words or putting their feelings into words; the ability to be defined then is not inherent in the word, but it is rather a capability of the speaker.

Potts (2007d) counters in his reply that this characteristic, while not completely testable and perhaps lacking a suitably scientific description, is an essential component of expressives. He states that only observations can tell us that no definition can sufficiently paraphrase the content of these words. He explains that, although a person who is adept at putting his/her feelings into words or manipulating the language might be able to describe why he/she used a certain expressive in a specific situation, this is not akin to them being able to define the word generally.

Regarding repetition, Geurts (2007) brings to the fore several examples of other words that are repeatable without being redundant such as in the phrases “far, far away” or “many, many years ago.”
Schlenker (2007) does not agree that the repetition of expressives heightens their emotive impact and Jay and Janschewitz (2007) stress that repetition does not continually add emphasis to the content expressed. They claim that at some point repetition results in desensitization; the emotional effects no longer accumulate.

In response to these arguments, Potts claims that the fact that other types of words are repeatable as well does not diminish his theory.

Anand (2007), Geurts (2007) and Lasersohn (2007) discuss the possibility that expressives are not nondisplaceable because they can fall under the scope of tense or other operators such as modality or conditionals. According to Anand, expressives can express past emotions (32) or possible emotions (33) (italicized).

(32) My wife often reminds me that *I even once screamed* at my daughter that I would never allow her to marry that bastard Webster. But time has taught me how wrong I was, and I’m incredibly happy to claim that bastard, who I know now is far from a bastard, as my son-in-law today.

(33) [After trying several computers, which fail.] Ok, if this one works I’ll give it to my first born child. But if *it fails*, I’m gonna smash the damn thing in the ground.

Geurts (2007) and Lasersohn (2007) also provide examples such as (34-35) which they claim show that expressive content can fall under the scope of an operator, in this case a conditional (italicized). In all of these cases, the emotional impact is supposed to be hypothetical and therefore do not express the current emotions of the speaker.
(34) *Even if* you’re fucking brilliant, you can still lose the role just because you’re not exactly the right height, look, or body type.

(35) I consider John a saint. But *if* he ever screws me over, I’ll crush the bastard like a bug!

Potts considers that the problem might be that we are relying too heavily on our own judgments to determine whether or not a particular expressive is being used with past reference or is falling under the scope of an operator in some utterance. He calls for new techniques to be designed that can answer these questions.

Finally, Sauerland (2007) and Schlenker (2007) both claim that expressives could be accounted for under a theory of presupposition and that therefore a separate category of meaning is not required. They both state that expressives are carriers of presuppositions that happen to be indexical and Schlenker adds that they are also attitudinal and sometimes shiftable. According to these authors, there is no reason that presuppositions cannot display these characteristics.

Potts reminds us again of the independence property (discussed above) which he believes so neatly distinguishes CIs from presuppositions.

In his response, Potts also mentions that, while he has focused on the semantics of the issue, he is in agreement with the thought that pragmatics must be brought in to the arena in order to fully describe the behavior of expressives, and therefore the behavior of CIs. He expresses his agreement with Geurts’ view that any theory of the use of expressives/CIs “will have to rely on world knowledge and pragmatic inference” (214).
I believe that Potts’ theory of CI holds great promise to be able to account for AFs; that this theory in fact describes (at least in part) the manner in which social information is imparted into an utterance. Part of the meaning contributed by the AFs displays the characteristics of CI; it is encoded by the AF but yet not part of the at-issue entailment. More specifically, AFs will be shown to have an expressive meaning which is independent if the at-issue entailments, nondisplaceable, dependent on the perspective of the speaker, ineffable, immediate, and repeatable. These characteristics will be explored using the methods discussed in the following chapter.

Because I do not believe that all social meanings attributed to AFs are CIs, I will also explore the notion of conversational implicature. I hypothesize that not all meanings contributed by AFs are entailed by them; these meanings are cancelable and can be accounted for using the theory of conversational implicature.

3.5 Conversational Implicature

The notion of conversational implicature was born out of the work of Grice and has been one of the primary foci of pragmatic research since. The notion was developed in an effort to categorize certain types of meaning that might be expressed by an utterance that go beyond what the speaker actually said. The basic components of Grice’s (1989) theory of conversational implicature (CVI) were described in the previous section. To reiterate, conversational implicatures add to the meaning of an utterance but do not rely on the meaning of any word in that utterance to do so. The meaning associated with a conversational implicature comes from the context of an utterance.
To go into further detail, a conversational implicature is produced (and understood) through the interplay of the words used by a speaker, the Cooperative Principle, and the context of the utterance, which also includes background information. The Cooperative Principle is repeated in (36).

(36) Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

Grice explains that rational people generally follow this principle when communicating and maintains that it could be extended to other forms of behavior as well. Grice further explains the functioning of the Cooperative Principle by breaking it down into four categories, each of which is further broken down into maxims. The categories and maxims of the Cooperative Principle are seen in (37).

(37) I. Quality

a. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the purpose of the exchange).

b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

II. Quality

a. Do not say what you believe to be false.

b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

III. Relation

a. Be relevant.
IV. Manner

a. Avoid obscurity of expression.

b. Avoid ambiguity.

c. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

d. Be orderly.

In order to see how this interplay works, let us look at a few examples. We will first view examples of what Grice calls particularized conversational implicature or, “cases in which there is no room for the idea that an implicature of this sort is normally carried by saying that $p$” (37).

Imagine the utterance in (38). Spoken void of any context, it leaves a lot to be desired. We do not know whose dog this is, where the dog is, or why this information would be of interest to anyone. However, with the knowledge that it was spoken by Veronica to a firefighter who has arrived to extinguish a fire at her home, a lot more information can be gathered without adding another word to the utterance.

(38) My dog is inside.

In this case the speaker would most likely be conversationally implicating something along the lines of (39).

(39) Get my dog out of the house.

While the speaker did not actually tell the firefighter to get her dog out of the house, the firefighter can rightfully infer this implicature based on the interplay of the words, the Cooperative Principle and the context of the utterance. The firefighter will assume that the dog is in the house as far as the speaker knows because she would not
have said what she believed to be false or that for which she lacked evidence. He will assume that the words spoken to him are relevant to this context and therefore that the dog is inside the house that is on fire. Based on his knowledge of fires, he will know that the dog must be gotten out of the house. Because of the implicatures produced by this interplay, the speaker did not need to waste precious time telling the firefighter (40).

(40) My dog is in my house, which is the one on fire. The fire will kill my dog if you do not get her out of the house. Get my dog out of the house and bring her to me.

Now imagine the same utterance (38), this time it is being said by the speaker at work just after she and a coworker, Gabe, notice that it is pouring outside. Now Gabe will not infer that Veronica wants him to get her dog out of the house, as in the previous example, because the context here is completely different. Veronica did not need to say exactly where her dog was, because Gabe can assume based on his knowledge of Veronica and her dog or even on his knowledge of the general habits of dog owners that the dog is in Veronica’s house (or perhaps in the dog’s own doghouse). Gabe, without other information suggesting the contrary, will assume that Veronica is telling the truth. He will also assume that Veronica’s comment is relevant and therefore infer that the dog is not getting wet in the rain. Gabe will assume that Veronica only has one dog; otherwise her utterance would have been ambiguous. By only uttering (38), Veronica has implicated (at least) all the information spelled out in (41) and Gabe is in turn able to infer all of this information.
(41) I have one dog and she is not outside in the rain. She is in the house and is therefore not getting wet right now.

These examples show that it is not words alone that allow speakers to express meaning. Many meanings are expressed and understood by virtue of the context in which they are spoken and the (subconscious) knowledge of the Cooperative Principle adhered to by both speaker and hearer.

Now let us look at another form of CVI, generalized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicatures are implicatures that always rise when a particular utterance is made unless something about the context prohibits it from arising. In the previous examples, one could not say that “Get my dog out of the house” always arises from the utterance “My dog is inside;” in fact that implicature would require very specific contextual factors to be present. However an utterance such as (42) always conversationally implicates (43) unless blocked by the context.

(42) Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese.

(43) Andrew did not eat all of his macaroni cheese.

According to scholars such as Horn (2004), (42) implicates (43) because, if the speaker had known that Andrew ate all of his macaroni and cheese, he would have said so. If he had known that Andrew ate all of the macaroni and cheese but only stated (42), he could be accused of not making his contribution as informative as required and the hearer might respond with (44).

(44) He didn’t eat MOST of it, he ate ALL of it!
However the implicature in (43) might be blocked in the following context:
Andrew will not get dessert unless he eats most of his macaroni and cheese. Andrew is so excited about getting dessert that he eats all of his macaroni and cheese to make sure that he can have some. After the meal, his dad looks at his plate and then asks his mom (45). His mom responds with (46).

(45) Did Andrew eat most of his macaroni and cheese?
(46) Yes, Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese.

In this case Andrew’s mother is making her contribution as informative as required, because it is only of interest whether or not Andrew has eaten most of his macaroni and cheese; it essentially does not matter if he has eaten it all or not.

Conversational implicatures of both types display the properties of being cancelable, nondetachable and calculable.

We have already seen an example of the cancelability of CVIs (in the case of Andrew and his macaroni and cheese). However this is not the only way that CVIs can be canceled. They might be canceled explicitly. Say for a moment that Andrew’s dad had not seen his plate. Andrew’s mom might have canceled the implicature that Andrew did not eat all of his macaroni and cheese by stating (47).

(47) Yes, Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese. Actually, he ate all of it!

Conversational implicatures are nondetachable in that any two (or more) utterances with the same literal meaning uttered in the same context will produce identical CVIs. Let us return to the utterance in (38), repeated here as (48).
(48)  My dog is inside.

Veronica might have said any number of phrases with the same truth conditions, such as (49-51) and still produced the same CVI repeated in (52).

(49)  My dog is in the house.
(50)  My puppy is in there.
(51)  Sadie is inside.
(52)  Get my dog out of the house.

Conversational implicatures are calculable in that they can be calculated using the maxims if the Cooperative Principle in combination with the context. Examples of how this works were shown above.

The notion of CVIs has been one of the most influential in the area of pragmatics. Two of the most noteworthy researchers who have attempted to improve upon Grice’s original model have been Laurence Horn and Stephen Levinson.

Horn (1984) believes that Grice’s maxims are superfluous and he attempts to boil them down to just the essentials. He claims that, aside from the maxim of quality, there are two principles involved in rational communication: Quantity (Q) and Relation (R). Both of these principles are followed by the speaker, one for the benefit of the hearer (The Q Principle), and the other in interest of the speaker himself (The R Principle). These principles are shown in (53)-(54).

(53)  The Q Principle:

    Make your contribution sufficient.

    Say as much as you can.
(54) The R Principle

Make your contribution necessary.

Say no more than you must.

It is the Q Principle which allows utterances such as (42) to produce implicatures such as (43). According to Horn,

If I tell you that [Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese], I license you to draw the inference that [he did not eat all of it]. (If I knew [he did], and this knowledge was relevant to your interests, it would have been incumbent on me to obey the Q Principle and say so; the assumption that I am obeying Quantity allows you to infer that I did not know for a fact that the stronger predication – [that Andrew ate all of the macaroni and cheese] - held.) (13)

It is the R Principle that explains how the utterance in (42) can produce the implicature in (43). Veronica says no more than she absolutely has to for the firefighter to understand that she wants her dog out of the house. Because the firefighter can assume that Veronica is obeying the R Principle, he can infer that, upon saying that the dog is inside, she actually means more than just that.

Just as under Grice’s theory, CVIs under Horn’s model are cancelable, calculable and detachable.

Levinson (2000) also believed that Grice’s maxims were superfluous, but he called for three principles that he believes interlocutors follow in rational communication. The fact that interlocutors follow these principles is to explain the possibility and nature of CVIs. He invokes the principles of Quantity (Q), Informativeness (I) and Manner (M).
He divided each into two maxims, one directed at the speaker of an utterance, and one directed at the hearer. These principles, along with their maxims are seen in a simplified version in (55).

(55) The Q Principle

Speaker: Say as much as is consistent with the facts (bearing the I-principle in mind).

Addressee: Assume the speaker made the strongest statement possible in accordance to what he knows.

The I-Principle

Speaker: Say as little as necessary (bearing the Q-principle in mind).

Addressee: Amplify the informational content of the utterance to the most specific interpretation possible.

The M principle

Speaker: Indicate abnormal situations using marked expressions.

Addressee: Marked expressions indicate abnormal situations.

If both speaker and hearer are following the three heuristics described by Levinson (and each assumes that the other is following them), default interpretations arise from certain expressions. Note that in the “Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese” example, the default interpretation will always be that he did not eat all of it unless something in the context tells us that this is not the case. On the contrary, in the “My dog is inside” example, there really is no default interpretation. There is no
implicature that is conveyed “unless;” the implicature will vary from context to context. According to Levinson (2000), these default interpretations are a key component of human language that must be accounted for. These default interpretations are the GCIs associated with particular utterance types. Levinson claims that GCIs belong to a layer of meaning which he calls utterance-type meaning. Levinson claims that this type of meaning lies in between what is said and utterance-token meaning, or PCI. According to Levinson, a theory of utterance-token meaning accounts for those CVIs that are directly dependent on context, such as the “My dog is inside” example seen above. A theory of utterance-type meaning on the other hand would account for CVIs that come through almost without regard to context, such as the “Andrew ate most of his macaroni and cheese” example above. These implicatures are not based “on direct computations about speaker-intentions, but rather on general expectations about how language is normally used” (Levinson 1995 93; emphasis in original). A theory of GCIs can therefore explain how it is that certain expressions are conventionally used to implicate certain meanings across a variety of contexts. Because these implicatures are expressed and can be inferred in such a wide variety of contexts, it is difficult to group them with PCIs, which will not be inferred equally in different contexts. Because GCIs remain cancelable, Levinson is against grouping them with “what is said.”

The phenomenon of conversational implicature will be utilized in this study of AFs.
3.6 Previous Pragmatic or Semantic Approaches to Address Forms

Many researchers have alluded to the meanings of AFs being examples of CIs, CVIs or presupposition; many simply do so off-hand, without much of an explanation. A summary of such claims follows.

The idea that a pronoun presupposes the existence of its referent is explored in depth by Roberts (2005) and mentioned by many other investigators including Atlas (2004), Marsen (2006; discussing Frege’s original model of presuppositions) and Horn (1989). The felicitous use of a particular AF relies on the existence of a referent that corresponds to its person, number, and gender features. I have found no counter-claim to this idea. However, this only covers the personally deictic referent of the AFs, not the socially deictic information, and is therefore of little interest to the present investigation.

Claims that the socially deictic features of second person pronouns are also presupposed have been made (or alluded to) by several authors. Fasold (1990) says that “using vous can be said to ‘presuppose’ that the addressee is either non-solidary with or more powerful than the speaker” (168; emphasis in original). He claims that an utterance will be pragmatically infelicitous, but still comprehensible and falsifiable, if such a presupposition proves to be false.

Voegelin (1977) develops a theory in which the correct usage of Japanese honorifics relies on the existence of what she terms “presupposed cultural spaces.” If an honorific is used which indexes a certain presupposed culture space that does not match the culture space assumed by the hearer, the utterance will result in the hearer taking offense.
Blas Arroyo (1995) hypothesizes that the alternation of AFs in Spanish triggers the presuppositions necessary for the hearer to understand the meaning of the alternation. For example, an alternation in form might tell the hearer that the presuppositions about their relationship have changed.

Brown and Levinson (1987) argue such theories. They state that “hitherto the basic assumption in the study of address forms has generally been that their usage presupposes certain social attributes of their referents” (182). They declare that, based on their findings, address forms are more accurately described as vehicles of politeness that can mitigate possible face threatening acts, therefore they do not rely on any presupposed context.

Other investigators have alluded to AFs as being contributors of CIs; there is very little elaboration on this. Abbot (2006) merely includes them as an example on a list of CIs.

Levinson (2004) mentions the view of Shibitani (1999) that “the contents of honorifics should be taken to be conventional implicatures overlaid on the referential content, for the deictic content is not cancelable and does fall under the scope of logical operators” (121). This can and will be shown to be true later on in this paper.

Tsohatzidis (1992) says that the social distance conveyed by a V form is conventionally implicated. He claims that T forms differ from V forms in that they conventionally implicate something other than social distance, without expanding on what this might be.
Lambert and Tucker (1976) state that the socially deictic information conveyed by AFs is “not the central theme of communication, rather (it) comes as (an) indirect, incidental, and subtle adjunct () to the more purposeful interaction” (143). In their research they do not actually label the socially deictic information as conventional implicature; however, this description matches Potts’ description of CI.

Levinson (1979) claims that the socially deictic meanings related to address forms and other honorifics is conventionally implicated. Using examples from Tamil, he explains how they follow Grice’s definition of conventional implicature, and are therefore related to words such as *but* and *even*. The meanings associated with T and V forms are not part of the truth conditional content of the utterance; they do not fall under the scope of negation, modals, or verbs of saying or believing. They are not cancellable or calculated and they are detachable. He also states that some politeness related usages are results of conversational implicature.

Ardila (2003) states that T and V forms contribute “semantic conversational implicatures, i.e. implicatures that regulate formality in locutionary acts (79).” She claims that these are implicatures of “quality and degree (79)” and that their correct use adheres to the quality maxim of conversation.

Fitch, as reported in Placencia and Garcia (2007) claims that AFs have no inherent meaning and all associated meanings are by virtue of context and the choice of one over the other.

Ford (1995) claims that the social meanings associate with AFs and other honorifics include “distance, politeness, deference, self-effacement, formality, restraint
and reserve” (756). She mentions that these meanings are “implicated” but does not elaborate as to how this is so or what kind of implication or implicature it might be.

This summary of the pragmatic explanations of address forms demonstrates that this is an area in which there is a need for in depth study as well as consistency in terminology.

3.7 Indexical Fields

Eckert (2008) discusses the concept of the indexical field in association with phonological variants in English. According to her, these variants, such as the alveolar vs. the velar pronunciation of the present participle (-ing) form, do not carry specific meanings. They are, however, associated with contextual characteristics. For example, the velar variant is often associated with education while the alveolar can be associated with laziness. These associations are contextually based; while they may be associated with these characteristics at times, other times they may be associated with characteristics such as pretentiousness and unpretentiousness, respectively. The array of possible associations for a given variant makes up its “indexical field.” Eckert defines an indexical field as a “constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable” (1). These associations differ from conversational implicatures in that a speaker may not have any intention of expressing them when using the form they are associated with. This notion will therefore prove to be useful in accounting for characteristics, such as age, that are so often associated with AFs but don’t seem to be purposefully implicated by the speaker.
3.8 Conclusion

I hypothesize that all non-referential meanings associated with AFs are either conversationally or conventionally implicated. I intend to demonstrate that there is one constant value always attributed by the V form. This content is entailed by the utterance but not part of the at-issue content; it is a conventional implicature. Other meanings associated with the V form and those associated with the T form are variable. They may be implicated in certain contexts but not others. They are cancelable. These meanings are conversationally implicated. In addition, there is an indexical field of contextual characteristics associated with the forms which are contextually determined and recognized by interlocutors but not necessarily conversationally implicated by the speaker.
Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1 Previous work on address forms

A vast amount of research has been completed in the area of address form usage. Much of the research in Spanish was described above, as were several investigations undertaken in other languages. In each of these studies the methodology used reflected the goals of the study. The goals differed from researcher to researcher, but in general they were seeking to answer one or more of the following questions: Who addresses whom with which address form? What do the address forms mean? When or why is one form chosen over another? What benefits does a speaker gain in choosing one form over another? How has the use of the forms changed throughout history?

The most popular methodologies that have been used to investigate these questions in previous studies include written questionnaires, oral interviews, observation and literary analysis. Each of these methods has its advantages and its drawbacks and these will be discussed in turn.

According to Braun (1988) a researcher can gather a great amount of data from interviews and questionnaires; however there will always be some discrepancy between what the informants say they do and what they actually do. An informant may try to tell the investigator what he thinks the investigator wants to hear. An informant might try to show the investigator that he knows how to use “‘good’ language” (72). Braun also
discusses the simple fact that some informants are better than others. She classifies “better” as someone who has good intuitions about their language and is able to/enjoys talking about it. A good informant will also provide information, stories, anecdotes, etc., without being prompted. Despite all of its drawbacks, Braun maintains that the problems associated with interviews and questionnaires are not as prominent in AF research as in other domains because most speakers are consciously aware of how they use these forms. I agree with Braun in this respect. Speakers do seem to be highly cognizant of how they use AFs. They can tell you with whom they use which form, generally without (much) hesitation. This is not to say that their reports are 100% faithful to their actual performance. In fact, one informant in the current study reported that it was possible that at times he was not conscious of which form he chose in a specific situation. Specifically, he stated that he thought he addressed his doorman with the V form but that he very well might address him with the T form without realizing it sometimes.

Another issue is that of memory. To my knowledge no researcher has reported this problem, but it is quite possible that an informant might simply have forgotten which AF they used on a specific occasion. An informant in this study told me during the interview that he always addressed his ex-girlfriend’s dad with the V form. After the interview he remembered that he actually did not do so. However, as Braun indicated, speakers’ reports of AF usage are more accurate than their reports of other linguistic variables.

Among the other benefits that Braun associates with interviews and questionnaires is the ease with which one can gather specific and systematic data without
having to wait for it to come up naturally, as is necessary with observation or textual research. For example, an investigator might be interested in AF use in the workplace in Nicaragua. This investigator could conduct observations daily but might never witness interactions between certain members of the staff. The investigator might not be able to compare the AFs used during lunch vs. those used during a meeting for example. This would not be because these interactions do not occur or because AFs are not used in these situations. It may just be happenstance that the investigator is not able to witness them while there.

With the interview or questionnaire it is also easier to systematically select informants according to the criteria designated by the researcher in order to control for variables such as sex, age, or socioeconomic background. In this way, a researcher can study AF use among a certain age group or examine the differences in AF use by people of differing social backgrounds. If the investigator is relying on observation or pre-existing material he will not have as much control (if any) over the selection of informants.

Jaramillo (1990) agrees that the questionnaire/interview method is beneficial in the study of AFs and supports its use. She claims that other methodologies are not structured enough and that they rely too much on personal opinion. Jaramillo therefore chose a structured questionnaire as her method of research on AF usage in New Mexico and in Arizona (1990, 1996). She attempted to overcome the problems she saw in other studies by selecting her informants to equally represent the sociolinguistic characteristics that she believed would most affect AF usage: age, gender and education level. She
modeled her questionnaire after that of Lambert and Tucker (1976). In this questionnaire she presented informants with a series of interlocutors such as mother, grandparent or comadre (the mother of one’s godchild or the godmother of one’s child), and asked them whether they would use tú or usted when addressing each one and in turn whether they would be addressed as tú or usted in each case. This type of data may have taken years to collect via observation. In fact, such data may never have been collected if the author hadn’t been able to observe an interaction between nephew and aunt, for example.

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) suggests, as did Braun, that observation is generally not a very reliable methodology because of the fact that it is often unsystematic and random. However, she claims that if done in a structured way the results obtained can be fairly reliable. In addition, because of the (near) elimination of the observer’s paradox, the results can be assumed to be more accurate than those obtained through direct questioning. If the informants do not know they are being observed, their AF use can be said to be natural; they won’t be trying to “show off,” as might happen in an interview or questionnaire.

Blas Arroyo (1994) employed structured observation in his study of AFs in Spain. He designed his observation by employing the help of specific people who would interact with a set interlocutor type in a set context. The informant in these cases did not know that his use of AFs was being studied. This allowed the results to be more consistent and reliable than would have been possible with random observation.

As discussed by Taavitsainen and Jucker (2003), certain factors need to be taken into account when conducting research of this sort using literary analysis (specifically on
historical texts). These factors boil down to author interference, copier error and the fact that the type of document/genre of the work may play a role in how AFs are employed. There is also the issue stated by Braun (1988) that the investigator has no control over what kind of data he finds. Therefore researchers might never encounter all of the information that might be of interest to them. However keeping these factors in mind, Taavitsainen and Jucker suggest that letters, court records and drama can be excellent sources of data.

The techniques described above have been used in many AF studies to date. The written questionnaire and the oral interview will be adapted and utilized in the current study.

4.2 Methodology used in the current study

To my knowledge, this is one of the first studies of the pragmatic properties of AFs. Because of this, I have looked into the methodologies used to test for conversational and conventional implicatures as well. Most studies investigating the pragmatic properties of various linguistic forms involve qualitative analysis of relatively few data and are often based on the author’s own intuitions. The results of various tests for implicatures, such as the cancelation test described above, are arrived at by the investigator. Many aspects of the current investigation required an improvement on this type of methodology. The first and most obvious reason to veer from this methodology was the fact that this investigator is not a native speaker of Peninsular Spanish. Therefore, any intuition of hers would have to be supported by a native speaker. Secondly, it was unclear what implicatures or meanings the speakers of this dialect associated with the
forms. In a typical cancelation test, the implicature being canceled is known ahead of time. The myriad research completed on AFs has provided many possible meanings that are associated with one form or the other. As shown above, these meanings varied geographically as well as socially. For this investigation, it was necessary to determine which of these meanings were valid in Peninsular Spanish. In turn it was necessary to determine whether each of these meanings was conveyed via conventional or conversational implicature (or by some other means). Due to these factors, a mixture of methodological types has been implemented in order to obtain the necessary data. The data had to be both qualitative and quantitative in order to achieve the goals of the study. A large amount of information was needed in order to determine the many possible meanings of AFs that were to be tested and in turn all of these meanings had to be examined. Because each informant might only provide one possible meaning, many informants were required.

In this study I have employed the use of the oral interview and the written questionnaire to qualitatively and quantitatively investigate the properties of AFs. The details of these are discussed in section 4.2.1.

4.2.1 The Oral Interview and Written Questionnaire

Both an oral interview and a written questionnaire were utilized in an attempt to counterbalance the advantages and drawbacks of each approach. These methods were chosen because of their relative efficiency in obtaining specific data in a systematized way. The data required for this dissertation are of a fairly specific nature, therefore encountering sufficient data using methods such as observation and literature analysis
would have been nearly impossible. As a case in point, while completing this investigation, I never personally witnessed an instance in which a speaker used *usted* in a disdainful way or switched AF in a moment of anger. Because of this, my only option was to give the informants the opportunity to talk about these, and other, particular cases.

The oral interviews were advantageous because they allowed the informants to speak at length on the topic if desired. This format also allowed both the investigator and the informant to ask for clarification on responses and questions. It also allowed the investigator to ask follow-up questions and expand on the discussion. With these advantages there would be the potential to gather data beyond that originally sought through the scripted questions. The major disadvantage to the oral interviews proved to be the quantity of informants that could be obtained during the research period. The interviews had to be completed individually in order to avoid undue influence on each informant’s responses.

The written questionnaires were designed to increase the number of informants, thereby improving the reliability of the research. The majority of the questions included in the oral interviews were also included on the written questionnaires. Questions that required more time to answer were not included. The major drawbacks of the questionnaire included the fact that there was no opportunity for clarification on the part of the investigator or the informant. Because of this, some responses consisted of a “no entiendo la pregunta” or “no sé.” Other responses could not be interpreted by the researcher because they were either illegible or off-topic. In addition, the informants were limited in the length of their responses and there was no opportunity for follow-up
questions. Finally, the questionnaires were often completed in groups. The informants were asked not to discuss their answers with one another; however the researcher had no control over whether or not they actually did. Any possible discussion may have influenced some of the informants’ responses. Despite these drawbacks, the written questionnaires did prove to provide valuable information regarding the characteristics of \textit{tú} and \textit{usted}.

The interviews and questionnaires used in this study differ significantly, however, from those used in previous studies. As described above, this methodology has typically consisted of presenting informants with various interlocutors and/or situations. They are then asked which AF they would use in that situation or which AF they would expect to receive. This line of questioning does not get at the meaning of the forms or how it is contributed. In the questions that make up the interviews and questionnaires in this study, the informants are never presented with a context in this manner. In this study there are questions which are designed so that the informant actually provides this contextual information. While this is still a “self-report” on the part of the informant, there is less influence on their responses because of the way the questions are formatted; the informants themselves provide the relevant information. In addition, contextual features that the investigator might not think of have the opportunity to arise. Possibly more importantly, the informants will not be forced to discuss preconceived contexts that they may not actually have any experience with and that have nothing to do with their everyday lives.
The implicature tests are also unique in that they are meant to be performed by the informants, not by the investigator. Such a method is not typical of pragmatic tests. This is advantageous, once again, because the responses to these tests are less influenced by preconceived notions about how they should be answered. There are various tests for both conventional and conversational implicature that will be described in detail in this chapter. In order to complete the tests, the informants are asked to put themselves in various situations in which the tests must be performed naturally and the informants actually get to decide how to perform them. For example, in order to test for the property of independence that is characteristic of conventional implicature, the informants are presented with a situation (Question 1, seen in (2) below) that provides them with the opportunity to argue the truth of the content presented or not. The test is performable regardless of whether or not they choose to argue in this way. As another example, I will discuss the cancellation tests used in this dissertation. As seen in Chapter 3, cancellation is the key characteristic of conversationally implicated content. This test is presented in several different ways to the informants. In most cases they choose both the content to be cancelled and in doing so cancel that very content at the same time. In this way, the social content of the AFs is determined by the informants, not the researcher.

The questions used for the oral interviews and written questionnaires were designed to elicit the meanings associated with the AFs as well as to test for some of the characteristics of conventional implicature (expressive content) and conversational implicature, as well as to encourage the informants to discuss their use of AFs. The oral interviews and the written questionnaires contained, for the most part, the same
questions. The questions that were excluded from the written questionnaire were those which took more time to answer than the others or required more explanation. Questions which were included only in the oral interviews will be marked with an OI. When a question is being discussed in this dissertation, it will be labeled with the question number corresponding to the oral interview. All questions can be seen in Appendix A (oral interview) and Appendix B (written questionnaire). All questions were asked using the T form. This decision was made for several reasons. First, most of the informants were approached on college campuses or were introduced to me via a third party. In addition, I felt that using the T form would allow the informants to feel more comfortable; it would put them more at ease than would be possible with the V form. This prediction was seen to be true based on the comments made by many informants during the interviews. Making them feel as comfortable as possible was necessary in order to decrease the effect of the observer’s paradox. Another option would have been to formulate all the questions using impersonal verb forms. However these types of questions generally prove to be awkward and difficult to understand (evidenced by the fact that the 1 impersonal question included in the interviews often had to be repeated). In addition, I did not want the informants to view the situations presented to them as being impersonal, but rather to feel that they were in those situations themselves. Because of the need for consistency, the T form was used most questions in all interviews and questionnaires. Some of the situations presented to the informants were set up using the V form in order to elicit their reaction to the form and, as mentioned above, there was one
question that was phrased impersonally. If the informant used the same form as the question in their response, this is not indicated.

In the oral interviews not all questions were asked of all informants. Some informants were asked additional questions not asked of others. Question selection was based on the flow of each individual interview. In some cases, an informant would inadvertently answer a question before it was posed. Some questions were added, deleted or modified during the interview process based on the commentary of the informants. Questions were modified or deleted if they proved to be confusing for the informants. This was generally because they were too abstract and had to be made more concrete in order to elicit responses.

All of the questions were designed with several goals in mind. The questions that I planned to answer are seen in (1).

(1) What is the social content associated with \( \text{tú} \)?

What is the social content associated with \( \text{usted} \)?

Is this content conveyed via conventional implicature, conversational implicature, or are they part of the at-issue content of the utterance?

In order to avoid undue influence on the content provided by the informants, the majority of the questions did not reference any particular content or association. This allowed for the speakers to provide me with the content or associations that came to them naturally. A common drawback in previous studies has been that the researcher used predetermined meanings of the forms. By not doing this, I was able to obtain a broad
array of possible meanings and avoid the possibility of influencing the informants to say them.

The characteristics of conventional implicature triggers that were tested for in the oral interviews and written questionnaires were independence, immediacy, nondisplaceability, perspective dependence and descriptive ineffability. Repeatability was not tested specifically because of the inherent difficulty that AFs must be repeated in some form any time reference is made to the addressee; however some comments made by informants will be used to show that AFs possibly show this characteristic.

According to Potts (2007c), expressive content is independent of at-issue content in that each can be argued independently of the other. This property was tested using Question 1 (2) in which the informant was presented with two versions of a situation. In this situation a woman claims that the informant is a friend of her relative. In one version the informant is told that he/she does not know this woman’s relative. In the other version they are asked to disagree with the AF used by the woman. In each case the informants were asked to disagree with either the at-issue content or the content associated with the AF. Some informants were addressed by the woman as usted and some of the informants were addressed by the woman as tú. This was decided randomly in situ. The at-issue content of each utterance was the information that the informant is a friend of this woman’s relative. The content associated with the AF was not determined by the researcher, but left open to interpretation by the informant. This question was always asked first, before the informant could deduce that the interview was about address
forms. This was done in order to avoid undue influence on the way they responded to the woman in the question.

(2) Question 1

a. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

Imagine that you are on the street in a city where you don’t know anyone and a woman approaches you and say “You are TÚ a friend of my son/daughter/brother/sister, right?” How would you respond?

b. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

Imagine that you are on the street in a city where you don’t know anyone and a woman approaches you and say “You are USTED a friend of my son/daughter/brother/sister, right?” How would you respond?

c. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de usted. ¿Cómo le responderías?

Imagine that you are on the street in a city where you don’t know anyone and a woman approaches you and say “You are USTED a friend of my son/daughter/brother/sister, right?” You believe that she is the
mother/sister of your friend, but you don’t think she should have addressed you as USTED. How would you respond?

d. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de tú. ¿Cómo le responderías?

Imagine that you are on the street in a city where you don’t know anyone and a woman approaches you and say “You are TÚ a friend of my son/daughter/brother/sister, right?” You believe that she is the mother/sister of your friend, but you don’t think she should have addressed you as TÚ. How would you respond?

Address forms will be shown to carry content that is independent of the at-issue content if the informants are able to argue each type of content separately. The informants should be able to deny the fact that they are friends of this woman’s relative while accepting the AF with which she has addressed them. They should also be able to agree that they are friends of her relative while rejecting her choice of AF. They might answer along the lines of “Yes, I am a friend of your son, but there is no need to address me as usted” or “No, I do not know your son.” If this is the case, we will have evidence that AFs are characterized by the property of independence. If informants are unable to argue these pieces of information independently, then AFs will not be shown to impart meaning that is independent of the at-issue content.
Nondisplaceability is the “here and now” property of expressive content. According to Potts (2007c) the content of a CI trigger can only be understood to be valid at the time of utterance. Because of this, it does not fall under the scope of operators. Immediacy is the label used to describe the immediate effect that CIs have on the context in which they are uttered. These characteristics were tested using Question 2 in (3).

(3) Question 2

a. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de usted. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de tú?

Think of someone that you address as ‘USTED’. Who is this person? What would happen if tomorrow you address him/her as TÚ?

b. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de tú. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de usted?

Think of someone that you address as ‘TÚ’. Who is this person? What would happen if tomorrow you address him/her as ‘USTED’?

With these questions we are investigating the effects of a sudden switch in AF. If the content is immediate and nondisplaceable, the switch should be readily noticed and the addressee should assume that the content associated with the new AF is being directed at him at the time of its utterance. According to Potts (2007c), it is the immediacy property which allows switches of AF to be so perceptible. Therefore, if informants confirm this, the content associated with tú and usted may be characterized as being immediate.
Content that is nondisplaceable also does not fall under the scope of operators such as negation. Examples of this will not be sought specifically, but any naturally occurring examples will be used to either support or refute the claim that AF content is nondisplaceable.

The ineffability property, or the impossibility of defining CI content adequately, was tested using the questions in (4).

(4) Question 3 oI

a. Imagináate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de usted, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del usted, pero usando el tú?

Imagine a situation in which you want to ask someone on the street for directions. You want to address them as ‘USTED’, but this form no longer exists. How could you express the same effect using ‘TÚ’?

b. Imagínate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de tú, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del tú, pero usando el usted?

Imagine a situation in which you want to ask someone on the street for directions. You want to address them as ‘TÚ’, but this form no longer exists. How could you express the same effect using ‘USTED’?

In this case the informants were asked to express the meaning of each AF without using that AF. The “meaning” of each AF was left to the interpretation of the informant. The ease with which the informants replaced the content of the AFs would speak to the
ineffability of that AF. If the informants were able to paraphrase the AF, then AFs could not be said to be ineffable. However, if the informants could not easily paraphrase the AFs this would support the case that they do display the property of ineffability. The “comfort” of the informants and the “ease” with which they paraphrased the AF content was judged based on the informants’ statements. Some explicitly stated that the task was impossible or difficult. These reactions were used to determine the ease or difficulty of the task.

The perspective dependence property was tested using two variations on an indirect quotation test. The first test used is seen in (5). The intention of this test was to learn whether or not the content of the AF always had to be attributed to the speaker. In this case the informant was asked to imagine that he/she was on the street with a friend. A stranger passes by and informs the friend that he/she has dropped his/her wallet. The stranger addresses the friend as _usted_. The friend did not hear the stranger; therefore the informant must tell the friend what the stranger said.

(5) Question 4 OI

a. Estás en la calle con un amigo. Alguien pasa y le dice a tu amigo “Se le ha caído la billetera.” Tu amigo no lo ha escuchado y te pregunta “¿Qué me ha dicho?” Tú respondes “Dijo que _______________.”

You are on the street with a friend. Someone passes by and says to your friend “You _usted_ dropped your wallet.” Your friend didn’t hear him and asks you “What did he say?” You respond “He said that __.”
b. ¿Qué dirías si quisieras que tu amigo supiese que el hombre le había tratado de usted?

What would you say if you wanted your friend to know that the passerby had addressed him using ‘USTED’?

Another version of the indirect quotation test was used to determine the perspective dependence of the CI content of AFs is seen in (6). In this case, the informants were given a situation in which an indirect quote was directed to them and they were asked to attribute the AF to either the current speaker or the speaker being quoted.

(6) Question 5 OI

a. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor Gonzále ha dicho que le quiere ver en su oficina.”

¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de usted? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?

A co-worker says to you “Mr. Gonzalez wants to see you USTED in his office.” Who has referred to you using ‘USTED’, your co-worker or Mr. Gonzalez?

b. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor González ha dicho que te quiere ver en su oficina.”

¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de tú? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?
A co-worker says to you “Mr. Gonzalez wants to see you TÚ in his office.” Who has referred to you using ‘TÚ’, your co-worker or Mr. Gonzalez?

If the content of AFs is indeed conventionally implicated or expressive content, then it will only be attributable to the speaker. This will be shown in the first test if the informant uses the tú form when quoting the stranger rather than repeating the usted form used by the stranger. In the second test the informants must attribute the AF to the coworker who has reported the speech of their boss in order to show perspective independence. If the speakers either repeat the usted form used by the stranger or attribute the AF to the boss the perspective independence of AF content will not be supported.

The questions discussed above were designed in order to determine whether or not AF social content might be conventionally implicated. Because it was not known what, if any, social content was conventionally implicated ahead of time, tests for CVI were completed in order to determine which of the social meanings were cancelable. Those which were not cancelable but had passed the CI tests, would be considered to be conventionally implicated.
In order to test for conversational implicatures, many varieties of cancelation tests were attempted in the interviews and in the questionnaire. The different versions used are seen in (7-12)\(^4\).

(7) Question 6

(a) Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de usted pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tratado de usted pero ____________________________.
   Imagine that someone has addressed as ‘USTED’ but you don’t think he/she should have. How would you complete this response?
   You addressed me as ‘USTED’ but ____________________________.

(b) Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de tú pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tuteado pero ____________________________.
   Imagine that someone has addressed as ‘TÚ’ but you don’t think he/she should have. How would you complete this response?
   You addressed me as ‘TÚ’ but ____________________________.

(8) Question 7

(a) Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de usted, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?

---

\(^4\) Question 8 is not discussed here because it was asked of very few informants and elicited few results. The purpose of Question 8 was to elicit cancelable meanings but other questions proved to better serve this purpose.
“Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que ______________.”

Imagine that you have addressed someone as ‘USTED’, but this person was shocked by the form you used. How would you complete this response?

I addressed you as ‘USTED’, but I didn’t mean to say that __________.

b. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de tú, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?

“Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que ______________.”

Imagine that you have addressed someone as ‘TÚ’, but this person was shocked by the form you used. How would you complete this response?

I addressed you as ‘TÚ’, but I didn’t mean to say that ____________.

(9) Question 9

¿Has tratado a alguien de usted aunque no querías?

Have you ever addressed someone as ‘USTED’ even though you didn’t want to?

(10) Question 10

¿Has tratado a alguien de usted que no respetabas?

Have you ever addressed someone with ‘USTED’ that you didn’t respect?

(11) Question 11

a. No te trato de tú porque tengamos confianza, sino porque __________.
I am addressing you as ‘TÚ’, not because we are close, but rather because ____________.

b. No le trato de usted simplemente por respeto, sino ________________.

c. I am addressing you as ‘USTED,’ not simply out of respect, but ______.

Several versions of cancelation tests were employed in order to isolate as many different implicatures as possible.

In questions 6 and 7 the cancelable content is actually provided by the informant. The questions were structured in such a way as to be able to test for cancelability and to discover multiple possible conversational implicatures at the same time. Each answer given by an informant will, at the same time, inform the investigator of a meaning that is possibly associated with AFs and demonstrate that that meaning is cancelable. Any cancelable meaning might be considered to be a CVI. Take as an example question 8a.

The informants were able to fill in the blanks with whatever occurred to them. Imagine that they completed the response as seen in (12).

(12) Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que fueras mayor.

I addressed you as ‘USTED’, but I didn’t mean to say you were old.

In this case we would know that “being older” was a meaning that could be associated with the usted form. At the same time we would learn that this meaning was cancelable and therefore not at-issue content or conveyed by conventional implicature. This cancelable content would therefore be conveyed via conversational implicature.

Question 7 served an additional purpose; answers to Question 7 which were posed with negative polarity were also able to demonstrate nondetachability. For example, the
response seen in (13) suggests that *cercanía* can be expressed with either the T or the V form.

(13) Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que no tuviésemos cercanía.
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I addressed you as ‘USTED’, but I didn’t mean to say that we weren’t close.

In questions (9-11), the content being tested is specified to the informant. They are provided meanings that have been commonly associated with AFs within a question or statement structured in a way that offers the informant a chance to cancel that content. If they are able to, this is evidence supporting the hypothesis that these meanings are conversationally implicated as opposed to conventionally implicated or being at-issue content. If they are not able to cancel the content, this will evidence conventionally implicated or at-issue content. These more specific questions were always asked after the open-ended questions to avoid undue influence.

In question 11a the informants were presented with the opportunity to cancel the meaning of confianza that was commonly associated with the T form in previous questions and offer other, possibly less common, implicatures. In question 11b the informants were not given the opportunity to cancel the respect expressed by the V form, but rather to add additional implicatures that could be triggered by this form. By taking respect away from the informants as a possible answer, they were forced to provide answers that may not have been given otherwise. Since respect proved to be a popular association with the V form, informants could easily offer this as an answer and not have to think of other possibilities. This question insured that they did provide other responses.
Question 11b was set up without a strict cancelation of respect however because of the controversy involved in asking informants to tell an addressee that they didn’t wish to show them any respect. When asked to do this most were taken aback and couldn’t imagine themselves doing so. A few informants however were able to do so with relative ease, providing further evidence that respect is a conversational implicature and not inherent to the meaning of *usted*.

Several other questions were asked in order to encourage informants to discuss the function of AFs in their personal lives. The intention behind this was to gather evidence as to whether T forms and V forms behaved in the same manner and could therefore be treated equally in the analysis of Peninsular AFs. If the forms do not behave in a parallel fashion, the same explanation of meaning contribution might not be applicable to both forms. These additional questions are seen in (14)-(22).

(14) Question 12
a. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le tutearas pero no te sentiste cómodo de tutearle?
   Has anyone ever asked you to address them as ‘TÚ’ but you didn’t feel comfortable doing so?

b. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le trataras de usted pero no te sentiste cómodo de hacerlo?
   Has anyone ever asked you to address them as ‘USTED’ but you didn’t feel comfortable doing so?

(15) Question 13
a. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de usted para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de tú? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

Can you address someone as ‘USTED’ in order to indicate that you do not want to address him/her as ‘TÚ’? Can you provide an example?

b. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de tú para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de usted? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

Can you address someone as ‘TÚ’ in order to indicate that you do not want to address him/her as ‘USTED’? Can you provide an example?

(16) Question 14

¿En algún momento te ha enseñado alguien cuándo usar usted y cuándo usar tú?

Has anyone ever taught you when to address someone as ‘USTED’ vs. ‘TÚ’?

(17) Question 15

a. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de usted, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de usted o porque crees que es necesario o requerido?

When you address someone as ‘USTED’, is it because you want to or because you feel that it is necessary or required?

b. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de tú, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de tú o porque crees que es necesario o requerido?

When you address someone as ‘TÚ’, is it because you want to or because you feel that it is necessary or required?
(18) Question 16

¿Hay situaciones en las que crees que tienes que tratar a alguien de usted?
¿Y de tú?

Are there situations in which you feel you have to address someone as ‘USTED’? ‘TÚ’?

(19) Question 17

¿Hay momentos en los cuales quieres tratar a alguien de usted? ¿De tú?

Are there times in which you want to address someone as ‘USTED’? ‘TÚ’?

(20) Question 18

¿Por qué crees que alguien te trataría de usted? ¿De tú?

Why do you think someone would address you as ‘USTED’? ‘TÚ’?

(21) Question 19

¿Hay alguien que quieres que te trate de usted?

Are there people that you want to address you as ‘USTED’?

(22) Question 20 oí

¿Qué opinas de la pérdida del uso de usted hoy día?

How do you feel about the decrease in the use of ‘USTED’ nowadays?

Asking these questions gave the informants the chance to expand on how they used AFs and their feelings towards them. This would provide additional data on the possible meanings associated with them. They also served the purpose of demonstrating to what extent tú and usted are interchangeable in certain contexts. In addition, they prompted informants to discuss AF switches.
4.2.2 Location of the Study

The oral interviews and the written questionnaires were completed between August 25th and September 18th of 2009 in Madrid and Manzanares, Spain. Manzanares, with a population of approximately 18,000, is located in the province of Ciudad Real in Castile-La Mancha, Spain approximately 100 miles south of Madrid (Instituto 2010). Madrid, the capital of Spain, has a population of approximately 3 million (Instituto 2010). I chose these locations in order to be able to compare the use of AFs in two different settings: a large city in which many of the informants did not know each other and had little to no contact with one another vs. a small town in which most of the informants had known each other for most of their lives and had regular contact with each other.

4.2.3 Informants

4.2.3.1 Oral Interviews

Twenty-four of the twenty-seven Madrid informants were approached on various university campuses in the city. These campuses included the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (in the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, the Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación, the Facultad de Ciencias de la Información, and the Facultad de Farmacia) and the Saint Louis University Madrid. All of these informants were associated with the university in some way, either as students, instructors or employees. Of the remaining informants, two were recent graduates of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid and one was a prospective student visiting the campus.

In this group of informants there were sixteen males and eleven females. Their ages ranged from 18 to 48. Most of the informants self-identified as being born and raised
in Madrid. Two informants (one male and one female) had lived in Madrid since they were 17 years old. They were 22 and 21 respectively at the time of the interview. One male informant had lived in Alcalá, a city approximately 25 miles from Madrid, until he was 21. He was 23 at the time of the interview. Two 48-year-old males had lived in Madrid since they were 9 and 12. One 44-year-old female had lived in Madrid since she was 24. The results from these six informants will be closely monitored as to whether or not they differ from the rest of the data. I expect, however, that their results will be unproblematic due to the fact that they have lived in Madrid for most of their adult lives.

While nearly all informants reported that they learned to distinguish tú and usted at home as a child, many also claimed that it is not until one is “older” that one begins to give and receive usted regularly.

All of the Manzanares informants were either members of, or relatives of members of, El Club de Tenis de Manzanares. This site was chosen because of the high density network of the members. Of this group of informants, four were female and eight were male. Their ages ranged from 25 to 70. The majority of the informants (7 of 12) were members of the same family, either by marriage (3 females) or birth (4 males). This offered the opportunity to study the dynamics of address forms within the family and to compare the use of AFs of the different members of the family.

The sex and age of all informants from both Manzanares and Madrid can be seen in Table 2 below.
Table 2 Age and Sex of Informants in Madrid and Manzanares: Oral Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Madrid</th>
<th>Manzanares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3.2 Written Questionnaire

The written questionnaires were distributed on University campuses in Madrid. These campuses included the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (in the Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, the Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación, the Facultad de Ciencias de la Información, the Facultad de Farmacia and the Facultad de Medicina) and Middlebury College. Those completed by Middlebury College faculty were completed via e-mail. Most of these informants were associated with the university in some way, either as students, instructors or employees. Some of the questionnaires were completed by high school graduates who were on the campus of the Universidad Complutense in order to complete their selectividad, a test which determines their placement in the university. The sex and age of all informants who completed the written questionnaire in Madrid can be seen in Table 3 below.

Only one written questionnaire was completed in Manzanares. There is only one because the written questionnaire was first distributed in Madrid, after the Manzanares
study had taken place. A member of El Club de Tenis de Manzanares showed interest in completing the survey and he did so via e-mail. His responses will be compiled with those of the written questionnaire participants from Madrid, bringing the total to 53. Any instances in which his answers differ significantly from the rest will be noted. This questionnaire was completed by a 39-year-old male who is a blood relative of the family mentioned above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Questionnaire</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Age and Sex of the Informants of the Written Questionnaire

Specific information regarding all informants can be found in the appendices. Appendix C contains information regarding the oral interview informants and Appendix D contains information regarding the written questionnaire informants.

4.3 Conclusion

I have taken advantage of several techniques in order to determine the type of meaning that AFs contribute to an utterance. Tests that have been shown to be effective in identifying conventional and conversational implicature have been utilized. These tests
were completed by native speakers from Madrid and Manzanares, Spain. A total of 92 informants took part in either an oral interview or a written questionnaire. The questions in each were designed to test for the properties of independence, immediacy, nondisplaceability, perspective dependence and descriptive ineffability, cancelability, and nondetachability. Many questions served the double purpose of testing for cancelability as well as identifying possible implicatures (conversational or conventional).

The results of the investigation will be discussed in the following chapter and the information gathered will be used to determine the type of meaning that AFs trigger.
Chapter 5: Presentation of the Data

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the data obtained through the oral interviews and written questionnaires conducted in Madrid and Manzanares. These results will be presented in 3 sections. First will be those pertaining to conventional implicature (section 5.2) and second will be those pertaining to conversational implicature (section 5.3). Finally, the responses to the additional questions regarding the use of AFs in the informants’ lives will be presented in section 5.3. Meanings associated with the AFs will be presented throughout the chapter. The results for each interview type and the questionnaire will always be presented independently of each other followed by a general discussion of the patterns found among the answers. All citations presented from the interviews or questionnaires will be followed by a code identifying the informant who provided that data. All informants who participated in the Madrid oral interviews will be identified by MD followed by a number. For example, the first informant in this category will be identified as MD1, etc. All informants from Manzanares who participated in the oral interviews will be identified by MZ followed by their number. All of the informants who completed the written questionnaire will be identified by WQ followed by their number. Because only 1 Manzanares informant completed the written questionnaire, his results will be grouped with those from Madrid. Any case in which his responses differ from the
responses of the Madrid group will be presented separately. The codes for each informant can be seen in Appendix C and Appendix D. Examples in which informants are putting themselves into the position of speaker are marked with quotation marks. Examples in which they are discussing the forms or the situation will not be marked.

An explanation of the conclusions drawn from these results will be offered in the following chapter.

5.2 Conventional Implicature

Many of the questions asked of the informants were designed to test for the various properties of CIs and CI triggers, according to Potts (2007c). The properties tested for in the interviews and questionnaires were independence, immediacy, nondisplaceability, perspective dependence, and ineffability. The repeatability characteristic was not tested specifically due to the reasons discussed in Chapter 3; because of fact that AFs must be repeated in some form any time reference is made to the addressee.

5.2.1 Independence

Two of the questions on the oral interview were designed to test for the independence property. These questions are repeated below in (1-2). The intent of these questions was to demonstrate whether or not the social content of the AF was independent of, and therefore separable from, the at-issue entailment of an utterance. Because CI content is known to have this property, if AF social content is shown to have this property as well, it will provide evidence for the case that AF social content is CI content.
(1) Question 1

a. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

b. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de usted. ¿Cómo le responderías?

c. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

d. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de tú. ¿Cómo le responderías?

(2) Question 4

a. Estás en la calle con un amigo. Alguien pasa y le dice a tu amigo “Se le ha caído la billetera.” Tu amigo no lo ha escuchado y te pregunta “¿Qué me ha dicho?” Tú respondes “Dijo que ________________.”

b. ¿Qué dirías si quisieras que tu amigo supiese que el hombre le había tratado de usted?
In Question 1 the informants were given a situation in which they had the opportunity to argue either the at-issue entailment of an utterance or the AF content. If they were able to argue one or the other independently, the two types of content would be shown to be independent of one another.

The distribution of the number of people in the Madrid group who answered the various parts of Question 1 are shown in Table 4.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Distribution of Question 1: Madrid

All of the 22 people that answered 1a and 1c either made some sort of commentary on the fact that they didn’t know the woman’s relative (3) or attempted to gather information in order to discern whether or not they knew the relative (4). None of the informants made any comment regarding the AF used by the woman to address them.

(3) “Perdone señora pero creo que se está equivocando de persona.” MD14
    “Excuse USTED me ma’am, but I think you have USTED me mistaken for someone else.”

(4) “¿Quién es su USTED hijo?” MD1
    “Who is your USTED son?”

I could not always determine whether the informants responded as if they were speaking directly to the woman using the V form, or whether they answered using third
person, but this did not affect the outcome of the question. While it would be interesting to note how many of the informants responded using the V form, of importance here is simply whether or not they accepted the woman’s choice of form used towards them.

The responses to 1b and d varied. The informants first answered whether they knew her relative or not. In regards to the AF, of the 11 who answered 1b, 10 either asked the woman to address them with the T form (5) or told her that it was not necessary for her to address them with the V form (6). One informant explained that the V form was the appropriate form and, rather than ask her to use the T form, she would address her with the V form as well (7).

(5) “Sí es cierto, soy el amigo de su hijo, pero tutéame; no me trates de usted.”

MD15

“Yes, it’s true, I am your son’s friend, but address TÚ me as ‘TÚ’; don’t address TÚ me as ‘USTED’.”

(6) Que soy una persona joven y que tampoco hace falta tratarme de usted.

MD32

I am young and there is no reason to address me as ‘USTED’.

(7) Si es una persona educada me hubiese tratado de usted. MD6

If she is a polite person she would have addressed me as ‘USTED’.

Of the 7 who answered 1d, 1 jokingly asks the woman to address him with the V form (8) and the rest said they would not say anything (9).

(8) “De tú no, de usted.” (laughing) MD1

“Not ‘TÚ’, ‘USTED’.
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(9) No le diría que me ha molestado porque no me ha molestado. MD16

I wouldn’t tell her that it bothered me because it didn’t.

The distribution of the number of people in the Manzanares group who answered the various parts of Question 1 is shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>1c</th>
<th>1d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Distribution of Question 1: Manzanares

The Manzanares responses were similar to those of Madrid; all but one of the informants commented on the relationship they had with the woman’s relative without questioning the AF in questions 1a and c. The informant who commented on the AF from the beginning had been told ahead of time by another informant that the interview was about the use of tú vs. usted.

In response to question 1b, 2 informants asked the woman to address them with the T form, 2 claimed they wouldn’t care or notice which form she used and 1 said that they would just use the form that she used. As for 1d, none gave a way to ask the woman to address them as usted: 4 stated either that they wouldn’t care that she used the T form or that she definitely should use the T form (10) and 2 said that they would simply address her with the V form (11).

(10) ¿Ella a mí? ¿Que no me trate de tú?... Es que debe tratarme de tú. MZ21
She addressed me? Tell her not to address me as ‘TÚ’? …But she should address me as ‘TÚ’.

(11) Le contestaría hablándole de usted. MZ18

I would answer her using ‘USTED’.

The responses to this question from both groups of informants support the claim that the at-issue content and the AF content of the utterance are independent of each other. In every response from every informant either the at-issue content or the AF content was addressed. The argumentation varied: some informants blatantly said that they did not know the woman’s relative, some attempted to figure out who the relative was, and some cautiously explained to the woman that she must have confused them with somebody else. In response to the AF there was variation as well. Many claimed that they would not comment on the woman’s choice. Several told her that the V form was unnecessary or that she could feel free to use the T form for various reasons. These responses are telling because they demonstrate that, while an informant could argue the choice, they can just as easily choose not to. In all cases, whether they chose to argue the AF or not, they still told the woman whether or not they knew her relative. Throughout all of the responses, not one informant related their knowing the relative with the AF used. Each informant argued, or chose not to argue, either type of content independently.

Question 4a was designed with a similar purpose to Question 1. In this case, the independence property (as well as the perspective dependence property to be discussed below) was examined through the use of an indirect quotation test. If the informants were able to indirectly quote the passerby’s utterance without quoting the AF used by him, the
at-issue content of his utterance will be shown to be independent of the content of the AF he used. Question 4b pertains more to the perspective dependence property of CI content and will therefore be discussed below.

Twenty-four people in Madrid answered Question 4a; 24 of them filled in the blank with some variation of the answer seen in (12). Although the passerby had used the pronoun le, the indirect object pronoun associated with the V form, in each indirect quote the pronoun used was te, the indirect object pronoun associated with the T form. All of these informants used the T form when indirectly quoting a statement originally containing the V form.

(12) Se te ha caído la cartera.

You dropped your wallet. TÚ

All 11 Manzanares informants responded to Question 4a by filling in the blank with an indirect quote containing the T form.

The results of this question also support the claim that AF content is independent of at-issue content. All of the informants asked were able to successfully pass on the information regarding the wallet to their friend, but not a single informant passed on the information conveyed by the V form used by the passerby. This is significant because it shows that a faithful rendition of an utterance can be made even though the AF used is different. Many of the informants actually felt uncomfortable when they were later asked to tell their friend that the passerby had addressed them as usted. The results of this question show that the content of the AF used by the passerby was not part of the at-issue entailment of his utterance.
5.2.2 *Immediacy and Nondisplaceability*

The nondisplaceability and immediacy properties of CI content were examined using Question 2 (13). With this question, I attempted to determine whether or not the use of an unexpected AF could “change the expressive setting of a context” (Potts 2007c: 191). If an addressee does not notice the change in AF or if the change is of no consequence to him or her in the moment of the utterance, there would be no evidence that the AF content is affecting the context of the utterance. If an addressee does notice the change and the change is significant to him or her in the moment in which it is uttered, this will evidence the immediacy of the AF content. If the AF used in this utterance has no bearing on AFs used in the past, this will support the nondisplaceability claim.

(13) Question 2

a. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de usted. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de tú?

b. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de tú. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de usted?

Twenty-five of the Madrid informants and 9 Manzanares informants were asked Question 2a. As shown in Table 6, 16 of the Madrid and 3 of the Manzanares informants claimed that nothing would happen if they suddenly used the T form with an addressee that they always used the V form with (14-15). Of those that claimed that nothing would happen, 3 stated that, although the interlocutor wouldn’t say anything, he or she might be offended (16). Two others claimed that it would show a lack of respect or manners (17).
Two Madrid informants stated that their interlocutor would be offended by the sudden use of the T form (18). Five of the Madrid and 1 of the Manzanares informants claimed that there was no one with whom they always used the V form. Two Madrid, 5 Manzanares and 14 written questionnaire informants offered other possibilities including that it depended on the person whether they would be offended or not (19) or that the interlocutor would think that a change in their relationship had occurred (20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Offense/apologize</th>
<th>No use of usted</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MD N=25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ N = 50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MZ N=9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Responses to Question 2a

(14) No le daría importancia. MD16
It would matter to him/her.

(15) Supongo que no me diría nada…le daría igual. MZ23
I suppose he/she wouldn’t say anything and it wouldn’t matter.

(16) Yo creo que nada a no ser que sea una persona a la que realmente no debería o hubiese sido una ofensa tratar de tú. Pero yo no creo que pasase nada. MD7
I don’t think anything unless it was a person that you really shouldn’t address as ‘tú’ or that would be offended by ‘tú’. But I don’t think anything would happen.
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(17) Seguramente no pasaría nada pero es como un poco falta de educación,
falta de respeto. MD8
Surely nothing but it’s kind of rude, disrespectful.
(18) Puede ser que no le parezca bien. MD9
He/she might not like it.
(19) Depende de la personalidad, algunos se enfadarían, a otros les gustaría.
MD38
It depends on the person, some might get angry, others might like it.
(20) Tendría que pasar que …habría más confianza. Habría pasado algo….
alguna experiencia juntos o que me diga él “hoy no me hables e usted,
tutéame.” MD1
It would have to be that…we were closer. Something happened…some
experience together o he might have told me “don’t address me with
‘USTED’, address me with ‘TU’.

In response to Question 2b, the majority of informants (18/27 in Madrid, 8/12 in
Manzanares, 36/49 written) claimed that the informant would either laugh at them or find
their form of address strange (21-22). Six of the Madrid informants and 3 of the
Manzanares informants stated that a sudden use of the V form would cause their
interlocutor to think that something had happened, either that the speaker was angry with
them (23) or that some event had occurred to cause a distance in their relationship (24-
26). The distribution of these responses is shown in Table 7.
(21) Se sorprendería; pensaría que era, que haces broma. MD8
He/she would be surprised; he/she would think it was a joke.

(22) Sería ridículo… se ha vuelto loco; algo te pasa…como… ¿Qué que medicación te estás tomando? ¿Qué te han hecho? ¿Qué libro has leído que te ha hecho hablarme de usted en este momento? MZ17

It would be ridiculous… he’s gone crazy; something is happening to you…like…What drugs are you taking? What have they done to you? What book have you read that’s made you address me with ‘USTED’ now?

(23) Se pensaría que estoy enfadada o algo. MD10

One would think I was angry or something.

(24) Pensaría que había ocurrido algo entre los dos, un enfado o una cosa entre los dos y que nos hemos distanciado. MZ18

He/she would think that something had happened between us, a disagreement or something and that we had grown apart.

(25) La relación no sería muy buena…no va bien…ha habido una cosa. MZ27

The relationship would not be good…it’s not going well…something happened.

(26) Quedaría un poco preocupado…se sorprendería mucho y a lo mejor se asustaría. MD37

He/she would be a little worried, surprised, he/she might even be scared.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Laugh/ find strange</th>
<th>Think something happened</th>
<th>Wouldn’t do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N=27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N = 49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N=12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Responses to Question 2b

The responses to this question varied greatly from version a to b, although across the informant groups the responses were very similar. Over all, the majority of informants, 64.3%, claimed that nothing would happen if they suddenly used the T form with someone to whom they previously always used the V form. 70.5% of informants claimed that, if they suddenly used the V form with an addressee, this person would either laugh at them or find the AF choice to be very strange.

These results reveal that the sudden use of the V form does have an immediate impact on the context situation. So much so that the nearly all of the informants said that the addressee would be shocked, in disbelief, or even worried. The T form on the other hand didn’t seem to have much effect in most cases. If the T form did have an effect, such as offending the addressee or sounding uneducated, in most cases it was not enough of an effect to provoke the listener into saying something about it. This may signal that the T form does not display the characteristic of immediacy, or possibly that it is somehow less immediate than the V form. Some informants show that they are aware of the V form’s ability to change the context when they stated that they sometimes purposefully use the V form to make a joke (27).
Lo hacemos de vez en cuando para jugar como para dar un tono de solemnidad que no es requerido en la conversación. O incluso mensajes de texto que envíás diciendo ‘me gustaría verle esta tarde señor tal’ y es un amigo tuyo pero pensaría que está bromeando. MD7

Sometimes we do it in fun to impose a solemnity where not required in the conversation. Even in text messages that you send saying “I’d like to see you USTED this afternoon Mr. so and so” and he is a friend of yours. But I would think he was joking.

These results are highly suggestive and give insight into the differing behavior of these two forms. Nearly all informants volunteered the information that the use of the T form often has absolutely zero effect on the context and perhaps even goes unnoticed. In turn, nearly all informants volunteered the information that the use of the V form would definitely and always have an impact on the context of the utterance and that its use is highly salient.

The nondisplaceability characteristic is supported as well by the fact that, as demonstrated by Potts and Kawahara (2004) and Potts (2007c), AF content is not affected by operators such as negation or modalization. The informants in this study unwittingly provided evidence for this through many of the statements they made. In the example seen in (28), this informant is doing something very interesting. He is negating the meaning that the addressee inferred from the AF, however he is still not negating the AF; he continues to use the V form (le). He even goes on to explain that, even though he has
denied that the AF meant that the addressee was old, it still had another purpose, which, according to this informant, is to show good manners or to be courteous (29).

(28) “No quería tratarle de…como una persona mayor.” MD8

“I didn’t mean to treat you as if you were older.”

(29) Hay gente que cree que lo dices porque es mayor pero es simplemente por educación. MD8

There are people that think that you say it because they are old but it’s simply out of good manners.

At other points throughout the interviews AFs are seen accompanied by other types of operators; these operators never have any effect on the content associated with the AF. AFs are seen in questions, such as (30). The content of the AF however is not being questioned. In this case the informant is asking if her interlocutor was referring to a particular person.

(30) “Creo que sí, ¿te refieres a ________?” MD33

“I think so, do you mean TÚ ______?”

AFs are accompanied by modals such as quizá in (31). In this case the use of the T form is not being judged, but rather the content of whether or not the addressee deserves something; in this case it was respect.

(31) “Eres igual que yo, y quizá no te mereces que te hable de usted.” MZ17

“You are TÚ the same as me and perhaps you don’t deserve TÚ to be addressed as ‘USTED’.”
In addition, we find AFs within conditional clauses such as (32). In this case again it is not the content of the T form that is affected by the conditional, but rather the preferences of the addressee.

(32) “Si prefieres te trato de tú.” MD34

“If you prefer TÚ I will address you as ‘TÚ’.”

In order to determine whether AF social content is immediate and nondisplaceable we have looked at the AF content’s effect on the context and at the effect of the linguistic context on the AF content. The results show that AF social content is, in fact, immediate and nondisplaceable.

5.2.3 Perspective Dependence

The property of perspective dependence was examined using questions 4 (33) and 5 (34). Content that displays this characteristic can only be attributed to the speaker of the utterance.

(33) Question 4

a. Estás en la calle con un amigo. Alguien pasa y le dice a tu amigo “Se le ha caído la billetera.” Tu amigo no lo ha escuchado y te pregunta “¿Qué me ha dicho?” Tú respondes “Dijo que ________________.”

b. ¿Qué dirías si quisieras que tu amigo supiese que el hombre le había tratado de usted?

Question 4a will expose whether or not AF social content is dependent on the perspective of the speaker because we have the same listener being addressed by two different people, the first of which is quoted by the second. In this scenario the informant
is playing the role of a friend of the listener, therefore we would expect him to use the T form when addressing him. The passerby however uses the V form. The question is whether or not the informants will report the V form used by the passerby when indirectly quoting him to their friend. If they do, this will provide contradictory evidence, showing that the AF content does not necessarily show the perspective of the speaker. If the informant uses the T form typical between friends even though he is talking about what someone else has said, it will be evident that the AF content does display the perspective of the speaker. In fact, we have already seen above that every informant used the T form when indirectly quoting the passerby, evidencing the claim that AF content is dependent on the speaker’s perspective.

Question 4b was designed to elicit further support for the perspective dependence of AF content. After the informants used te in their indirect quotes they were asked what they could say to make their friend understand that the passerby had actually used the V form to address them. The distribution of the responses to 4a and 4b can be seen in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4a N=25</th>
<th>4b N = 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Distribution of Questions 4a-b: Madrid

Thirteen informants claimed that they would not know what to say (34) or would not say anything to their friend (35) in order to let them know what the passerby had said.
“Te ha dicho el señor que se le había caído…” uu. Es que no sabría. Yo le trataría a mi amigo de tú… Es difícil tratárselo explicar. MD32

The gentleman said to you TÚ that you USTED…” uu. I wouldn’t know. I would address him as ‘TÚ’. It would be difficult to explain.

En el lenguaje coloquial no se dice; en general creo que no se comenta. MD34

In everyday language it’s not said; in general you don’t comment on it.

Seven people stated that they would have to tell their friend explicitly which AF the passerby had used, as seen in (36).

Te ha tratado de usted. MD13

He addressed you TÚ as ‘USTED’.

Seven people offered an explanation as to how the passerby had treated the friend (there is some overlap among informants who offered an explanation and those who claimed they didn’t know what to say or that the friend had to be told directly). These explanations included telling their friend that either the friend or the passerby must be old (37), that the passerby had treated them with respect (38), that the passerby was educated (39), or that the passerby was nice (40).

Como gracia le diría ‘te ha visto viejo.’ MD38

To be funny I would say ‘he thought you TÚ looked old.’

Ese señor te ha tratado con mucho respeto. MD4

The gentleman addressed you TÚ very respectfully.

Es un tío educado por lo menos. MD1
At least he was polite.

(40) Lo ha dicho amablemente. MD16

He said it nicely.

The distribution of answers to 4a and b from the Manzanares group can be seen in Table 9. Of this group five people answered 4b saying that they did not know what to say or that they wouldn’t say anything. Two said they would have to tell their friend directly; 1 of these offered an explanation of why they would have to do so (41).

(41) Tú le vas a dar a tu amigo el tratamiento que le tienes que dar bien de usted o bien de tú. MZ18

You will address your friend the way you have to, whether it be ‘USTED’ or ‘TÚ’.

Four informants offered an explanation as a way to tell their friend that the passerby had used the V form. The explanations mirrored those given by the Madrid informants (42-44).

(42) “Te ha visto mayor.” MZ23

“He thought you looked old.”

(43) “Te está diciendo respetuosamente.” MZ18

“He said it respectfully.”

(44) “Mira que persona tan educada o que persona tan cordial.” MZ17

“What a polite and cordial person.”
These responses provided compelling support for the hypothesis that AF content is dependent on the speaker’s perspective. The informants were unable to directly quote the AF and make it so their friend knew that it was actually the passerby who had used it. The informants had to tell their friend, either directly or through an explanation, that the V form was used.

The property of perspective dependence was further examined through Question 5 (45).

(45) Question 5

a. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor González ha dicho que le quiere ver en su oficina.”

¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de usted? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?

b. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor González ha dicho que te quiere ver en su oficina.”

¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de tú? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?

This case also involved an indirect quote, but the informant was not one of the speakers. The informants were asked to tell me who had used a particular AF to address them- the speaker of the indirect quote, or the speaker being quoted. If AF content is
dependent on the speaker’s perspective, the informants should have chosen the 
*compañero* and if the AF content is not perspective dependent, they may have chosen the 
*compañero* or Sr. González. The distribution of responses for the Madrid group can be 

seen in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5a N=17</th>
<th></th>
<th>5b N=9</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El compañero</td>
<td>El jefe</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El compañero</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Distribution of Questions 5a-b: Madrid

Seven informants named the *compañero* as the origin of the V form in 5a and 5 
chose the *compañero* as the source of the T form in 5b. While most did not offer an 

explanation as to how they chose their answer, some comments, such as those seen in 

(46-47) were offered.

(46) El compañero, yo no sé cómo se lo ha dicho el Sr. González. MD3

The coworker, I don’t know how Mr. González said it.

(47) El compañero…porque me ha hablado a mí directamente. MD36

The coworker…because he spoke to me directly.

Five informants chose *Sr. González* as the source of the V form in 5a. One

explanation of this choice is seen in (48)
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(48) El Sr. González…si es un compañero me trataría normalmente de tú…si dice ‘el Sr. González le quiere ver’ es que está hablando a través de él.

MD35

Mr. González…because a coworker would address me as ‘TÚ’, if he says “Mr. González wants to see you usted’ it’s because he is speaking for him.

Three people reported that both the compañero and Sr. González had used the V form in 5a (49); two claimed that both had used the T form in 5b (50).

(49) Los dos…supongo que ellos han continuado hablando de usted…si en algún trabajo hay esa costumbre de hablarse de usted, supongo que todos entre ellos se hablan de usted. MD37

Both…I suppose that that they both used ‘USTED’, if there it is customary to speak with ‘USTED’, I suppose everybody does it.

(50) Los dos…si el Sr. González quiere verme a mí es porque ya me conoce y mi compañero también. MD15

Both…if Mr. Gonzalez wants to see me it’s because he knows me and my coworker does as well.

The remaining four informants for 5a and 5b did not actually choose the source of the AF; they explained the typical use of AFs in an office environment.

The distribution of answers to these questions in the Manzanares group can be seen in Table 11.
Four of the Manzanares informants chose the *compañero* as the source of the AF in both 5a and 5b. A telling explanation is seen in (51).

(51) Mi compañero…porque normalmente en castellano no va a transmitir lo que ya haya dicho el otro en el sentido de ‘tú’ o ‘usted’ sino es de primera persona. MZ19

My coworker…because in Castellano one doesn’t normally transmit what another has said when it comes to ‘tú’ or ‘usted’, it is first person.

While only 50 and 64% of all informants chose the *compañero* as the source of the AF in questions 5a and b respectively, I believe that these responses have still provided further evidence of perspective dependence. In 3 cases for question 5a and in 2 cases for question 5b the informants responded that both the *compañero* and Sr. González had used the AF. This answer is not actually unexpected. The informants who answered this way apparently realized that the AF was definitely coming from the *compañero*; they simply added that Sr. González said it too. The truth is that they could not know what form Sr. González had used; they seem to be basing their judgments on their belief of how bosses should address their employees in the workplace. The quote shown above in (49) supports this idea. Because the informants were able to judge the AF as coming from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5a N=5</th>
<th>5b N=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El compañero</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>El compañero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Distribution of Questions 5a-b: Manzanares
the compañero, we can add these “both” cases to the total of compañero cases and now the percentages are 64% and 79% respectively.

Next, if we subtract the cases in which the informant either did not attribute the form to either the compañero or Sr. González, our rates are even more convincing at 74% and 100%.

This only leaves the 5 cases in which informants from the Madrid group answered question 5a with Sr. González. In 2 of these cases, the informants explained that it had to be Sr. González because she and the compañero had “igualdad de puesto” and because “un compañero me llamaría de tú.” Based on these explanations, it seems safe to say that these 5 informants were actually expressing their beliefs about who should have used the V form and not about who did use the V form. Subtracting these cases brings our rates to 100% across the board- highly suggestive evidence for perspective dependence.

5.2.4 Ineffability

Question 3 (52) was asked in an attempt to analyze the definability of AF content. CI content is said to ineffable in that it is difficult or impossible to express with other words. In this task the informants are asked to express the meaning of the V form without using it and to express the meaning of the T form without using it. The meaning of the forms was left open to the interpretation of the informants, thereby allowing them to focus on whatever meaning came to mind first.

(52)  Question 3
c. Imagínate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de usted, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del usted, pero usando el tú?

d. Imagínate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de tú, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del tú, pero usando el usted?

In the Madrid group, there were 24 responses to Question 4a. Some of the answers overlap. Six of the informants did not know how they could complete the task, as seen in (53).

(53) Si es una persona desconocida o mayor siempre usaría la forma usted. Entonces es difícil imaginar que a un desconocido le trate de tú, sobre todo si es una persona mayor. MD33

If he/she is older or a stranger I would always use ‘usted’, so it’s difficult to imagine addressing a stranger as ‘TÚ’, especially if he/she is older.

Nine informants used the conditional verb form in their responses; with some explicitly stating that they could use this form (54).

(54) Utilizando el condicional- “podrías decirme…podrías indicarme” o quizá “querrías indicarme.” MD7

Using the conditional- “could you tell TÚ me…could you show me” or maybe “would you like TÚ to show me.”

Six informants used other “polite-sounding” words in place of the V form (55-56).
(55) Con la palabra perdón o excusa. MD35
With the word *perdón* or *excusa*.

(56) Utilizar alguna palabra educada. MD6
With a polite word.

One informant used the imperfect form in his response (57).

(57) Buenas tardes, quería preguntar… MD5
Good afternoon, I wanted to ask…

Others claimed that an educated tone of voice could be used (58) or that one could avoid direct reference to the listener (59).

(58) con un tono educado…perdona, me puedes indicar pero con un tono a lo mejor más dulce. Es con el tono de voz; puedes expresar el mismo pero con un tono educado. MD29
In a polite tone of voice…excuse me, can you show me, but with maybe a sweeter tone of voice. It’s the tone of voice. You can express the same thing but with a polite tone of voice.

(59) Sería difícil…dónde está, dónde se encuentra tal, estoy buscando tal calle… MD16
Without addressing the person directly…it would be difficult…where is, where can one find this, I’m looking for this street…

Two interesting comments were made in which the informants asked for clarification by asking me if I meant for them to show respect in their response (60).

(60) ¿De respeto? MD1
Respectfully?

When asked to replace the T form in Question 3b, 7 offered possibilities such as using friendly words or tone (61), smiling (62), using colloquial language (63), and even not using polite introductions (64).

(61) Con otro tono como más amigable supongo. MD11
In a more friendly tone I suppose.

(62) Una sonrisa…expresión de la cara. MD38
A smile…facial expression.

(63) Con palabras de la calle que usan los jóvenes. MD8
With slang that young people use.

(64) Sin el perdón, directamente. MD39
Without saying *perdón*, directly.

Some of the informants made comments as to the meaning of the T form. These centered around friendship or closeness, as seen in (65-67).

(65) ¿Hablar por ejemplo de una manera más cercana? MD8
Do you mean speak in a more familiar manner?

(66) Dando un tono de familiaridad. MD29
With a familiar tone of voice.

(67) La manera que te expresas suele ser más de amistad o más de tú a tú. MD38
The manner in which you speak tends to be more ‘TÚ’ to ‘TÚ’.
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Similar responses to 4a were given in the Manzanares group: 3 informants used the conditional verb form in their response (68), 4 used “polite words” (69), and 1 said that one should try to sound polite (70).

(68) Le hablaría con tiempos del verbo que me permitieran hacer la pregunta de una forma respetuosa. MZ18
I would speak to them using verb tenses that allow me to ask the question in a respectful way.

(69) Por favor- ni es usted ni es tan familiar como el tú. MZ20
Please- it’s not ‘USTED’ nor is it as familiar as ‘TÚ’.

(70) Intentas hablarle muy educado sin usar usted. MZ24
You try to speak very politely without using ‘USTED’.

An interesting comment made is seen in (71), in which the informant claims that some people do not want to be addressed with the V form anyway because it makes them feel old.

(71) Hay gente que, en España, piensa que al tratarle de usted le haces mayor. MZ24
There are people in Spain that think that you make them older when you address them using ‘USTED’.

Half of the informants (4) who were asked Question 4b in the Manzanares group were unable to come up with a response or simply used the V form with no obvious replacement for the T form (72).

(72) “¿Me puede indicar…sabrá usted dónde está esta calle?” MZ26
“Can you show usted me… would you know usted where this street is?”

Three would replace tú with other words, as seen in (73).

(73) Con expresiones como hola, qué tal. MZ19

With expressions like hola, qué tal.

One associated the T form with friendliness. He claimed however that the V form was not necessarily unfriendly (74).

(74) Usted es más serio… pero no tiene por qué dejar de ser amigable MZ24

‘USTED’ is more serious… but that doesn’t mean it can’t be friendly.

Another informant related the V form with distance when told that she could not use the T form. She said that she would use the expression por favor in combination with the V form in an effort to mitigate the distance that would otherwise accompany the form (75). Interestingly enough, this same informant claimed that she would use the expression “por favor” in response to Question 3a as well, saying that it would ease the familiarity associated with the T form (69 above).

(75) Lo mismo… pidiéndole por favor para evitar la distancia del tú al usted. Al pedirle por favor me parece que a ella rompo esa barrera que existe. MZ20

The same… asking please to avoid the distance of changing from ‘TÚ’ to ‘USTED’. Asking please seems to break the barrier that exists.

The most interesting thing about the responses to this set of questions was the fact that no informant actually attempted to tell their addressee anything regarding the social content of the AF that they were told they couldn’t use. Instead of attempting to express this content directly to the addressee, they chose other methods of conveying the same or
similar content. These methods included using certain verb tenses or expressions, speaking with a certain tone of voice, smiling, etc.

Regarding verb tense, the one most used in response to Question 3a was the conditional. Chodorowska-Pilch (2004) claims that the conditional tense conventionally implicates “interpersonal distance between interlocutors” (59) in Peninsular Spanish. She states that the use of this form is a politeness strategy used by the speaker in order to place distance between him and the situation. In doing so he mitigates a request made towards the addressee. Similar findings have been described regarding the imperfect (Chodorowska-Pilch 2000), which was also used in response to this question.

In sum, many informants hesitated to answer this question. Those who finally did offered a variety of interesting strategies for dealing with the “loss” of the AF that they wanted to use. When told they could not use the V form they attempted to sound educado in some other way, either through verb forms or other expressions. When told they could not use the T form they tried to seem friendly, generally through their demeanor or through the use of informal expressions such as hola. Within their responses they linked the AFs to meanings such as respect, distance, and friendliness. Most importantly, not one informant tried to paraphrase these meanings. This lends support to the idea that this is not an easy task. Perhaps the best way to express these ideas is through the use of these AFs.

The final characteristic of CIs is that of repeatability. This wasn’t specifically examined in this study, however some clues were provided by informants suggesting that
AF content may be repeatable. While there is certainly not enough evidence to make a definitive claim, I will present these clues.

We know of course that the avoidance of AFs is nearly impossible in Spanish and that the forms are therefore repeated often. Comments made by informants, such as that seen in (76), tell us that the continued use of the V form would effectively maintain a distance with another person. Twelve comments were made to this effect.

(76) Alguien con quien quieres mantener la distancia. WQ45

Somebody with whom you want to maintain a distance.

This provides evidence that the V form continuously adds its meaning each time it is used. It does not say anything regarding the strengthening of that meaning however. In regard to this, one informant claimed that using the V form continuously was actually a violent act because it didn’t allow for friendship to develop (77).

(77) Y toda la vida si es necesario, pero …es un poco violento y no te da la sinceridad, amistad, la confianza... MZ28

All of your life if necessary, but …it is somewhat harsh and doesn’t lend to sincerity, friendship, closeness...

Another comment suggests that the use of an overt pronoun vs. a null pronoun might have a repeatability effect. That is to say, address using an overt pronoun might enforce/reinforce the social content more than address with a null pronoun. One informant discussed that in the past she had to use the overt pronoun often because it was expected. Now she prefers to use a null pronoun and therefore would say (78) over (79). This informant repeated several times that she did not like the word usted because it was
too strong (80). Based on her discussion it would seem that the use of the V form with a null pronoun was somehow less strong than the V form with the overt pronoun. This would require more research before any definitive conclusions can be drawn.

(78) “¿Quiere tomar una cosa?” MZ25
“Do you want USTED (null pronoun) something to drink?”

(79) “¿Quiere usted tomar una cosa?” MZ25
“Do you want USTED (overt pronoun) something to drink?”

(80) La veo como muy áspera, muy fuerte. MZ25
I see it as being very harsh, very strong.

So far we have seen evidence that suggests that the social meaning, whatever it may be, associated with the address forms tú and usted is independent, immediate, nondisplaceable, perspective dependent, ineffable, and possibly repeatable. Several meanings have been suggested by the informants; these are supported by previous findings in the research. The V form has been associated with courtesy, age, distance, respect, anger, and solemnity. The T form has been associated with familiarity, friendship, and closeness.

These properties discussed are characteristic of CIs; however because none of the characteristics above clearly distinguish CIs from CVIs, in the next section I will discuss those characteristics that do: cancellation and nondetachability. These properties will differentiate conventional from conversational implicature by demonstrating whether or not a meaning is dependent on the words used in the utterance.
5.3 Conversational Implicature

The following set of questions served the functions of probing for, attempting to cancel, and testing the nondetachability of possible implicatures triggered by AFs or AFs in context. Each question generally served at least two of these functions.

In Question 6 (81) the informants were asked to give a reason as to why they shouldn’t have been addressed with either the V or the T form. In doing so, they provided meanings associated with the AFs while canceling them at the same time. Question 7 functioned in a similar way except in this case the informants were asked to apologize for their use of either the T or the V form and tell their addressee that they didn’t mean to imply X; thereby supplying the implicatures and canceling them at the same time. Answers to questions 6a and 6b which were posed with negative polarity were also able to demonstrate nondetachability.

(81) Question 6

a. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de usted pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?

   Me has tratado de usted pero ________________________________.

b. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de tú pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?

   Me has tuteado pero ________________________________.

The most common responses to Question 6a among 16 Madrid participants were variations on (82) and (83).

(82) No hace falta. (6 responses)
There is no need.

(83) Puedes tutearme. (8 responses)

You can address me as ‘TÚ’.

In addition to these responses some also offered explanations as to why they could be addressed with the T form. The explanations related to the age of the informant or their view of the closeness of the relationship (84-85).

(84) Háblame de tú…también soy joven. MD29

Address me as ‘TÚ’, I am young as well.

(85) Me gustaría que me trataras de tú; tenemos confianza para hacerlo. MD35

I would like it if you addressed me as ‘TÚ’; we are close enough to do so.

The definitions of tú and usted seen in (86-87) were offered by two of the informants. Here usted is described as formal, impersonal, and cold. It is associated with old age and maturity. The T form is defined as a “close” form.

(86) El usted me parece muy formal…más impersonal, más frío. Me gusta un tratamiento más cercano. MD14

‘USTED’ seems very formal to me… more impersonal, colder. I like a closer form of address.

(87) Me alegra porque me gusta que la gente me considere mayor. Me hace sentir importante. Me hace sentir maduro. MD13

I’m happy because I like it when people think I’m older. It makes me feel important. It makes me feel mature.
Ten informants answered Question 6b. Of these, 4 insisted that they would never make this statement and therefore did not fill in the blank. Two filled in the blank only by asking the interlocutor to address them as *usted*. Of interest were the 4 informants who offered possible reasons to be addressed as *usted*. These informants claimed that the relationship between themselves and the speaker was not close enough to allow for the use of the T form or that the speaker needed to keep their distance by using the V form (88-91).

(88) “No tienes confianza para tutearme.” MD9
    “You are not close enough to me to address me as ‘TÚ’.”

(89) Si creo que me han insultado diría “mantén un poco las distancias y trátame con más respeto.” MD35
    If I think they have insulted me I would say “Keep your distance and treat me with more respect.”

(90) “Creo que no tenemos tanta relación”…crees que te están timando… intentar parar la relación de amistad. MD38
    “I don’t think we have that kind of relationship”…you think they are trying to cheat you….to try to stop a friendly relationship.

(91) “No tenemos confianza y trátame de usted.” MD36
    “We are not close friends; address me as ‘USTED’.”

Six Manzanares informants answered Question 6a. One did not fill in the blank, stating that he would never correct someone’s form of address. Two claimed that the V form was unnecessary; two asked the interlocutor to address them with the T form. Most
of these informants offered reasons as to why V was unnecessary (92) or why they could be addressed with T (93-94). These reasons regarded age and the closeness of the relationship between the interlocutors.

(92) “No me trates de usted que yo no soy tan viejo.” MZ19

“Don’t address me as ‘USTED’, I’m not that old.”

(93) “Nos conocemos suficientemente o tenemos los amigos comunes suficientes para que nos mantengamos una conversación de tú a tú.” MZ18

“We know each other well enough or we have enough friends in common to maintain a conversation addressing each other as ‘TÚ’.”

(94) “Vamos a ser amigos.” MZ20

“We are going to be friends.”

In response to 6b, 1 Manzanares respondent would not fill in the blank and 2 offered the reasons that they didn’t know each other well enough or that the V form was more appropriate (95-96).

(95) “No nos conocíamos; no teníamos esta confianza.” MZ20

“We didn’t know each other; we weren’t that close.”

(96) “Me parece más correcto que me hablases de usted.” MZ23

“It seems to me that you should address me as ‘USTED’.”

In the written questionnaire the majority of informants answering Question 6a (32 of 52) either asked the speaker to address them with the T form or asked them not to address them with the V form (97).

(97) “La próxima vez no lo hagas.” WQ7
“Next time don’t do it.”

Fourteen claimed that the V form was unnecessary. Seven informants offered a variety of other options: three stated that it didn’t matter that the V form had been used (98), two mentioned age (99-100), and one mentioned the closeness of the relationship (101).

(98) No pasa nada. WQ28
No matter.

(99) Me hace sentir mayor. WQ27
It makes me feel older.

(100) “Soy muy joven para eso, tutéame.” WQ48
“I’m too young for that, address me as ‘TÚ’.”

(101) “Hay confianza, tutéame.” WQ29
“We are close, address me as ‘TÚ’.”

The responses to 6b on the written questionnaire followed a similar pattern in that most of the informants (31 of 50) either asked the speaker to use the V form (102) or told them not to use the T form (103).

(102) “Prefiero que me trate de usted.” WQ9
“I prefer that you address USTED me as ‘USTED’.”

(103) “Prefiero que no me tutees.” WQ4
“I prefer that you don’t address me as ‘TÚ’.”

Three informants stated that they would not make a comment about the speaker’s use of the V form (104).
(104) No le pediría que me tratase de usted. WQ5

I wouldn’t ask that he/she address me as ‘USTED’.

Fifteen informants offered other answers. Five mentioned the type of relationship held between themselves and the speaker (105-107); one actually told the speaker that it was fine that he used the T form because they were friends (107). Four claimed that there was a lack of respect (108), 3 claimed that the AF didn’t matter (109), 2 mentioned distance (110-111), and 1 mentioned age (112).

(105) “No te conozco.” WQ16

“I don’t know you.”

(106) “¿Has cenado alguna vez conmigo para tutearme?” WQ44

“Have we dined together sometime that you think you can address me as ‘TÚ’?”

(107) “No te preocupes, somos amigos.” WQ30

“Don’t worry, we’re friends.”

(108) “No me has mostrado respeto.” WQ26

“You haven’t shown me respect.”

(109) “No pasa nada.” WQ13

“No matter.”

(110) “Mantén una distancia.” WQ21

“Keep your distance.”

(111) “Creo que deberíamos guardar las distancias.” WQ29

“I think we should keep our distances.”

150
“No pasa nada, me haces sentir joven.” WQ31

“No matter, you make me feel young.”

Sixteen informants from the Madrid group answered Question 7a and 7b (113).

Question 7

a. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de usted, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?

“Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que ______________.”

b. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de tú, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?

“Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que ______________.”

In response to 7a, ten filled in the blank stating that they didn’t mean to imply that the addressee was old (114). Two didn’t intend to say that there was not a close relationship between them and the addressee (115). Two didn’t mean to say that the situation was formal (116), 1 stated that she didn’t mean to offend (117), and 1 claimed that she used the V form because it was customary (118).

(114) “Fueras mayor.” MD2

“You were older.”

(115) “Que te sintieses que no había amistad entre nosotros.” MD38

“I didn’t want you to feel that there was no friendship between us.”

(116) “No quería ponerlo a lo mejor muy formal o muy distante.” MD37

“I didn’t mean to make it very formal or very distant.”

(117) “No quería ofenderle.” MD34
“I don’t mean to offend you.”
(118) “Porque es la costumbre.” MD11

“Because it is customary.”

In response to 7b, 5 didn’t mean to disrespect the addressee (119), 3 didn’t mean to offend (120), and 1 didn’t mean to say that there was not a close relationship (121). Three respondents claimed that they would not say anything; they would simply switch the AF (122). Other answers commented on the formality of the situation (123)

(119) “No pretendía faltarle el respeto.” MD39

“I wasn’t trying to be disrespectful.”
(120) “No quería ofenderle.” MD37

“I didn’t mean to offend you.”
(121) “Hubiera tanta confianza.” MD5

“There was a close relationship.”
(122) “Discúlpeme y al partir de ahora le trato de usted.” MD36

“Forgive me and from now on I will address you as ‘USTED’.”
(123) “Que sea completamente informal.” MD30

“That it’s a very informal situation.”

Of the Manzanares group, 7 informants answered Questions 7a and 7b. The answers for 6a were similar to those of the Madrid group with 4 informants commenting on respect, 1 on the closeness of the relationship, and 1 on distancing himself from the addressee. One informant claimed that he would never address someone with the incorrect form and therefore this wasn’t an issue.
The answers to 7b were also very similar to those of the Madrid group. The comments regarded respect, offense, or simply a switch to the V form.

The responses to these questions on the written questionnaire were similar to those of the oral interviews. The distribution of the answers can be seen in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Offense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Distribution of Question 7a: Written Questionnaire

Of the 41 informants who answered 6a on the written questionnaire, 23 said that they didn’t mean to imply that the addressee was older (124), 1 of these added that they didn’t mean to imply that the addressee was “too serious” either (125). Five informants made a comment about the closeness of the relationship (126-127), 2 mentioned respect (128), and 2 claimed that they didn’t mean to offend the addressee (129).

(124) “Fueses mayor.” WQ35

“You were older.”

(125) “Fueses tan mayor y/o serio como para merecerlo.” WQ53

“You were old or serious enough to deserve it.”

(126) “No tuviésemos cercanía.” WQ50

“We weren’t close.”

(127) “No haya confianza.” WQ21

“There isn’t trust.”

(128) “Te respetase.” WQ27
“I didn’t respect you.”

(129) “No quería ofenderle.” WQ22

“I didn’t mean to offend you USTED.”

In additional answers given to this question some of the informants made statements about the formality of the situation (130), their habits regarding the use of the V form (131), the comfort of the addressee (132), their authority (133), and even that they didn’t mean to say that addressee was intimidating (134).

(130) “Hubiera tanta formalidad.” WQ46

“It was so formal.”

(131) “Es algo habitual de mi profesión.” WQ47

“It is common in my profession.”

(132) “Tal vez te sientas más cómodo si te tuteo.” WQ42

“Perhaps you would feel more comfortable if I address you as ‘TÚ’.”

(133) “Tenga más autoridad. WQ36

“You have more authority.”

(134) “Intimidaras. WQ37

“You intimidated me.”

In their responses to 7b (distribution in Table 13), 29 of 35 informants claimed that they didn’t mean to disrespect the addressee (135) and 2 mentioned confianza (136).

(135) “Te faltase el respeto.” WQ12

“I disrespect you TÚ.

(136) “Tuviera suficiente confianza.” WQ11
“We were close enough.”

In other answers, 1 informant stated that he didn’t mean to make fun of the addressee (137), 1 didn’t mean to bother the addressee (138), 1 said that he didn’t mean to say that the addressee deserved to be addressed with the T form (139) and another that the addressee did deserve this because he was a nobody (140).

(137) “Me río de ti. WQ26
“I was making fun of you TÚ.”

(138) “Algo así le molestara.” WQ41
“That would bother you.”

(139) “Lo merecieras.” WQ53
“You deserved TÚ it.”

(140) “Pero es que como es usted un don-nadie, se lo merecía.” WQ33
“But since you are a nobody, you deserved it.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7b Written Questionnaire N = 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Distribution of Question 7b: Written Questionnaire

Through this series of fill-in-the-blank tasks shown in Questions 6 and 7, several possible implicatures that can be triggered by AFs have been identified. Each form seems more likely than the other to trigger certain implicatures; however in all cases these implicatures are cancelable. This is shown by the fact that the informants are able to claim that that was “not what they intended to say.”
Respect and confianza were often associated with the AFs and these implicatures were further explored in questions 12a and 12b (141).

(141) Question 12

a. No te trato de tú porque tengamos confianza, sino porque ________.

b. No le trato de usted simplemente por respeto, sino ____________.

Seventeen Madrid participants, 11 Manzanares participants, and 47 questionnaire participants answered Question 12a. As seen in Table 14, 7 Madrid, 3 Manzanares, and 8 questionnaire informants offered a comment on the age of the interlocutor (142-143). Six Madrid, 4 Manzanares, and 12 questionnaire informants made a comment about the closeness of the relationship between speaker and addressee (144). 3 Madrid informants filled in the blank in a negative manner showing that their use of the T form was intended to disrespect the addressee (145-146). Informants from Manzanares and Madrid claimed that the use of tú was comfortable or customary in this situation (147-148).

(142) “Eres una persona joven.” MD10

"You are a young person."

(143) Por edad quizá…a un niño a un joven. MZ23

Because of age maybe…a child, a younger person.

(144) “Te conozco; porque nuestra relación me parece más cordial o más familiar.” MZ26

“I know you; our relationship seems cordial or friendly.”

(145) “Eres un pringado.” MD12

“You are a loser.”
(146) “No te respeto.” MD38
    “I don’t respect you.”
(147) “Porque me siento más cómodo.” MD37
    “Because I feel more comfortable.”
(148) “Es mi manera habitual de hablar.” MZ22
    “It’s the way I speak.”

Some of the informants made comments about the V form in their response (149-151).

(149) “El usted me parece muy frío.” MD14
    “‘USTED’ seems colder.”
(150) Usted a lo mejor implica demasiado respeto. MZ27
    ‘USTED’ probably implies too much respect.
(151) Hay como un trozo de hielo que no está pero como una cortina como que
tú me ves a mí, en este caso, mayor. MZ28
    There is a sheet of ice, it’s not really there, it’s like a curtain, like you see me, in this case, as being older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Negative Connotation</th>
<th>Custom/comfort</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Usted comment</th>
<th>Unnecessary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N=17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N=11</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N=47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Responses to Question 12a
These responses indicate that *confianza* is not inherent to the meaning of *tú* and that this form can be used to address someone with whom the speaker does not share a close relationship. The informants’ responses also indicate that this form can and is used for other purposes than to index this type of relationship between the speaker and the addressee; it can also be used to express disdain or a lack of respect. It can be used to index the age of the addressee when the addressee is younger than the speaker. All of these meanings are potentially conventionally or conversationally implicated. However, based on the wealth of data summarized in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, as well as many comments made by the informants in this study, it is plainly seen that these meanings are not always expressed by the T form. They are therefore reliant on context and conversationally implicated. We know this is true because, if they were conventionally implicated, they would be entailed by the T form and therefore present whenever the T form is used. I will demonstrate with example (145). In this case the informant claims that he is not using the T form to express *confianza*, but rather to let the addressee know that he is a loser. If “you are a loser” were conventionally implicated, then anytime the T form would be used, the recipient of this form would be being called a loser. We know that this is not the case; it would only be in a very limited range of contexts that this meaning would be understood.

The comments made regarding the V form provide interesting information as well. According to these informants the V form would be too respectful or too “cold.” The fact that *usted* so often conversationally implicates great respect allows for the
possibility of manipulating the T form to implicate that the addressee is not worthy of respect, as seen in (146) above.

Seventeen Madrid participants, 10 Manzanares participants, and 42 questionnaire participants answered Question 12b. The most common answer, shared by 5 from Madrid, 2 from Manzanares, and 25 from the questionnaire was that the V form was used por educación, or, to show good manners (152-153). Five from Madrid, 2 from Manzanares and 10 from the questionnaire commented that the situation called for the V form; that the V form was appropriate or necessary in that situation. The informants either didn’t give an example or gave the example that they were in a work or official situation (154-155). Two informants in each interview group and 1 informant in the questionnaire group mentioned the age of the addressee, stating that the V form was used with older people (156). Three informants from Madrid, 1 from Manzanares, and 3 from the written questionnaire used the V form because they didn’t know the addressee (157-158). One person from Madrid, 3 from Manzanares, and 10 from the written questionnaire claimed that the addressee deserved to receive the V form for various reasons (159-160). In (161) we see an informant using the V form to express power. (162-163) demonstrate the use of the V form between interlocutors with strained relationships. One informant from the written questionnaire claimed that the V form was used to indicate that there was some sort of distance between the speaker and the

5 The term educación is generally used to refer to politeness or good manners in Spanish. This was confirmed by native speakers of Peninsular Spanish, who were asked to review all examples involving this term.
addressee (164). Cases of overlap are marked with an asterisk in Table 15 below. There is some overlap in the written questionnaire data in that 1 informant claimed that the V form was both for *mayores* and for strangers. There is overlap in the Manzanares data in that 1 informant claimed that the V form could be used to show good manners or in a negative way.

(152) “Porque es lo correcto.” MD13

“Because it’s the right thing to do.”

(153) “Por educación.” MD15

“Out of courtesy.”

(154) “Porque me parece que en esta situación es lo más apropiado.” MD30

“Because I believe that it is the most appropriate choice in this situation.”

(155) “Por motivos de trabajo.” MZ21

“Because of work.”

(156) Por edad puede ser. MZ20

It might be because of age.

(157) “No le conozco demasiado.” MD35

“I don’t know you very well.”

(158) “Porque es mi forma de dirigirme a cualquier persona con la que no tengo un trato habitual.” MZ18

“Because it’s the way I speak to anybody I don’t talk to very often.”

(159) “Por admiración.” MZ17

“I admire you.”
Because he/she deserves it…he/she is important for some reason.

“You are below me.”

You might not like him/her or you might not get along.

“I don’t want to be friends.”

“To show distance.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Educación”</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Stranger</th>
<th>Positive Association</th>
<th>Negative Association</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N= 17</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N=10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N= 42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Responses to Question 12b

The responses to this question offer several reasons that a speaker of these dialects might use the V form. We see that the main reason is that the V form is an expression of good manners and is used in official or work situations, when the addressee is older, and when the interlocutors do not know each other. The form can index a characteristic in the addressee that deserves admiration. The form can indicate that the speaker does not want to be friendly with the addressee or that the two do not get along.
The form can be used to indicate a distance between the interlocutors. These meanings are potentially conversationally or conventionally implicated and will be discussed further below.

Two of the Manzanares informants were asked a version of 12b in which any denotation or connotation of respect was explicitly canceled (165). These informants were able to accept this cancelation and associate the meanings seen in (166-167) with the V form.

(165) Le trato de usted no porque le respete, sino ___________________.

I’m not addressing you as ‘USTED’ because I respect you, but rather _____.

(166) “Porque no tengo mucha confianza”…pero eso no se dice a una persona.

MZ21

“Because I don’t trust you”… but you don’t say that to somebody.”

(167) “Por obligación.” MZ17

“I have to.”

This provides evidence that respect is cancelable and not part of the conventional meaning of the V form. It also lends insight as to why a speaker might use the V form to address someone that he or she does not respect: because they feel obligated to or because they do not feel close to this person.

A further attempt to show that respect was cancelable and context dependent was made in Question 10. The informants were asked whether or not they ever address anyone who they didn’t respect with the V form. Of 14 Madrid participants, 9 said yes;
their responses are seen below (168-176). The remaining 5 informants either said no or claimed that they respected everyone.

(168) En plan demostrar que estás muy enfadado. MD6

To show that you are very angry.

(169) Unos cuantos profesores…ya son como son para que no sean peores.

MD10

Some professors…they are how they are, so they don’t get worse.

(170) Sí, gente desconocida que no tengo porque ni respetar ni dejar de respetar.

MD16

Yes, strangers. I have no reason to respect them or not respect them.

(171) Es por el tono de voz, puedes decir algo a la gente de usted pero le puedes estar diciendo cualquier barbaridad. MD29

With your tone of voice, you can address someone as ‘USTED’ but you can be saying any horrible thing.

(172) ¡Sí! En cualquier discusión que puedes tener o cualquier altercado …para marcar la diferencia. MD31

Yes! Any argument or altercation…to mark differences.

(173) Sí…a veces cuando alguien hace algo que no es muy educado…la trato de usted independientemente de la edad que tenga…No merece un trato de respeto pero la forma es usted para que suene más contundente. MD34
Yes, sometimes when someone does something that’s not very polite I address them as ‘USTED’ regardless of their age. They don’t deserve respectful treatment but you use ‘USTED’ because it sounds blunt.

(174) Si no les respeto no suelo hablar con ellos. Si no me queda más por obligación le trataría de usted. MD35

If I don’t respect them I tend not to talk to them. If I have to, I use ‘USTED’.

(175) A lo mejor en una discusión o algo así…pero normalmente cuando utilizo usted es para, mostrando mis respetos, mostrando educación. MD37

Maybe in an argument or something like that but normally it is to show respect or manners.

(176) Sí, profesores, por educación. MD39

Yes, professors. Because it’s polite.

Of the 6 Manzanares participants, 2 answered yes to this question (177-178) and 1 answered that he might, but claimed that respect didn’t really have an effect on his choice; it was based on age or whether he knew the addressee (179). The remaining 3 said no because they respected everyone (180) or because if they did not respect someone they would not talk to them (181).

(177) Sí… personas que no conoces… cuando estás con un obispo pues estás hablando con una persona muy importante… y les tienes que hablar de usted, pero siempre tienes esta sensación de decir “eres igual que yo, y quizá no te mereces que te hable de usted.” MZ17
Yes…people that you don’t know…when you’re talking to a bishop you are talking to someone very important…and you have to address them as ‘USTED’, but you always feel like saying “You are the same as me and maybe you don’t deserve to be addressed as ‘USTED’.

(178) Sí, quizá…a una persona que quizá había oído o tenía entendido que podía no ser una persona limpia, por decirlo así, pero por desempeñar el cargo o por estar en determinada situación creo que mi obligación es tratarle usted.

MZ23
Yes, maybe a person that I heard is bad, but because of their position or the situation I am obligated to use ‘USTED’.

(179) Quizás alguien mayor, pero no es…es que yo el tú o el usted utilizo en función sobre todo de la edad, normalmente allí no me equivoco porque al partir de una cierta edad y según lo conozco no. MZ19
Maybe someone older, but it’s not…it’s just that I use ‘TÚ’ and ‘USTED’ based on age and at a certain age I normally don’t make a mistake.

(180) Tengo un respeto a todo el mundo, si el tratamiento es de tú o usted.

MZ18
I respect everybody, regardless of whether I use ‘TÚ’ or ‘USTED’.

(181) Si no me cae bien…procuro ignorarlo. MZ27
If we don’t get along I try to ignore him.

Based on the responses to this question it is obvious that respect is not inherent in the meaning of the V form. One can use the V form with no intention of demonstrating
respect toward the addressee and respect is not necessarily inferred by the addressee (as during a conflict or altercation). This shows that respect is cancellable. Comments such as (180) demonstrate that it is also nondetachable. Since this meaning carries these characteristics it must be conversationally implicated.

5.4 Additional Questions

The following group of questions was asked in order to encourage participants to discuss various aspects of the AFs. In doing so they provided further meaning associated with AFs and evidence as to whether the two forms behave in a similar manner.

Question 13a and b (182-183) were asked in an effort to explore the behavior of the AFs, specifically their interchangeability and whether the use of one could implicate or be inferred as a denial of the other.

(182) ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de usted para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de tú? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

(183) ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de tú para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de usted? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

As seen in Table 16, question 13a was answered by 52 informants: 6 from Madrid, 1 from Manzanares, and 45 from the written questionnaire. The majority of these claimed that the V form could be used to indicate that the speaker did not want to use the T form. Most of the informants who answered yes to this question provided an explanation of what it would mean to do so. A breakdown of these explanations can be seen in Table 17.
Table 16 Distribution of Question 13a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N= 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N= 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N= 45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Distribution of Yes Explanations: Question 13a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Fight</th>
<th>Greater Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N= 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N=1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N= 20</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common response was that *usted* could be used to indicate that distance was desired between the speaker and the addressee. The idea of distance took several forms. Some of the informants simply claimed that distance was desired (184-185). Others claimed that the use of *usted* could act as a barrier or a separation between speaker and addressee (186). Some claimed that they could indicate that they did not want a close relationship with the addressee (187-189).

(184) Quieres poner alguna distancia entre tú y ella. MD29
You want to impose distance between you and her.

(185) Si quieres mantener una distancia. MD33
You want to maintain a distance.

(186) Usted es para poner una barrera. MD31
‘USTED’ is for creating a barrier.
(187) Cuando yo no quiero relacionarme con una persona creo que la mejor forma de poner una barrera es ponerle un usted pero encima cargado con énfasis para decirle. MZ26

When I don’t want to associate myself with somebody I think the best way to create a barrier is to use ‘USTED’ with emphasis to let them know.

(188) Alguien a quien no quieres dar confianza. WQ6

Somebody you don’t want to be close to.

(189) Cuando quieres dar a entender que no quieres tener nada que ver con esta persona. WQ36

When you want someone to understand that you don’t want anything to do with them.

Seven informants claimed that the V form could be used during a fight or altercation to indicate that the tú form was not desired (190-196). Example (196) is especially interesting. The informant states that if someone speaks to him rudely or displays bad manners he would ask them to address him with V form. It seems as if he is playing with the perspective of the forms. His interlocutor apparently sees no reason to use the V form but the informant is correcting him in a way. He is saying that the way he is being treated is reason enough to grant the use of the form. The idea appears to be that his interlocutor does not deserve to use the T form with him.

(190) La nuera a la suegra porque se llevan mal. WQ12

A daughter-in-law to her mother-in-law because they don’t get along.
Si estás discutiendo con alguien y no quieres tutearlo para que no te replique por no conocerle de nada. WQ19
If you are arguing with somebody and you don’t want to use the ‘TÚ’ form to avoid being accused of acting like you know them.

Conflicto, para no mostrarle amistad. WQ21
Conflict, in order not to show friendship.

En un enfado o conflicto. WQ30
In anger or in a conflict.

Al discutir con alguien al que no conoces demasiado. WQ38
When arguing with someone you don’t know well.

Si hay alguien a quien no conozco y me está hablando de malas formas. WQ42
If there is someone I don’t know well and he/she is being rude to me.

Si alguien se me aproxima con mala educación y malos modales, le pido que me hable de usted. WQ52
If someone comes up to me being rude I ask them to address me as ‘USTED’.

Two of the informants mentioned that the use of usted marked a very high level of respect (197-198).

Para…remarcar el respeto. WQ50
To really show respect.
According to me, addressing someone as ‘USTED’ means you have a greater respect for them for various reasons: age, profession, etc.

The majority of informants answering this question agreed that the V form could be used with the purpose of letting the addressee know that they did not want to use the T form. They provided three reasons as to why a speaker might do this. These reasons were to make sure that your addressee was aware of the distance between you, to argue, or to show great respect.

As seen in Table 18, 50 informants answered question 13b: 6 from Madrid, 1 from Manzanares, and 43 from the written questionnaire. Again, the majority of responses indicated that one form could be used to signal a desire not to use the other. In this case, 5 of 6 Madrid informants, 1 of 1 Manzanares informants, and 31 of 43 questionnaire informants claimed that the T form could be used in order to indicate that the speaker did not wish to use the V form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 Distribution of Question 13b

In this case explanations were given both by informants who answered yes and informants who answered no. The explanations offered by those who answered no,
however, were very telling in that they actually indicated that the AFs could be manipulated in such a way. These explanations can be seen in (199-201). It seems that in each case the informants were actually judging the appropriateness of using AFs in this way and not the actual possibility of doing so. These explanations cast a doubt on all of the no responses; all of the no responses may have been judgments of appropriateness rather than possibility.

(199) No. Es de mala educación. WQ39
     No. It’s rude.

(200) No. Falta de respeto. WQ40
     No. It’s disrespectful.

(201) No. Habría que preguntarle antes. WQ46
     No. I would have to ask first.

The distributions of the explanations offered by those who answered yes to this question can be seen in Table 19. The most common explanation was that the T form could be used to indicate a lack of respect toward the addressee (202-204). Two informants claimed that the use of the T form in this way could cause offense or that it was demonstrative of poor manners (205). One claimed that the T form could be used so that the addressee did not feel old (206). One claimed that the T form could be used to make the addressee feel comfortable (207). One claimed that the T form could be used to show that the relationship between the speaker and the addressee had grown closer (208). Three of the informants seemed to claim that the T form always indicated a desire not to use the V form (209).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of respect</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Anytime</th>
<th>Closeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N=4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N=12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Distribution of Yes Explanations; Question 13b

(202) “Ya no te tengo respeto- tú no eres nadie ahora.” MD31
“I don’t respect you anymore- you are TÚ a nobody now.”

(203) “No mereces mi respeto.” MD38
“You don’t deserve my respect.”

(204) Para faltar el respeto de esa persona con ánimo de herir. WC19
To disrespect this person with the intention of hurting his/her feelings.

(205) Puede ofender. MD32
It can offend.

(206) A una señora de mediana edad para no hacerle sentirse mayor. WQ12
To a middle-aged woman, so she doesn’t feel old.

(207) Para que se sienta más cómodo. WQ29
So that he/she feels more comfortable.

(208) Mostrar confianza, pero con el tiempo. WQ21
To show trust, but with time.

(209) En cualquier ocasión. WQ25
Any time.

Apart from the last 4 responses, all of the informants who offered explanations attributed a negative meaning to using the T form in this context.
The interplay of the forms demonstrated in the response to Question 13 offers valuable insight into the calculation of meanings associated with AFs. The informants have provided us with evidence that calculation does occur; when one form is used they are aware that the other form is not and make inferences based on that fact. These choices between AFs seem to be very salient to both the addressee and the speaker. For example, if the V form is used, the addressee knows that the speaker has chosen not to use the T form. The speaker can use take advantage of this and manipulate the use of the forms in order to convey different messages. Examples of such messages were seen above and include, for example, that the speaker does not to have anything to do with the addressee.

Question 15 (210) was another attempt to prompt the informants to discuss their own use of AFs and why they used them. The distribution of their answers can be seen in Table 20.

(210) Question 15

a. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de usted, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de usted o lo ves como obligación?

b. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de tú, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de tú o lo ves como obligación?
Fifty-five informants answered question 15a. There was a fairly even split between those who claimed that they used the V form because they wanted to and those who claimed to use the V form because they had to. An additional 15 informants claimed that it depended on the situation whether they wanted to or had to. Still others claimed that it was something they simply did out of habit (211). Those who found the use of usted to be obligatory claimed that it was something required by society (212-213).

(211) Me suele salir de forma natural. MZ23

It comes out naturally.

(212) Cuando es un desconocido es establecido. MD10

With a stranger it is expected.

(213) Vienes obligado por la sociedad. MD30

You are obligated by society.

Those who said that they wanted to use the V form claimed that they did it to distance the addressee in a respectful way (214), to show respect because that was how they had been taught (215), or because they had good manners (216).

(214) Porque quiero crear una barrera de un poco de respeto. Que tampoco quiero un acercamiento. MZ21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>“Educación”</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Depends</th>
<th>Natural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Distribution of Question 15a
Because I want to create a respectful barrier. I don’t want to be too close either.

(215) No sé, por respeto, porque me han educado así. A las personas mayores les trato de usted y las personas de estatus. MD12

I don’t know, out of respect, because I was taught that way. I address older people and people of status with ‘USTED’.

(216) Es algo que quiero hacer porque llevo la educación. MD31

I want to because I have good manners.

There were many people however who offered other responses in which they described why or when they would use this form. These responses mirrored those given as reasons for having to or wanting to use the form. The most common of these was that the V form was used in good manners and that they were taught that way (217-220).

(217) A veces me parece más formal y educado. MD13

Sometimes it feels more formal or polite.

(218) Es importante respetar ciertos roles y por educación. MZ19

It’s important to respect certain roles and also out of courtesy.

(219) Un protocolo de educación… es parte del castellano y yo creo que hay que usarlo. MZ24

A protocol of good manners… it’s part of Castellano and I think that it should be used.

(220) Educación…como te han educado en casa. MD38

Polite…it’s how you were taught at home.
Others claimed that *usted* used to show respect (221).

(221) Cuando lo hago siempre lo hago por respeto, para mostrar respeto a una persona. MD37

When I do it I always do it out of respect, to show respect to somebody.

While there was not a consensus as to whether speakers wanted to use the V form, felt they had to, or neither, the reasoning behind these answers was consistent. The V form is part of courteous speech and is used to show respect.

Forty-one informants answered question 15b. The answers given were similar to those given for 15a in that some informants stated that they wanted to use the form or that they felt they had to and some informants commented as to when they used the form or why. There are some major differences in the distribution to these answers however. In the case of the T form, 22 informants said that they used it because they wanted to while only 4 claimed that it was necessary and none said that it depended on the situation. Recall that for the V form, 15 informants said that it depended on the situation whether the form was required or whether they wanted to use it, 10 said that it was necessary and 12 said that they wanted to use it. Eight informants also claimed that the use of the T form was something natural or habitual (222-224), as opposed to 1 such claim for the V form. One informant actually claimed that T was normal while V was required (225). Another interesting difference was that no informant claimed to use T because it was in good manners, but 1 informant did claim that it was used because it was how they were taught (226).

(222) Te sale sólo. MD10
It just comes out.

(223) Es algo natural. MD29

It’s natural.

(224) Lo hago por inercia, porque en el 95% de los casos es lo que utilizo.

WQ50

I do it automatically, because in 95% of cases it is what I use.

(225) Lo veo como algo normal…veo más necesario tratar a alguien de usted, o sea, necesario en el sentido de que a mí me cuesta más. MZ22

I see it as being normal…I think it as more necessary to use ‘Usted’ in the sense that it requires more effort.

(226) Algo educativo. MD34

It is part of our education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>Taught</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Habitual</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N=13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N=6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N=22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 Distribution of Question 15b

Upon comparing the answers to 15a and 15b we can see that the speakers do not view the two AFs in the same light. The T form seems to be more natural and in general desirable to use. The V form is more likely to be associated with obligation or with educación. A comparison of these results can be seen in Table 22 below. This distribution suggests that the forms do not pattern equally. Usted is “learned” and it is something that
speakers feel they “have to” use in certain situations. *Tú*, on the other hand, is used in the cases in which speakers do not feel they have to use *V*. Their comments regarding the naturalness of the *T* form and their desire and habitual use of it support this idea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obligation</th>
<th>Want</th>
<th>“Educación”</th>
<th>Habitual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Tú</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Usted</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 Comparison of Questions 15a and 15b

Question 19 (227) was asked in an effort to gather more possible reasons for using the *V* form. This question differs in that it asks the question from another point of view. Rather than asking the informants why or when they use the *V* form, they are asked when they would like it used towards them. This would hopefully discourage responses that the form was required or *por educación*.

(227) ¿Hay alguien que quieres que te trate de usted? ¿Quién?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Depends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD N= 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N= 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N= 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 Distribution of Question 19

The vast majority of informants, 40 of 58, stated that there was no one that they wished would address them as *usted*. Only 1 informant gave a reason for this, stating that she was too young for it (228).

(228) Aún estoy muy joven para eso. WQ12
I’m still too young for that.

Two informants stated that it depended on the situation. One claimed that he sometimes wanted to be addressed with the V form out of respect (229).

(229) Otras veces por respeto si me gustaría que me trataran de usted pero no se da mucho el caso. MD33

Sometimes I would like people too because it is respectful but I don’t really care.

Many of the informants who answered yes to this question offered explanations as to when they would like to be addressed with V or by whom. One wanted to be addressed as usted during arguments or by her subordinates (230). She claimed that the T form would seem too derogatory (despectivo) during an argument.

(230) Sobre todo cuando existen momentos tensos o de valoraciones, de contradicciones en donde un tú te puede sentar, no despectivo, pero sí inferior… o con subordinados MD31

Most of all in tense moments or arguments, where ‘TÚ’ can make you feel, not insulted, but inferior…also subordinates.

Four informants wanted to be addressed as usted by strangers (231). Five wanted to be addressed with V in a professional situation or by their students (232-233). One informant wanted to be addressed this way by younger people (234). One informant wanted to be addressed with V out of respect (235).

(231) Los que no me conocen de nada. WQ41

People who don’t know me at all.
Entrevista de trabajo. WQ47
Job interview.

Gente menor. WQ3
Younger people.

Mis alumnos cuando sea profe. WQ25
My students when I become a professor.

En sitios donde…sea necesario un respeto mutuo. WQ53
In places where mutual respect is necessary.

These uses of usted match uses given in other questions, with the exception that no informants commented on the use of the form for the sake of manners.

Questions 12a and b (236) were asked in order to compare the informants’ views on using V vs. using T.

Question 12

a. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le trataras de usted pero no te sentiste cómodo de hacerlo?

b. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le tutearas pero no te sentiste cómodo de tutearle?

Ten informants from the Madrid group, 1 from the Manzanares group, and 51 from the questionnaire group answered 12a; 16, 5 and 51, respectively, answered 12b. The distribution of their answers is seen in Table 23.
### Table 24 Distribution of Question 12a and 12b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12a</th>
<th></th>
<th>12b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD N= 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MD N= 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ N= 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>MZ N= 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ N=51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>WQ N= 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of informants in the MD and WQ groups said that they had never experienced a time in which they were uncomfortable using the V form. The majority who said that the V form was not uncomfortable did not say why not; however one explained that it could sometimes be strange to use the V form, but not uncomfortable (237). Another explained that it was not uncomfortable because it was normal and how she was taught (238). A third informant explained that the V form was actually more comfortable than the T form at times because it was more impersonal (MD39).

(237) Me he sentido raro, incómodo no. MD30
It can be weird but not uncomfortable.

(238) No, porque es más formal parece que es más educado hasta que te dicen…es algo educativo…es normal tratarles de usted. MD34
No, because it is more formal, it’s more polite until they tell you…it’s polite…it’s normal to address them as ‘USTED’.

Few explanations were offered by those who said that using the V form had made them uncomfortable as well. Two stated that they were uncomfortable using the V form with addressees who were younger than them (239) and another said that using the V form for an extended period of time made her uncomfortable because she was not used to
doing so (240). She did say however that quick utterances or questions using the V form did not bother her.6

(239) Pacientes muy jóvenes. WQ46

Very young patients.

(240) Sí, porque tal vez porque no estoy tan acostumbrada a mantener una conversación sobre todo a mantener una conversación todo el rato pensando en usted …porque es diferente preguntarle a alguien de manera puntual sobre cualquier cosa de usted, es mucho más fácil. Pero mantener una conversación me siento mucho más cómoda tratándole de tú porque es la manera a la que estoy acostumbrada hablar. MD16

Yes, because maybe I’m not used to maintaining a conversation thinking of ‘usted’…because it is one thing to ask somebody one thing using ‘usted,’ it’s easy. But I feel much more comfortable maintaining a conversation using ‘tú’ because I am more accustomed to speaking that way.

The majority of informants overall, 58%, claimed that using the T form had made them uncomfortable at some time in their lives. The majority of informants in Madrid however claimed that this had never happened. Those who claimed that using the T form had never made them uncomfortable offered the explanation that using this form was

6 This response may have ramifications for the property of repeatability. Using the V form for an extended amount of time may cause the informant discomfort if the effects of the form are strengthened with each use.
more common or more comfortable (241-242) and that it offered a closeness that the informant apparently preferred (243).

(241) Siempre me siento más cómoda tratando de tú a la gente. MD16

I always feel more comfortable addressing people with ‘TÚ’.

(242) Es más común…te cuesta más llamar de usted. MD38

It’s more common…it takes more effort to use ‘USTED’.

(243) Tutear a alguien y eso es para más cercanía. MD32

Addressing someone with ‘tú’ means you are closer.

Nine informants mentioned that it made them uncomfortable to use the T form with those who were older than them (244-252). Some further specified that these people were strangers (249-250) or patients (251) and 1 discussed his discomfort with addressing middle-aged women as tú, even though he knows they do not like to be addressed as usted (252).

(244) Sí, con alguien muy mayor…al partir de 70 años. MZ19

Yes, with someone older…starting at 70 years of age.

(245) Muchas veces…estás acostumbrado (usar el usted)…sobre todo con personas mayores …se te olvida…por costumbre. MZ24

Often times…you are used to it (using ‘USTED’)…especially with older people…you forget…it’s habit.

(246) Sí, personas mayores. WQ27

Yes, older people.

(247) Alguna vez cuando era más joven yo a gente mayor. MZ28
Sometimes when I was younger to older people.

(248) Gente de más edad. WQ42

Older people.

(249) Alguna vez con personas desconocidas…y que además eran mayores que yo. MD33

Sometimes with strangers who are older than me.

(250) A veces con personas más mayores que no tengo mucha confianza…aunque te digan expresamente ‘prefiero que llames de tú’ pero a veces es difícil cambiar el chip porque sale natural. MD34

Sometimes with older people I’m not close to…even if they tell you to use ‘TÚ’ it’s difficult to change the chip because it’s natural.

(251) Si, pacientes ancianos. WQ47

Yes, elderly patients.

(252) A veces hay mujeres un poco más mayores que yo pero no son mayores. A lo mejor tienen 30 o 40 años y les molesta que hables de usted. A veces te lo dicen, generalmente no, pero a veces te lo dicen y se vaya. Te sientes mal porque te has metido la pata; te has equivocado…porque a las mujeres no les gusta parecer mayores. MD13

Sometimes there are women who are slightly older than I am but aren’t that old, maybe 30 or 40. ‘USTED’ bothers them. Sometimes they tell you, usually not, but sometimes they tell you and leave. You feel bad because
you put your foot in your mouth; you messed up…because women don’t like to look old.

Six informants mentioned that they had experienced discomfort addressing people with the T form in an academic or professional setting (253-258).

(253) Con profesores- “no le puedo tratar de tú.” MD7
With professors- “I can’t address you with ‘tú’.”

(254) Sí, profesores. WQ25
Yes, professors.

(255) Alguna vez con algun prof pero duró poco tiempo. WQ37
One time with a professor but it didn’t last very long.

(256) El primer director de un colegio. MZ23
The principal of a school.

(257) Sí, personas recién conocido en el ambiente laboral. WQ34
Yes, people you just meet at work.

(258) Jefe…inicialmente. WQ40
Boss…at the beginning.

Five informants mentioned in their explanations that using the T form made them uncomfortable when speaking to someone they did not know very well. This includes (250, 251, 258, 259) above as well as (259-260) below.

(259) Sí, en general cuando no tengo mucha confianza y estoy enfadada con esta persona. WQ43
Yes, in general when I’m not very close to someone and I’m mad at this person.

(260) Creo que sí pero no me acuerdo…la madre de una novia que tuve…al principio de usted. MD36

I think so but I don’t remember…the mother of a girlfriend I had…at first

I addressed her as ‘USTED’.

In some explanations there is an interplay of factors, such as strangers that are older or people that you have just met in the workplace. In the case of (259) we see that the additional factor of anger makes the use of the T form uncomfortable for this speaker. In the case of (260) the informant has specified a case in which he was speaking to the mother of his girlfriend.

Another informant (MZ20) was not specifically asked these questions; however she provided answers for them on her own. She claimed that she was uncomfortable using the T form with members of the clergy (261), to the point that she could not do so even when asked. She claimed that she would avoid addressing them rather than address them as tú. She told of a friend of her son, whom she had always addressed with tú, who became a priest. Once he became a priest she was not comfortable using this AF anymore, but she didn’t feel comfortable using the V form either because of his age and relationship with the family (262). She specified however that using the V form did not mean that she did not care for these people or feel close to them (263).

(261) Me infunde tanto respeto que no puedo. MZ20

He invokes so much respect in me that I can’t.
Me daba vergüenza por lo joven que es y ser amigo de (mi hijo). MZ20
I was embarrassed because he was so young and a friend (of my son’s).

El cariño es el mismo, todo bien. MZ20
The love is the same, everything fine.

These examples illustrate several factors that might cause discomfort in using the T form. These factors include the age of the addressee, the familiarity of the addressee and the social status of the addressee (professor, boss, clergy, etc.).

In sum, more informants had experienced discomfort using the T form than had using the V form; 58.3% vs. 30.6%. The informants did not seem to have much to say by way of an explanation of their feelings except in the case of T having made them feel uncomfortable. It seems that the speaker is essentially “missing something” by using the T form instead of the V form and therefore feels uncomfortable using it. The factor that influenced discomfort in the use of either form was the age of the addressee with respect to the speaker. Those who had not felt discomfort claimed that the use of the forms was natural or engrained in them.

At least one informant from each age group was asked Question 20 (264). They offered varying opinions about the recent decline in the use of usted. Some saw the change as positive, claiming that the T form was less distancing and united people (265-266). The first of these stated that, even if someone was not your friend, you could use the T form because there were other ways to distance them than using the V form.

¿Qué opinas de la pérdida del uso de usted hoy día?
(265) Lo veo más cercano con las personas mayores que antiguamente. Si bien es verdad que hay situaciones que a lo mejor se abusa de esto. Pero en principio…yo lo prefiero…distancia menos las personas…siempre hay muchos caminos para distanciarte de ellas. MZ26

I think people are closer to older people than before. Although there are times where this is abused. But in principle I prefer it. It distances people less. There are always a lot of ways to distance people.

(266) Junta más la relación. Porque el usted se segmentaba y se hablaba sobre todo cuando cualquier persona a cierta edad se dirigía a una persona mayor y ahora…es mucho mejor la relación entre personas mayores, más jóvenes, familiares, hijos, que no te digan de usted. Mucho más unida la relación que si dices de usted. El usted es una barrera pequeña que no sé pero es una barrera. MZ28

It brings people together. ‘USTED’ separated people and was used mostly when people of a certain age addressed older people and now…the relationship between older people, younger people, family members, and children is better now that they don’t use ‘USTED’. Relationships are closer if you don’t use ‘USTED’. ‘USTED’ is like a little barrier, I don’t know, but it’s a barrier.

Others claimed that the change was negative for essentially the same reasons and because the V form is respectful in certain situations (267-268). One of these claimed that, although the T form could be used respectfully, the V form should still be used.
(267) Me parece muy mal…es que es importante porque es un detonante de
respeto, como una barrera. MD31

It seems very bad…it’s important because it denotes respect, like a barrier.

(268) En determinadas situaciones yo creo que se debe mantener el
usted…especialmente cuando estás hablando con una persona que, por
ejemplo, una persona en el trabajo. O cuando estás con alguien que tiene
mucho mucha autoridad, dentro del trabajo o fuera del trabajo. Yo creo
que se debe mantener el usted… porque es una forma como de respeto.
Aunque también puedes hablar con mucho respeto utilizando el tú…yo
creo que en determinadas situaciones yo creo que se tiene que seguir
utilizándolo (el usted). Especialmente con personas que tienen cierta
autoridad o porque tienen un cargo de mucho respeto. MD37

In certain situations I believe that the use of ‘USTED’ should be
maintained…especially when you are speaking to, for example, someone
at work. Or when you are with someone that has a whole lot of authority,
at work or not. I think we should continue to use ‘USTED’ because it is a
form of respect. Although you can also show respect using ‘TÚ’…I believe
that in certain situations we have to continue using it (‘USTED’). Especially
with people of authority or in a respected position.

Others claimed that the change was neither positive nor negative (269-270).

MD29 discussed the ramifications of these changes, claiming that in current times
everybody was closer and there was less of a need to establish hierarchical differences.
She also hypothesized that *usted* was used more often in the past out of fear. MD38 was asked whether she thought the T form could be lost. She stated that it could not and gave as an example that *tú* was the only way to show someone affection in situations such as over the phone, when there was no other way to show them.

(269) Ni bueno ni malo, simplemente que los tiempos cambian…la misma educación tienes cuando hablas de alguien de tú que de usted…ahora tiende ser todo más cercano y se habla de tú…antes había a lo mejor como más respeto más miedo y quizá se hablaba la gente de usted por miedo…y a lo mejor era para marcar las distancias y ahora…más o menos iguales.

MD29

Neither bad nor good, times simply change…people are just as polite using ‘TÚ’ as they are using ‘USTED’…now everybody feels closer and they use ‘TÚ’…before there might have been more respect or more fear and maybe people used ‘USTED’ out of fear…and maybe to mark distances and now…we are more or less equal.

(270) No lo veo como bueno ni como malo. El usted es como más de respeto y el tú es como más de amistad…una persona aunque hables de usted también puedes decir que es amigo. …por el teléfono tú no puedes enseñarle a una persona tus efectos o lo que sea pues el tú hace de eso.

MD38

I don’t see it as either good or bad. ‘USTED’ is more for respect and ‘TÚ’ is more for friendship…but although you speak to someone using ‘USTED’ it
doesn’t mean they can’t be your friend. …over the phone you can’t show someone how you feel so ‘tú’ does it for you.

Regardless of the informants’ opinion on the decline in the use of the V form, patterns emerge in their explanations. The common thread is that V is some sort of barrier, although one informant mentioned that a friend could be addressed as usted. In other portions of the conversation with this informant she discussed an example of doctors who normally addressed each other with the T form addressing each other with the V form in front their patients because they do not want to affect the relationship between the doctor and their patient. The common thread regarding the use of the T form is that it brings people closer together.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the results to the question asked of the informants in this study. The responses to questions 8, 14, and 18 were not discussed specifically due to their low number of responses, however evidence gained in them will be used to support the conclusions drawn in the following chapters.

Many patterns were uncovered among these results. These will be summarized in the following chapter.
Chapter 6: The Interaction of tú and usted: conventional and conversational implicature

6.1 Introduction

In this study I have set out to determine what social content is associated with the address forms tú and usted in one dialect of Spanish and, most importantly, to determine how this content is contributed to an utterance. The results described in the previous chapter detail a variety of meanings that are associated with the T and V forms by speakers of this dialect. They associated the V form with older age, respect, lack of relationship, formality, good manners, hostility, and distance. They associated the T form with close relationships, younger or same age addressees, lack of respect, bad manners, or anger. This content has been tested for the properties of conventional as well as conversational implicature. According to the results of these tests, most of the associations mentioned above can be conversationally implicated in certain contexts; one of the meanings, distance, is conventionally implicated by the V form. Each of the meanings mentioned above will be discussed individually in this chapter. I will begin the chapter by discussing the differing behavior of the T vs. the V form. In section 6.3 I will discuss the conventional implicature contributed by the V form. In section 6.3 I will discuss how the interaction of the T and V form allows CVIs to arise and speak in detail about the most salient ones. I will discuss how each of these CVI relates back to the CI of distance.
6.2 Conventional Implicature

Based on the evidence gathered in this study, as well as the wealth of evidence gathered by other researchers, *tú* and *usted* do not appear to behave equally in terms of how they contribute meaning to an utterance. Recall that both of the forms have the same referential meaning; they both reference a singular addressee. Beyond that, they both appear to contribute social content of some sort. I argue, however, that it is actually only the *V* form that entails social content. This is done by way of conventional implicature. In order to see what information is entailed by the *V* form, let us review the results of the CI tests administered in this study.

6.2.1 *Usted*

Based on the evidence gathered in this study, as well as the wealth of evidence gathered by other researchers, *tú* and *usted* do not appear to behave equally in terms of how they contribute meaning to an utterance. Recall that both of the forms have the same referential meaning; they both reference a singular addressee. Beyond that, they both appear to contribute social content of some sort. I argue, however, that it is actually only the *V* form that does so by way of conventional implicature. In order to see what information is entailed by the *V* form, let us review the results of the CI tests administered in this study.

Based on the results described in the previous chapter, I have identified “distance” as the conventional implicature contributed by the *V* form for these speakers. I base my definition of distance on the model developed by Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) in her study of English and Polish address forms in combination with traditional definitions of
social distance. Karakayali (2009) reviewed the most common types of social distance. These include affective distance, normative distance, interactive distance, and cultural or habitual distance. Affective distance describes people’s subjective feelings about who is different from them. Normative distance describes the existence of structured social groups, such as families, who are distant from each other. Interactive distance is the measure of interaction between people, in terms of length and frequency. Cultural and habitual distance is caused by differences in people’s behavior. These types of social distance manifest themselves in society with the formation of various social groups and classes. People form groups with those who are least socially distant from them. Those who are less distant will have similar habits, similar traits, and will interact often with each other.

Park and Burgess (1924) discusses the phenomenon of psychological differentiation. He explains that, as people age, they begin to feel different or socially distant from each other based on factors such as sex, race, or social class.

Correlating these ideas with AFs, the V form entails that the speaker perceives social distance between himself and the addressee. This distance can be caused by the frequency of the interaction, the fact that they are in different social groups, or because of differences in the interlocutors themselves such as sex or age.

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) expands the concept of social distance by including the possibility that the cause or trigger for the differentiation between the speaker and the addressee lie in the situational context, that is to say, to not rely on social characteristics of the interlocutors. She claims that social distance “pertains to the social characteristics
of the speakers and the speech situation, varied and variable as they can be” (28). Triggers in the context might include the formality of the place or the event in which the interaction occurs.

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) uses distance as the basis for her theory of the evolution of AFs. She developed a distance-based model to counter Brown and Gilman’s (1960) power and solidarity based model, which she felt did not account well for AF usage. Her main criticism is that often times a relationship might involve varying degrees of both power and solidarity, leaving a lot of gray area for AF choice. According to Kielkiewicz-Janowiak AFs can express distance or a lack thereof. The concept of distance provides a better account for AFs because it is general enough to apply to all of their uses. It is able to do so because it takes into account the characteristics of the interlocutors and the situational context of the discourse. As we have seen in the literature review of Chapter 2, the idea that both speakers and context play a role in triggering AF choice is nothing new; however the forms have not necessarily been correlated solely with distance. In Kielkiewicz-Janowiak’s theory, languages that have a choice among AFs will have a [+distance] form and a [-distance] form. She claims that the forms work in opposition, that the [+distance] form is only meaningful because of the existence of the [-distance] form and vice versa. A [+distance] marked form is used when a speaker wishes to be polite, when they are speaking to an unfamiliar person, when they are in a formal situation, or when they wish to show deference (as in the use of honorifics). She associates the [-distance] form with familiar or intimate relationships, informal situations, and derogatory address.
It may be the case that social characteristics, such as differences in power or profession, are simply more salient in certain contexts. For example, a student might regularly address her professor with the T form, feeling no need to differentiate herself from him based on age or power. However, during an exam, the power he has over her will come to the foreground and she will therefore use the V form to acknowledge this. 

At this time I will not judge whether or not this is the case; I will follow Kielkiewicz-Janowiak’s insight that the situational context can trigger the use of the V form. I do not agree, however, with Kielkiewicz-Janowiak’s assumption that there is both a [+distance] and a [-distance] form. There is a wealth of evidence that suggests that the T form does not necessarily deny social distance. This form is often used with strangers, for example. It also seems to be the form used most often in cases of what I will call downward distance, in which a speaker addresses someone who is either younger than them or their subordinate. This speaker may or may not receive the T form in return. In addition, the T form does not necessarily have an effect or an impact on the context in the way that the V form does. This will be explored further in section 6.2.2.

According to Kielkiewicz-Janowiak, her theory can account for all uses of address forms with the exception of ironic or unfriendly uses of the [+distance] marked forms. She claims that these uses are “secondary and derivable” (85). She does not explain exactly what she means by this statement. I will show, however, that all uses can be accounted for using a distance-based model in which the V form entails distance and the T form has no such entailment.
Further support for the correlation of AFs with social distance is seen in Stainton’s (1987) study of interruptions. Stainton judged the degree of social distance between the participants based on the address terms they used with each other. This study was in English, therefore she judged those who addressed each other as *Mr.* or *Mrs.* to be more socially distant and those who addressed each other with their first names to be less socially distant. In doing so, she contends that terms of address are related to social distance, providing support for my theory that AFs (*usted* in this case) are deictic markers of distance. Stainton (1987) defines social distance as “the degree of familiarity between the participants in a conversation” (89). She describes a cline in which participants can range from minimally socially distant to maximally socially distant. Stainton correlated the degree of social distance between the participants in a conversation with the frequency of interruptions made during that conversation and found the correlation to be significant. She found that the conversations in which the interlocutors were more socially distant and using [+distance] AFs contained fewer interruptions than those with minimally distant interlocutors.

I agree with Kielkiewicz-Janowiak’s intuition that “by the notion of distance we can capture the meaning of AFs in the most unified and efficient way” (30) and by combining facets of Kielkiewicz-Janowiak’s model with differentiation-type definitions of distance, we come closer to a workable concept of distance that encompasses the interlocutors and the situational context. To this I add the idea that AFs only express social distance as perceived by the speaker. This goes along with the perspective dependence property of CI. In addition, social distance is not only measured by the
speaker, but it can also be created by the speaker. In sum, and for the purpose of this
dissertation, social distance will be considered to be a measure of differentiation felt by
the speaker toward the addressee. The differentiation is usually based on social
characteristics such as age, profession, and familiarity. Distance may be desirable based
on the situation as well. The speaker uses the V form to acknowledge this distance and to
let the addressee know that he does.

The idea that there is a [+distance] marked form resonates not only in the
intuitions of the speakers but also in the actual use of AFs by the speakers of this dialect.
And as Kielkiewicz-Janowiak suggested, the idea is flexible enough to encompass the
uses of these forms while still being specific enough as to not lead to overgeneralization.
I posit that the idea is in fact underspecified enough that it can account for all uses of the
V form by these speakers, including the ironic and other negative uses discounted by
Kielkiewicz-Janowiak. The context in which the AF is uttered provides the clues needed
for its exact interpretation. This underspecification is not unique to AFs. There are many
other items whose underspecification allows for a wider variety of meanings determined
by the context. Nunberg (1993), in his discussion of the English we, states that

most of the work of specifying the interpretation is accomplished in the contextual
background, rather than by the utterance, in a process mediated by the speaker's
intentions, the linguistic context, considerations of relevance, and so on…it is
because the context does so much work that the grossly underspecifying meaning
of we can turn out to be so useful (17)
The V form works in a similar fashion. It is used to deictically point out or create a distance between the interlocutors. The context then tells the addressee why the speaker is doing so or what kind of a distance has been recognized or created.

As Kielkiewicz-Janowiak stated, characteristics of either the interlocutors or the situation can trigger the use of a [+distance] form. We have seen examples of this throughout the interviews and questionnaires. In all cases, the meaning associated with the V form boils down to a perception of or desire for distance on the part of the speaker. The perception of distance might be caused by a particular quality or qualities of the addressee, as seen in (1), in which the speaker describes the qualities in the addressee that trigger her to use the V form.

(1) Una persona más mayor que yo normalmente, personas con cargos superiores, o a lo mejor personas que no conozco... MD6

Older people, people in higher positions, people that I don’t know...

The perception of distance might also be caused by the situational context, as seen in (2-3), in which the informants are explaining that the situation can determine whether or not they would use the V form.

(2) A lo mejor pues por la situación. MZ22

Probably because of the situation.

(3) Pero por desempeñar el cargo o por estar en determinada situación mi obligación es trátele de usted. MZ23

But because of the person’s position or the situation I am obligated to use ‘USTED’.
The speaker may not necessarily perceive an existing distance, but for one reason or another may want to impose one. Examples of this were seen frequently throughout the interviews and questionnaires; such examples include (4-7) below. In each case, the informant tells us that *usted* can be used to create a distance or a barrier between the speaker and the addressee.

(4) Quieres poner alguna distancia entre tú y ella. MD29

You want to impose distance between you and her.

(5) Porque quiero crear una barrera de un poco de respeto. Que tampoco quiero un acercamiento. MZ21

Because I want to create a respectful barrier. I don’t want to be too close either.

(6) Cuando yo no quiero relacionarme con una persona creo que la mejor forma de poner una barrera es ponerle un usted pero encima cargado con énfasis para decirle. MZ26

When I don’t want to associate myself with somebody I think the best way to create a barrier is to use ‘USTED’ with emphasis to let them know.

(7) Que quieres la separación. MD38

That you want distance.

Distance displays all the characteristics of CI in that it is entailed by the form while being independent of the at-issue entailment. It is also immediate, nondisplaceable, speaker-oriented, ineffable and possibly repeatable. This content is not cancelable or nondisplaceable, as a conversational implicature would be.
The participants in this study have provided us with support for the idea that distance is entailed by the V form. According to the informants, the use of the V form automatically imposes some sort of distance or barrier between the speaker and the addressee (8-11).

(8) Para marcar una distancia. WQ50
To mark distance.

(9) Cuando quieres mantener la distancia. WQ43
When you want to maintain a distance.

(10) Impone cierta distancia con la persona. MD16
It imposes a certain distance between you and another.

(11) La mejor forma de poner una barrera es ponerle un usted. MZ26
The best way to create a barrier is to use ‘USTED’.

In addition to statements such as those shown above, in all of the opportunities that the informants had to cancel meanings, they never canceled distance. The statements appearing below in (12-14) may appear to be cases of cancelation; however, when examined closely it can be seen that they are not.

(12) No quería ponerlo a lo mejor muy formal o muy distante pero tiendo a utilizarlo automáticamente. MD37
I didn’t mean to make this so formal or distant but I tend to use it automatically.
(13) No quería hacer o darte una respuesta de distanciamiento sino simplemente porque quizá la ocasión en la que estamos ahora mismo pues procede más llamarle de usted. MZ18

I didn’t want give you a distancing response I just thought that addressing you with ‘USTED’ was appropriate in the situation that we are in.

(14) Sí, una señora que viene a veces a limpiar mi casa. Siempre me dice que la llame de tú pero se me olvida y le llamo de usted. MD12

Yes, a lady that comes to clean my house. She always tells me to address her with ‘TÚ’ but I always forget and address her with ‘USTED’.

In (12) and (13) the informants both claim that they didn’t want to impose a distance or use a distancing form of address. These two responses have an interesting point in common, however; both informants seem to blame their use of the V form on the situational context. One states that he uses the form automatically. Based on the rest of his interview, it is obvious that he doesn’t always use the V form; he discusses its use with older people as well with as people that he doesn’t know. His response in this case seems to reflect the idea that he automatically uses the form when in such situations. MZ18 similarly claims that he used the V form because of the situation. He goes to explain that he often uses the V form with friends in certain formal situations and that it is because of the situation, and not the relationship he holds with the person, that he does so. In both of these cases then, it seems that the informant is simply acknowledging the possibility that the V form can be used to acknowledge distance based on the speaker or the situation.
In the third case (14) we see a man who has been asked by his housekeeper several times to address her as tú, but he always “forgets” and addresses her as usted. He discussed this situation in response to a question regarding whether or not there was anybody that he did not feel a distance with that he addressed as V. I believe that this case only strengthens the idea that the forms are dependent on the perspective of the speaker. It is the housekeeper who tells him to address her with the T form, but he can’t seem to do so. Even though she doesn’t feel the need to acknowledge a distance between them, he apparently does.

In addition to entailment and speaker-orientation, we can see specific examples of distance among the other characteristics of CIs as well. Among the tests for immediacy there were comments made, such as (15).

(15) Le chocaría como a distante. WQ41

It would strike her as being distant.

Distance can also be shown to be nondisplaceable in that it only applies to the time and place in which the V form is used. Several examples provided by the informants support this idea. See (13), in which the informant claims to use the V form to express distance because it was needed in that moment. Once the speaker no longer feels the need to express distance, he will no longer use the V form. Example (16), below, also supports the idea that the use of the form only applies to the moment in which it is used.

(16) “¿Cómo es que acá misma me tratas de usted?”

“How is it that you are addressing me as USTED right here?”
Regarding ineffability, the V form was often replaced by the conditional form in Question 3; 11 out of the 24 informants who successfully completed the task used a conditional form in their response. This form has been linked to distance by previous researchers, such as Chodorowska-Pilch (2004). She claimed similar results for the imperfect form, which was also used by informants in response to this question.

It is notable that, rather than attempt to explain the content that is lost when the V form is not used, most of the informants of my study chose to replace it with forms that are also associated with distance. The most common of which, the conditional, has even been linked to the conventional implicature of distance.

The final characteristic of repeatability was not tested explicitly in this investigation; however there were several comments made by informants that support the idea that distance is reinforced with the repetition of the V form. As discussed in the previous chapter, comments such as that in (17) tell us that a speaker will continue to use the V form only with those with whom they want to maintain distance. Ideas such as these, in addition with commentary regarding the use of an overt vs. a null pronoun, suggest that, for speakers, the quantity of the V form has a gradient impact on the imposition of distance.

(17) Alguien con quien quieres mantener la distancia. WQ45

Somebody with whom you want to maintain a distance.

The evidence discussed in this section shows that the distance contributed by the V form displays the characteristics of CI and that it is not cancelable. The T form differs
from the V form in that it does not contribute a CI. This is discussed in the following section, 6.2.2.

6.2.2 Tú vs. Usted

Based on the evidence gathered during this study it appears to be the case that there is no meaning that is conventionally implicated by the tú form. That is to say, there is no social content that is entailed by this form and therefore non-cancellable. The meanings associated with the T form are all context dependent.

Relationships like this, in which a pair of forms is equal except that one carries extra information that the other doesn’t, seem to be quite common in the world’s languages (cf. for example Andersen 2001, Battistella 1990, Jakobson 1984). According to Jakobson, in an oppositional pair such as this, one member carries some feature, which Jakobson labels A; the other member contrasts with the first in one or two different ways. The second member of the opposition may give no indication as to whether the feature A is present, or it may deny the presence of A. In Battistella’s (1990) terms, in an oppositional pair, one member asserts the presence of a particular feature, while the other makes no claim regarding that assertion. Let us look at an example of a lexical pair in opposition (example adapted from Battistella 1990). Take the terms gato and gata. Whereas the second term can only be used to refer to a female cat, the first can refer to either a male or female cat; it doesn’t necessarily indicate the sex of an animal. This is demonstrated below in (18 - 19).

(18) Cuando pasaba por la tienda vi ese gato otra vez.

When I passed by the store I saw that cat again.
When I passed by the store I saw that female cat again.

The utterance in (18) could be stated without knowing the sex of the cat and, if uttered, a hearer would not be able to assume that the cat was male without further evidence. The utterance in (19) would only be truthful if the speaker knew the cat was female. A hearer would only be able to assume that this was the case as well. This is because \textit{gato} and \textit{gata} form an opposition in which \textit{gato} is the more general term and \textit{gata} carries an added feature: information regarding the sex of the animal.

The term \textit{gato} may be used, as shown above, in such a way that it does not indicate the sex of the animal; it does not specify whether or not the feature [+female] is present. It may also be used, depending on the context in which it is spoken, to deny the presence of the feature [+female], as in example (20).

(20) “La gata es muy bonita.”

“The female cat is pretty.”

“No es gata, es gato.”

“It’s not a female cat it’s a male cat.”

In this case the term \textit{gato} is not neutral in regards to the sex of the animal; it is indicating that the feature [+female] is not present in this particular animal.

\textit{Tú} and \textit{usted} seem to operate in a similar fashion. \textit{Usted} appears to carry information that \textit{tú} does not. Because the T form does not carry this, it can be used either in opposition to the information entailed by the V form or it can be indifferent to it. In other words, by using the T form, a speaker can say something like “I am choosing not to
recognize a distance between us because there is not one” or “I make no comment regarding the existence of a distance between us or lack thereof.” The V form can thus be considered the [+distance] form, similar to the [+feminine] form gata; regardless of the context, social distance is expressed. The T form however is not [-distance], because it does not entail that there is no social distance between the interlocutors. The form may represent [-distance], just as gato may represent [+masculinity], but not necessarily so.

A problem to be overcome, specifically in the realm of AFs, is the ingrained belief that V forms have their own particular meaning and T forms have their own particular meaning as well. Jakobson himself says that one of the problems for a linguist is that “he often starts with the assumption that both categories should be of equal value, and that each of them should possess a positive meaning of its own” (1984: 1). If we assume the relationship described above in which the V form carries extra information and the T form does not, the behavior of the AF system in Peninsular Spanish can be accounted for.

Saying that T does not conventionally implicate content in the way that V does does not necessarily mean that the T form is not associated with any social meaning in the minds of speakers and addressees. The difference is that all meaningful associations with the T form are contextually based. As will be shown below, content is either conversationally implicated by the speaker, inferred by the addressee, and/or indexed by the form. According to the data provided by the informants, as well as that of previous researchers, it can be shown that the T form is associated with certain addressee, speaker, or situational characteristics such as age or relationship. These characteristics make up an
indexical field, as described by Eckert (2008). Much of the specific content associated
with the V form can be compared to an indexical field as well. All of the indexed
meanings associated with either form are ideologically related in that they all stem from
the [+distance] value of the V form.

It can be shown that V forms entail information beyond person and number to an
utterance and T forms do not. Any information perceived to be contributed by T forms
can be attributed to conversational implicature. The interplay of the two forms causes
various CVIs to arise according to the context. A wealth of data collected in this study
provides evidence for the non-parallel behavior of AFs. The two most telling pieces of
evidence are the informants’ to questions 6 (Me has tuteado pero…; Me has tratado de
usted pero…) and 2 (¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de tú/usted?). Question 6 will
be discussed first.

In response to question 6, 22 out of 78 informants (28%) in some way stated that
the V form was not necessary (21-22). This number becomes even more significant when
we subtract the cases in which informants simply asked the addressee to use the T form
with them (23) or not to use the V form (24). Excluding these responses, we are left with
22 out of 36 respondents (61%) stating that there was no reason to use the V form when
addressing them.

(21) No hace falta.

No need.

(22) No es necesario.

It’s not necessary.
Puedes tutearme.

You can address me with ‘TÚ’.

No me trates de usted.

Don’t address me with ‘USTED’.

This sentiment was repeated among answers to other questions as well, including for example 1C, in which informants were asked to disagree with an elderly woman’s choice of address. Four out of 18 informants responded to the woman telling her that it was not necessary for her to use the V form when addressing them (25). If we take away the informants who refused to disagree with the form and those who simply asked her not to use it, we are left with 4 out of 6 informants (66%) stating that the form was unnecessary.

“No hace falta que me tratase de usted.” MD2

“There is no need to address me with ‘USTED’.”

In only 2 cases out of all of the questions asked to all of the informants was a similar statement made in regards to the T form. In one case the informant filled in the blank of Question 11 by stating that the T form was not necessary (26). In this case there appears to be a possible misunderstanding of the scope of the question. The other case involved a completion of Question 6 (27).

“No te trato de tú porque tengamos confianza, sino porque no lo considero necesario.” MZ19

#I don’t address you with ‘TÚ’ because we are close, but rather because it is not necessary.
The informants’ comments regarding the necessity of the V form vs. the T form support the idea that speakers need a *reason* to use the V form and that they do not necessarily need a reason to use the T form. If this is the case, we have substantiation of our proposal that the V form entails specific information whereas the T form does not.

The reason for using the V form, according to the evidence gathered in this dissertation, is to acknowledge or impose social distance.

The second area of support for the idea that the V and T form do not behave equally lies in the responses to Question 2. In this question the informants were asked to think of someone that they always addressed with a particular form and then to say what would happen if they suddenly used the other form with this person. 84 informants were asked what would happen if they suddenly used the T form to address someone. Six of these can be discounted here because they claimed that there was no one with whom they always used this form. Out of the remaining 78 informants, 54 (69%) said that nothing would happen (28). The remaining 31% of informants offered various answers as described in Chapter 5. These included the possibility that the addressee would be offended or that he/she would assume the speaker to be acknowledging greater *confianza* between them. Those who would take offense would do so because they expected to be addressed with V.

(28) La verdad es que nada. WQ21

Nothing would happen.
Eighty-eight informants were asked about the sudden use of the V form; 4 of these stated they would never do so. Of the 84 remaining informants, 100% claimed that something would happen. In the majority of cases this “something” was that their addressee would think that something strange was going on or they would think that the speaker was kidding or joking around with them. Others said that their addressee would think they were angry. The quote in (29) sums up all of these views.

(29) Me mirarían raro, pensaría que estoy enfadada o bromeando. WQ36

They would look at me weird, think I was mad or joking.

In sum, 69% of respondents claimed that nothing would happen if they suddenly used the T form and 100% of respondents claimed that something would happen if they suddenly used the V form. This provides further evidence that the V form necessarily contributes meaning while the T form does not.

All content contributed by the T form, aside from second person singular reference, is either conversationally implicated or a part of its indexical field. The content that is typically associated with the T form will be discussed in the next section along with other CVIs typically associated with the V form.

6.3 Conversational Implicature

As stated above, all social content that appears to be associated with the T form is in fact conversationally implicated. In addition, there are several meanings typically attached to the V form which are conversationally implicated as well. In this section I will first discuss the manner in which such implicatures are calculated (Section 6.3.1). Following this I will discuss the most significant of the implicatures associated with AFs
6.3.1 Calculation of Implicatures

Whenever one references an addressee a choice has to be made between the T and V forms. This very choice allows for an incredible array of meanings. As Levinson said, “when we say something, we find ourselves committed to much more; just by virtue of choices between all the ways we could have said it.” (2000: 367) So, because listeners know that whenever they are addressed the speaker has made a choice as to how to address them, they are able to calculate why the speaker made the choice he did. The speaker knows that the listener knows this and will rely on the listener to calculate correctly. The implicatures discussed in this chapter are calculated based on the use or nonuse of the V form in context. If the V form is used, the listener knows that the speaker has chosen not to use the T form and that therefore there must be a distance-based reason for doing so. If the T form is used, the listener knows that the speaker has chosen not to use the V form and therefore that distance is either being denied or the speaker is making no comment on the issue.

Distance is entailed by the V form; however the motivation for acknowledging or imposing distance can vary by the context. The speaker might acknowledge an age or relationship-based distance. A speaker might distance themselves from the addressee out of respect or because of the formality of the situation. One might impose a distance because they want nothing to do with the addressee. One might temporarily create distance because they are angry with the addressee. The CI of distance is underspecified
enough to include all of these possibilities and exactly which is meant is conveyed via CVI. The speaker, of course, knows his motivation for choosing the V form and relies on the listener to be able to calculate it. The context will provide the required information to the addressee, who should be able to deduce why the V form has been used. We have seen cases in which the addressee does not calculate the implicature intended by the speaker, for example inferring an age-related meaning of the V form even when the speaker was not intending to make a comment regarding the age of the addressee.

If the T form is used, the addressee will calculate if distance is being denied because of age, relationship, informality, or a lack of respect. If none of these is the case, it is possible that the speaker is indifferent to any social distance.

All models of conversational implicature attempt to describe how these CVIs are calculated; however I will walk through the calculation process using Levinson’s (2000) model. I believe this model accounts best for the calculation of implicatures because it includes the M Principle, that which claims that speakers use marked words in marked situations and that listeners assume that marked words are used only in marked situations. These maxims are necessary to account for many uses of AFs, to be discussed below.

Let us look again at the simplified version of Levinson’s principles that we discussed in Chapter 3. I will discuss each principle in terms of its application to AFs.

(30) The Q Principle

Speaker: Say as much as is consistent with the facts (bearing the I-principle in mind).
Addressee: Assume the speaker made the strongest statement possible in accordance to what he knows.

If a speaker is obeying the speaker’s maxim of the Q Principle, he will include all relevant information in his utterance. Since the V form entails social distance, the speaker must use it if he wishes to acknowledge or impose distance. If not, he will be flouting this maxim. Flouting the maxim will have its own effects, to be discussed later.

If an addressee is obeying the listener’s maxim of the Q principle, she must assume that if the V form is not used it is because it is not needed; the speaker does not wish to acknowledge or impose social distance. In other words, if the T form is used, the addressee assumes it is because the V form can’t be.

This principle also allows us to account for permanent AF switches. Let us demonstrate this with an example in which two acquaintances address each other with the V form each time they see each other. One day they begin to have a conversation and one of them addresses the other with the T form. Based on the Q Principle, the speaker knows that the listener will hear this change of form and assume there is a reason as to why the speaker is no longer using the V form. The listener must assume that the speaker no longer has a desire to mark distance between them. If there is nothing in the context to suggest that he is angry or intending disrespect, the speaker may be implicating that he perceives that there has been a change in their relationship or wishes to change their relationship himself; they are now closer.

(31) The I-Principle
Speaker: Say as little as necessary (bearing the Q-principle in mind).

Addressee: Amplify the informational content of the utterance to the most specific interpretation possible.

The speaker’s maxim of the I-Principle is beneficial to speakers in that it allows for minimal effort on their part. They can exploit the fact that the listener will seek the most specific interpretation possible and therefore not have to say as much. In following the I-Principle the addressee looks for the most specific reason allowed by the context as to why a particular AF was used.

The speaker uses the V form knowing that by doing so she is telling the listener that she is acknowledging or imposing distance. This distance is based upon some characteristic of the listener or of the situation. The listener will consider the use of the V form and the elements of the context in order to come up with the speaker’s motivation for using the form. As Levinson states, the listener looks for the “richest temporal, causal, and referential connections” (2000: 114); he continues to specify the meaning until he has exhausted all the evidential resources he has at his disposal. As an example, let us imagine two interlocutors of the same age, one is a doctor and one is a patient and they are in the doctor’s office. The patient addresses the doctor first using the V form. The doctor will know that the patient is making some sort of comment regarding distance; he knows that it is not age-related. The doctor knows that the V form can also be used to create/acknowledge distance based on respect. If nothing in the context denies this possibility he might infer that the patient respects him. The patient knows this and
therefore does not have to explicitly tell the doctor that he respects him; the V form does the work for him.

If there is some reason for the doctor to think that the patient does not respect him, perhaps based on his mannerisms, a previous conversation, or the fact that the nurse informed the doctor that she overheard this patient speaking ill of him, the doctor might infer that the patient is commenting on the formality of the situation. Or perhaps the patient simply wants the doctor to think he respects him. If he doesn’t know that the nurse overheard him speaking ill of the doctor, he will assume that the doctor will infer respect.

(32) The M principle

Speaker: Indicate abnormal situations using marked expressions.

Addressee: Marked expressions indicate abnormal situations.

The existence of the M-Principle allows us to account for emotive uses of AFs, or, temporary AF switches. Based on the societal norms discussed above, speakers use certain AFs in certain situations. Listeners, in turn, will expect these AFs to occur in the same situations. If the “appropriate” form is used then the listener can assume there is nothing unusual about the situation. The speaker can then inform the listener that the situation is possibly not as it seems by using a form that otherwise might be unusual. Many informants hinted at the listener’s calculation of these situations in their answers to Question 2 and 7. Recall that the informants claimed that if the V form was used when they least expected it, such as from a friend or family member, they could only infer that something was wrong or strange. If the T form was used out of place it was generally
considered to be disrespectful. Temporary switches will be discussed in more detail in section 6.3.5.

The maxims of the M-Principle also allow speakers to play with the address forms in such a way as to be ironic. Braun (1988) mentions the possibility of the ironic use of a “higher” form when a “lower” one is expected, citing a German example involving Herr Hanson vs. Herr Dr. Hanson. In this example she discusses that using the Dr. form in an environment where the title was not necessary could be ironic. In Spanish it would be the V form that could be considered ironic when the T form is expected.

Sperber and Wilson (1995) define an ironic statement as an echoic utterance that implicates a negative attitude toward the content of said utterance. In a personal communication I was given an example in which a woman’s boyfriend was repeatedly asking her to do things for him: bring him a drink, make him a snack, etc. The woman responded saying “¿Y qué más quiere usted?” In using the usted form, she doesn’t echo anything he said per se, but she echoes his sense of entitlement. Using this form allows her to demonstrate how ridiculous she finds it that he considers himself to be worthy of being addressed as usted.

In other cases, the form is used humorously even though it is not necessarily echoic. In (33) below, an informant describes how he and his friends sometimes address each other with the V form in jest.

(33) Lo hacemos de vez en cuando para jugar como para dar un tono de solemnidad que no es requerido en la conversación. O incluso mensajes de
texto que envías diciendo me gustaría verle esta tarde señor tal y es un amigo tuyo pero pensarías que estás bromeando. MD7

Sometimes we do it in fun to impose a solemnity where not required in the conversation. Even in text messages that you send saying “I’d like to see you USTED this afternoon Mr. so and so” and he is a friend of yours but I would think he was joking.

Other informants discussed in response to Question 2 that their addressee would most likely think they were joking if they suddenly used the V form with them (34-35). These uses seem to match closely to ironic uses in that they implicate the ridiculousness of using the V form with that addressee.

(34)  Se sorprendería; pensaría que era broma. MD8

He/she would be surprised; he/she would think it was a joke.

(35)  Que suena chiste…de vez en cuande lo hago para hacer una broma…suena gracioso. MD16

It sounds like a joke…sometimes I do it as a joke…it sounds funny.

As previously mentioned, all socially deictic content typically attributed to the T form is conversationally implicated, as is much of the content typically associated with the V form. These meaning are implicated and inferred due to the fact that humans generally operate in accordance with the maxims described above. In the proceeding sections I will identify the possible meanings provided by the informants of this study and demonstrate that they are in fact conversationally implicated. Specifically, I will discuss the content concerning age, respect, relationship, emotion, formality, and
manners, all of which were provided by informants. All of these associations were also mentioned at some point in the literature review of this dissertation, therefore none come as a surprise and are all supported by the documentation of other researchers. In each case I will discuss what the possible conversational implicatures are and review the evidence for their cancellation and nondetachability.

6.3.2 Age

We know that addressees who are older than the speaker can trigger the use of the V form. This has been noted in previous research (see for example Carricaburo 1997) as well as supported by the informants in this study. Most informants claimed to use the V form with older speakers, some adding that they did so out of respect for their age. Many informants also indicated that addressees can often interpret the use of the V form as a sign that they are old. The idea that the V form can make an addressee feel old does not seem to be documented very often (cf. Moreno 2004 for an exception), however it was a common topic of conversation among these informants as well as in many personal communications I have had throughout the years. This provides an interesting dichotomy—the age of the addressee might determine or be reflected by the AF used, however whether or not this occurs, the addressee might assume it to be the case. In other words, they might assume that their age was the deciding factor in the choice of AF even if it wasn’t. Age was mentioned as a factor in using the V form more often than any other factor; 58% associated older age with the V form in Question 7a. Age was associated with the T form as well, but not as frequently; 24% associated younger or equal age with the T form in question 12a. Based on the results gathered in this study, it seems that age
may be the most influential factor in the use of the V form. This aligns with the findings of other investigators of Peninsular Spanish such as Alba de Diego and Sánchez Lobato (1980) and Ramón (2009). In essence, the use of the V form may be taken to mean something along the lines of “I acknowledge that you are older than me.” The T form, in turn, may be taken to mean something along the lines of “I acknowledge that you are younger than me or the same age as me.” Neither of these meanings is inherent to the forms, however, and they are cancellable.

As shown in the previous chapter, the “addressee as older” content often associated with the V form is cancellable. 37 of 64 informants (58%) completed the statement “Te he tratado de usted pero no quería decir que _____” with some variation of “fueras mayor.” By doing so they showed that mayor was indeed associated with the form and that it can be canceled. This is not always associated with the V form, as noted by the fact that this form can be and is used with addressees of the same age or even younger. Informants MZ21, MD31, and MD38 claimed that the V form could be used toward young people or people of the same age with whom they wanted to maintain a distance. Informants MZ23 and MZ28 made the claim that they would address younger people with the usted form if they were in an official position. Informant MD34 stated that, if a person were displaying poor manners, she would use the V form to address them regardless of their age.

The “addressee as younger or same age” content is also cancelable, since older people can be addressed with the T form as well. In addition, younger addressees and addressees of the same age as the speaker can be addressed with the V form. These age-
related meanings have been determined to be expressed by way of conversational implicature since they are cancellable and therefore not part of the conventional meaning of the V form.

Let us come back to our idea that the V form conventionally implicates some sort of social distance; the existence of these age-related conversational implicatures flows very logically from this basis. As stated above, the reason for using the [+distance] form can vary with the context. This allows for age to be the reason for using the V form at times and allows for other triggers to be the reason for using the form at other times. Notably, when it comes to age, only older age triggers the [+distance] form. If the addressee is younger, his age never triggers the use of the V form. Speakers of this dialect seem to only mark distance upwardly when it comes to age.

When the speaker feels that the age of the addressee is significant enough to recognize with the V form, the conversational implicature can arise that the speaker notices that the addressee is older. The frequency of this implicature explains the fact that addressees often infer this even when the speaker is not implicating it. Take as an example a speaker using the V form out of respect. An addressee might not take the form as a sign of respect, but rather as a sign that he or she is getting old.

The opposite inference can be achieved by the T form. One informant, in response to Question 6a, asked to be addressed with the T form because it made her feel younger (36). Such an inference might not match the implicature intended by the speaker, but it is possible and demonstrates the strong correlation that AFs have with age in this culture.

(36) Tutéame así me haces más joven. MZ25
Address me with ‘TÚ’ so you can make me younger.

Because the V form is often used to mark distance based on the older age of the addressee, the absence of the V form can mean one of two things: it can mean that the addressee is making no comment regarding the age of the addressee, or it can conversationally implicate that the speaker notes the equal or lesser age of the addressee.

6.3.3 Respect

Respect, or lack thereof, is often associated with address forms. This is the case in this dialect as well. Speakers associated the V form with respect and the T form with disrespect toward the addressee. However, we shall see that neither form entails either respect or disrespect. These meanings arise via conversational implicature.

Respect was shown to be cancellable in several ways. First, the V form can be used towards those whom one does not respect. Several participants discussed this possibility, claiming that they might use the V form with someone they did not respect simply because they thought it was expected of them or because they wanted to maintain a distance between themselves and that particular addressee. Several informants also participated in a task in which they were asked to complete the statement “No le trato de usted porque le respete, sino ______.” In doing so they further demonstrated the cancelability of this meaning. Regardless of how each informant filled in the blank, the act of doing so would cancel any respect that might have been inferred from the use of the V form.

The meaning of respect was shown to be nondetachable in that it can be expressed using the T form as well. This claim was made by many of the informants. Some did so
through Question 10, stating that they had used the T form but didn’t do so out of
disrespect. In addition, many comments regarding the fact that the T form can be used to
show respect were made throughout the interviews and questionnaires. Examples of such
comments are seen below in (37-39).

(37) El tú con respeto se ha vuelto muy popular. MZ26
‘TÚ’ with respect has become very popular.

(38) “(No quería decir que) no te respete igual si te hubiera tratado de usted.”
MD33
“(I didn’t mean to say that) I didn’t respect you just as much as if I had
addressed you with ‘USTED’.”

(39) Es el mismo respeto de usted… para mi es el mismo respeto…“le he
tratado de tú pero con respeto.” MD35
‘TÚ’ is just as respectful as ‘USTED’…for me the respect is the same…”I
have addressed you with ‘TÚ’ but with respect.

Several comments, such as those above and (40-43) below, allude to the idea that
respect can be shown with the T form, but that the V form should be used to show “extra
respect.”

(40) Ese señor te ha tratado con mucho respeto. MD4
The gentleman addressed you TÚ very respectfully.

(41) Usted a lo mejor implica demasiado respeto. MZ27
‘USTED’ probably implies too much respect.

(42) Para…remarcar el respeto. WQ50
To really show respect.

(43) Para mí, tratar de usted a alguien significa tenerle un mayor respeto por distintos motivos: edad, profesionalmente. WQ53

According to me, addressing someone as ‘usted’ means you have a greater respect for them for various reasons: age, profession, etc.

Based on the many comments such as these, in addition to those in which the T form is described as being respectful as well, it seems that the V form can be used to conversationally implicate a high degree of respect. A speaker might use this form to make sure that the addressee understands that they respect them a great deal.

In opposition to the V form being taken as a sign of respect, the T form can be taken as a sign of disrespect. This was confirmed by the informants in this study as seen in (44-45). In this case they were discussing when they might use the T form.

(44) Si no merece mi respeto. MD38

If he/she doesn’t deserve my respect.

(45) Para faltar el respeto de esa persona con ánimo de herir. WC19

To disrespect this person with the intention of hurting his/her feelings.

Using the information gathered in this study, we can see that disrespect is merely a conversational implicature that can arise in certain contexts regardless of the form utilized. Because disrespect can be expressed regardless of form, the meaning is nondetachable. Recall the following statements made by participants in this study (46-48).
(46) Es el mismo respeto de usted… para mí es el mismo respeto…le he tratado de tu pero con respeto. MD35
‘TÚ’ is just as respectful as ‘USTED’…for me the respect is the same…”
I have addressed you with ‘TÚ’ but with respect.

(47) Tengo un respeto a todo el mundo, si el tratamiento es de tú o usted.
MZ18
I respect everybody, regardless of whether I use ‘TÚ’ or ‘USTED’.

(48) Sí… a veces cuando alguien hace algo que no es muy educado…la trato de usted independientemente de la edad que tenga… No merece un trato de respeto pero la forma es usted para que suene más contundente. MD34
Yes, sometimes when someone does something that’s not very polite I address them as ‘USTED’ regardless of their age. They don’t deserve respectful treatment but you use ‘USTED’ because it sounds blunt.

Many examples similar to those seen in (49-50) provide evidence for the cancelability of disrespect.

(49) Le he tratado de tú, pero “no pretendía faltarle el respeto.” MD39
I addressed you with ‘TÚ’, but “I didn’t mean to disrespect you.”

(50) Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que “no te respete.”
I addressed you with ‘TÚ’, but I didn’t mean that “I don’t respect you.”

We know that if content is cancelable and nondetachable, it is not part of what is said and therefore cannot be entailed or conventionally implicated.
Returning to our basis of the distance-marking conventional implicature, we see that all respect-related conversational implicatures can easily be calculated. In fact, many researchers have connected the two concepts. Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that respect could be communicated by increasing the social distance between interlocutors. In doing so one elevates the addressee a higher social position than the speaker. This communicates respect because it displays that the speaker does not want to threaten the negative face of the addressee.

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) also links respect to distance. She claims that the [+distance] form in a language is used to express respect.

Many other authors echo these beliefs, including Placencia and García (2007), who state that V forms “imply different degrees of distance between speaker and addressee and show that the speaker wants to be respectful” (42).

It is also very common to encounter descriptions of AFs in which the V form is described as a respect or a distance marker. In the model I am proposing, there is no reason to separate the two; because the V form is a distance marker, it can be used to show respect. If a speaker uses the V form, the addressee will look for the reason that he did so. In the appropriate context it might be because he wanted to show respect.

6.3.4 Relationship

As seen in Chapter 2, address forms have been associated with the relationship held between the addressee and the speaker by nearly all researchers who have worked in the area. Although there are exceptions among languages and among dialects of Spanish, the V form is generally used between strangers or those who do not hold a close
relationship. The T form, in turn, is used between those who maintain a close relationship.

In this study the V form was in fact associated with the idea that something is lacking in a relationship. This might be because the interlocutors do not know each other, because they are not close friends, because their relationship has been strained, or even because the speaker does not want to have a relationship with the addressee (51-57).

(51) Personas que no me conocen en la calle. WQ38
People that I don’t know on the street.

(52) No me inspira suficiente confianza. MD2
Someone that I don’t trust.

(53) Que ya ha perdido un poco esa confianza probablemente. MD6
He/she has probably lost my trust.

(54) Para que no tome confianza. WQ39
So he/she doesn’t get too close to me.

(55) Cuando quieres dar a entender que no quieres tener nada que ver con esta persona. WQ36
When you want someone to understand that you don’t want anything to do with them.

(56) No quieres que haya un exceso de confianza. WQ29
When you don’t want to get to close.

(57) Para no mostrarle amistad. WQ21
In order not to show him/her your friendship.
The V form can also be used when the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is not on good terms (58-60).

(58) La nuera a la suegra porque se llevan mal. WQ12
A daughter-in-law to her mother-in-law because they don’t get along.

(59) Hay gente que te puede caer mal…los trataría de usted. MZ24
There are people that you might not get along with…I would address them with ‘USTED’.

(60) Puede que te caiga fatal o que tengáis un trato muy malo. MD31
It might be that you don’t like him/her or that you don’t get along.

These ideas are not necessarily always triggered by the V form and many were explicitly shown to be cancelable by the informants of this study (61-64).

(61) No quería decir que “no tuviera confianza.” WQ11
I didn’t mean to say that “I didn’t trust you.”

(62) No quería decir que “no te conozca.” WQ26
I didn’t mean to say that “I don’t know you.”

(63) No quería que “te sintieses que no había amistad entre nosotros…lo he hecho por respeto.” MD38
I didn’t want “you to feel there was no friendship between us. I did it out of respect.”

(64) Usted es más serio…pero no tiene por qué dejar de ser amigable MZ24
‘USTED’ is more serious…but that doesn’t mean it can’t be friendly.
In addition, several informants discussed the possibility of addressing one’s friends, even close friends, with the V form in certain situations. This is very similar to the situations described in Chapter 2 reported by researchers such as Wainerman (1976); in certain situations speakers adapt AF usage to their surroundings. Informants MZ18 and MD38 all mentioned this possibility. MZ18 (who worked in the government) claimed that he often used the V form with his friends when they were engaged in official business. MD38 informed me that doctors would often address each other as usted in front of patients and tú otherwise (much like the situation in Honduras reported by Castro 2001). She stated that “una persona de usted también puede ser amigo.”

Informants MZ20, MZ23, and MD33 mentioned certain relationships they had in which they maintained the use of the V form out of respect, even though they were friends. For MZ20 this relationship involved a priest. The priest would often come to their home for dinner and often asked to be addressed with the T form. This informant claimed that she simply could not do so because she had too much respect for him (65). She went on to say, however, that this did not mean that she did not care for him as a friend (66).

(65) Me infunde tanto respeto que no puedo. MZ20
He invokes so much respect in me that I can’t.

(66) El cariño es el mismo, todo bien. MZ20
The love is the same, everything fine.

MZ23 discussed a similar situation involving the director of the school at which she was a teacher. MD33 discussed his relationships with the in-laws of his siblings,
stating that, although they were friends, he addressed them with the V form because of their age (67).

(67)  Suegros de mis hermanos…por la edad…me parece más respetuoso.

MD33

The in-laws of my brothers for example…because of their age…it seems more respectful.

The idea of *confianza* and the T form seem to go hand in hand for the speakers in this study. This is exemplified in (68-70).

(68)  “Me gustaría que me trataras de tú; tenemos confianza para hacerlo.”

MD35

“I would like it if you addressed me as ‘TÚ’; we are close enough to do so.”

(69)  “No tienes confianza para tutearme.” MD9

“You are not close enough to me to address me as ‘TÚ’.”

(70)  “Hay confianza, tutéame.” WQ29

“We are close, address me as ‘TÚ’.”

There were participants who canceled this meaning without provocation, as seen in (71).

(71)  Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que “hubiera tanta confianza.”

MD5

I addressed you with ‘TÚ’, but I didn’t mean to say that “there was a close relationship.”
However, *confianza* was so commonly associated with the T form that Question 11a (No te trato de tú porque tengamos confianza, sino porque…) was added to the interviews in order to determine without a doubt whether this meaning was inherent to the form or whether it was cancelable. And, as the results show, the meaning is definitely cancelable. Responses such as those shown in (72-73) are evidence if this fact.

(72) Eres una persona joven. MD10

You are young.

(73) No te respeto. MD38

I don’t respect you.

Further evidence that *confianza* is cancelable lies in the fact that the T form can be and is often used with complete strangers. This often occurs when the addressee is of the same age or younger than the speaker, or if the addressee is a friend of a friend.

Using an AF can also signal that a change has occurred in a relationship. This is another phenomenon that has been discussed often in the literature on AFs. In some cultures the change in AF from a V form to a T form is so significant that it is accompanied by celebration (Mayer 1975; Bratt Paulston 1975). The information collected in this investigation shows that either form can signal that a change in the relationship has occurred. A change from the V form to the T form can signal that a closer level of friendship has been achieved. This is demonstrated through the informants’ statements below. In (74-77) the informants are discussing what their addressee would think if they suddenly used the T form with them.

(74) Que hay más confianza por lo que ya no es un desconocido. WQ12
That we are closer now and he/she is no longer a stranger.

(75) Significaría que tengo mucha confianza. WQ25

It would mean that I trust him/her a lot.

(76) Tendría que pasar que …habría más confianza. Habría pasado algo…. alguna experiencia juntos o que me diga él “hoy no me hables de usted, tutéame.” MD1

It would have to be that…we were closer. Something happened…some experience together or he might have told me “don’t address me with ‘USTED’, address me with ‘TÚ’.

(77) Lo entenderían como una señal de más acercamiento. MZ19

They would take it as a sign that you wanted to be closer.

The V form, on the other hand, can signal that there is a strain on the relationship or that the speaker no longer wishes to be friends with the addressee. The statement in (78) was made by an informant discussing what someone might say if he suddenly used the V form with them. This demonstrates that the sudden use of the V form can be inferred as a statement regarding a change in the status of a relationship. In this case the addressee wonders if he and the speaker are no longer friends.

(78) ¿Hemos perdido la amistad? WQ5

Have we lost our friendship?

There were other variations of these relationship-based meanings that arose throughout the interviews. As seen in Chapter 5, some informants discussed relationships in terms of knowing or not knowing the addressee, being related to the addressee or not,
being a friend of a friend of the addressee, etc. All of these relationship-based meanings are cancelable and nondetachable, and therefore contributed by way of conversational implicature.

Relating these meanings to distance is fairly straightforward. Here we have cases of social distance that match the definition given by Stainton (1987); the distance is a measure of the relationship held between the interlocutors. The V form is used to mark this distance. The T form is used when the speaker does not feel it necessary to mark distance. Depending on the context, a conversational implicature might arise regarding the specific nature of the relationship between the speaker and the addressee.

6.3.5 Emotion

As noted by many previous researchers and discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation address forms are linked to the expression of emotion. The emotions are generally negative, regardless of the AF used, and I found no counterexample in these data. The expression of emotion often coincides with an AF switch; however this is not necessarily the case. As seen in these data there are instances in which the AF may express emotion when there has been a switch or the first time a speaker addresses a particular addressee. I will begin by discussing emotional uses of the V form, followed by emotional uses of the T form.

The V form can be associated with hostility or anger. This was alluded to above during the discussion regarding relation-based meanings in which I mentioned that the V form could be used to show that the speaker did not want to pursue a relationship with the
addressee. Several speakers also reported that they might use the V form during an argument, as seen in (79-81).

(79) Algún desconocido con el que he tenido enfrentamiento. WQ38
Some stranger with whom you have had an altercation.

(80) En un enfado o conflicto. WQ30
In anger or a conflict.

(81) En plan demostrar que estás muy enfadado. MD6
To show that you are very angry.

Often the idea that the V form could be used in anger went hand in hand with the V form being used towards strangers or acquaintances. However, the idea that usted can signal anger without regard to the relationship held was evident in the responses made to Question 2. In this question informants were asked what would happen if they suddenly used the V form to address someone with whom they always used the T form. Many claimed that their addressee would assume that they were angry (82-84).

(82) Creería que estoy enfadado. WQ52
He/she would think I am very angry.

(83) Pensaría que había ocurrido algo entre los dos, un enfado o una cosa entre los dos y que nos hemos distanciado. MZ18
He/she would think that something had happened between us, a disagreement or something and that we had grown apart.

(84) Se creería que me había enfadado con ella. MD38
She would think I was mad at her.
The T form is also associated with anger or other negative emotions. The informants described this as purposefully disrespecting the addressee for some reason (85-86).

(85) Para faltar el respeto de esa persona con ánimo de herir. WQ19
To disrespect this person with the intention of hurting his/her feelings.

(86) Para indicarle que le has perdido el respeto también al tener enfrentamiento. WQ38
To show that you have lost respect for him/her or in an argument.

No informant explicitly canceled “anger” via any of the cancellation tests provided. However, it is fairly obvious that this meaning is not inherent in the V or the T form and is thereby conversationally implicated in very specific contexts. In addition, because negative emotion can be expressed with either form, this content is nondetachable.

Emotive expression relates to distance similarly to the meanings discussed above. Beginning with first-time encounters, the speaker may wish to impose a distance so that the addressee realizes that he/she has offended the speaker in some way. The example below (87) describes the use of the V form immediately following a car accident. She tells us why one would use the V form in this case, regardless of other factors, to address the person who has caused the accident.

(87) No tienes porque tratarle de usted…en plan demostrar que estás muy enfadado. MD6
You have no reason to address him/her with ‘usted’…to show that you are very angry.

In cases of an AF switch, the distance imposed by the speaker is simply temporary. Recall the words of Brown and Gilman (1960): “The general meaning of an unexpected pronoun is simply that the speaker, for the moment, views his relationship as one that calls for the pronoun used” (273). I believe that this sentiment is correct; the speaker wishes to impose a distance for that moment in order to express to the addressee that things are not status quo between them. The use of a different AF accomplishes this for the speaker.

6.3.6 Formality

It is common to hear that V forms are used in formal situations and T forms in informal situations. Descriptions of this type were seen in Chapter 2. And, as seen in Chapter 5, the informants of this study also reported that one could comment on the formality of a situation by using one AF or the other. We know, however, that the degree of formality is not entailed by either form because of the fact that the informants were able to cancel these implicatures. Recall the statements seen in (88-89).

(88) No quería decir que “hubiera tanta formalidad.” WQ46
       I didn’t mean to say that “it was so formal.”

(89) No quería decir que sea completamente informal. MD30
       I didn’t mean to say that “it was very informal.”

Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992) related formality to distance in her discussion of reasons to use a [+distance] marked form. Here distance is a commentary on the context
rather than the addressee. The CI of distance, combined with the context, conversationally implicates a degree of formality. A speaker can use the V form to conversationally implicate that the situation is formal. They are able to do so by using the distance marked form. The listener will look to the context in order to discover why the distance marked form is being used and will be able to calculate the formality of the situation. A speaker might use the T form to conversationally implicate that the situation is informal and therefore no distance is required.

6.3.7 Manners

The last association I will discuss is that of AFs with either good or bad manners. This association is especially interesting because “good manners” or “bad manners” do not seem to be a CVI, but simply an opinion about the appropriate use of the forms. The “appropriate” use of the forms may vary but, according to these informants, it is determined by the society or culture. It is what they were taught growing up. Some claim that they were taught explicitly when to use each form, but most explain that it was something that they learned through experience. Sample statements of this sort are seen in (90-97).

(90) Por las normas de educación que me han enseñado de pequeña. MD16
    By the norms that they taught me when I was little.

(91) De pequeño en el colegio…era en plan… usted era la parte más formal para mayores, ambientes más formales. MD30
    As a child in school, it was like… ‘USTED’ was the formal one for older people, formal atmospheres.
Normally it is engrained through education.

Maybe when you are little at school in language class but I think that you learn it at home as well.

You learn by speaking with people every day.

All your life you see it and learn when to use or the other.

Not explicitly in a class, it’s something that you know o that you learn with use.

Whatever you see you end up repeating.

The informants were taught, either explicitly or implicitly, that the V form should be used in certain situations. These situations correspond to those described above: when addressing an older person or a stranger, or in a formal situation such as a business interaction. Using the V form in these situations is considered to be “educado.” The use of a T form may or may not be considered to be in poor taste if used in similar situations.
One informant described that if he were to answer the phone at his workplace using the T form with a client, that client may have a negative feeling about the business. He might think something along the lines of (98).

(98) Buf, esta empresa, qué empleado tiene. MZ17

Wow, this business, what kind of employee do they have?

There are times of course when the V form is not considered appropriate as well: among friends or when addressing a younger person for example. Question 2 provided many examples of the potential awkwardness involved with using the V form in situations where the T form is expected.

The idea of “manners” may be less of a CVI and more of an opinion about the use of the forms themselves. A person who uses the V form in the appropriate situations is often considered to be *educado* while a person who doesn’t might be considered *maleducado*. The appropriate situations are conventionalized in each dialect and speakers learn what they are through socialization.

6.4 The Indexical Field

I mentioned above the possibility of the addressee misinterpreting the speaker’s motivation for using a particular form. Specifically, several informants mentioned the possibility that an addressee would infer that a speaker found them to be older even if this was not the speaker’s intention. There are several factors, such as age, that are associated with one or both AFs that don’t seem to necessarily be purposely implicated on the part of the speaker. They can be so implicated, as demonstrated above. For example, a speaker can purposefully use the T form in order to make the addressee feel younger. However it
seems that some of the associations made with AFs are more often more indirect. That is
to say, even if a speaker does not intend to conversationally implicate any particular
message such as those described above, there are still associations made with the forms.
Concepts such as age, relationship status, and formality seem to be of the type that is
regularly associated with AFs even without a purposeful implicature. These concepts
make up the indexical field of AFs. Figure 1 below shows this indexical field as is
modeled after the visual representations of indexical fields in Eckert (2008). Italicized
text represents indices of the V form and plain text represents indices of the T form. The
indices appear in no particular order and they are all related in that they are based on the
[+distance] value of the V form.

![Indexical Field of Address Forms]

**Figure 1** Indexical Field of Address Forms

240
6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the idea that the V form entails social distance. This entailment forms the basis of an array of context-dependent meanings triggered by the forms or associated with the forms.

Social distance is conventionally implicated; it is not part of the at-issue entailment, but rather a comment made by the speaker in regards to any aspect of the context.

Several context-dependent meanings may be conversationally implicated. They are expressed by purposeful manipulation of Levinson’s (2000) conversational maxims on the part of the speaker.

In situations in which the speaker does not intend to convey any specific message related to the AF used, associations are still made with the forms. These associations make up the indexical field of the AFs and are all related to the idea of social distance.
Chapter 7: Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

7.1 What have we accomplished?

The research described in this dissertation was undertaken in an attempt to further the field of AF research in a way that had previously only been hinted at. By investigating the mechanism in which AFs contribute meaning to an utterance, I hope to have shed some light on their ability to accomplish so much in a language.

The T and the V form both index a second person singular addressee in the context. This is where their commonality ends. The V form conventionally implicates distance. This means that when the V form is used, distance is entailed. We know that the distance that is entailed is based on the speaker’s perspective of the addressee and/or the situation. We know that the speaker can either acknowledge or impose distance. We know that the affects of introducing or acknowledging distance are immediate and noticeable. Social distance is nondisplaceable; its use only applies to the moment in which it is used. This distance is ineffable in that the V form is the easiest and best way to express it. The repetition of the V form may even emphasize or strengthen the social distance between the interlocutors.

The T form, on the other hand, does not entail any social content. The existence of two forms, one of which carries social content and the other doesn’t, creates a situation in
which these two forms can interact to create a broad array of meanings. These meanings that arise are contextually based.

The manners in which the AFs of this dialect contribute meaning are shown in Figure 2 below.

![Figure 2 Model of Meaning Contribution by Address Forms](image)

This model allows us to account for the pragmatic flexibility of AFs as well as the variation that exists in their use. At this point I will show this by returning to each of the areas of AF research discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

The social meanings that have been associated with AFs have been discussed thoroughly in the preceding chapter. All of the meanings described by previous researchers can be accounted for by a model in which the V form entails distance and the
T form entails no particular social meaning. We have seen how the interaction between the two forms allows for many different conversational implicatures to arise. These include all those discussed by other investigators in the field of AFs including respect, anger, and solidarity. One meaning that has not been discussed specifically as yet in this dissertation is power; however this meaning is obtainable via the same mechanism of conversational implicature. Few cases that can be construed as involving power were mentioned by the informants in this study and in fact the word poder was never used. MD10 made the comment in (1) in which she explains why teachers should be addressed with the V form.

(1) Sí, como hay que mantener la superioridad de él es el profesor y que tú eres la alumna que hace lo que él dice. MD10
   Yes, since you have to maintain the seniority of him as the professor and you as the student that does what he says.

   This comment demonstrates the use of the V form to recognize the power of the addressee.

   The strategic use of AFs can also be accounted for using this model. As claimed by Brown and Levinson (1987) and others, the V form can be used as a negative politeness strategy and the T form as a positive politeness strategy. Clear examples of the V form being used in this way were seen in these interviews. One excellent example was the use of the V form to acknowledge distance out of respect, even though the speaker did not respect the addressee. In (2) she describes why she uses the V form with teachers that she does not respect. In this case she simply wants them to think she does so that
they do not treat her poorly. Although she is flouting the speaker’s maxim of the I
Principle by including information that isn’t the case, she is counting on her teachers to
assume that she is not doing so. Without information to the contrary they will calculate
her implicature of respect, even though it is false.

(2)  Ya son como son, para que no sean peores. MD10

They are how they are, so they don’t get worse.

Positive politeness strategies rely on the same calculation of implicatures. MZ28
mentioned that he addresses young people with the T form so that they feel more
comfortable (3). In this case the speaker is relying on the addressee to follow the Q
Principle and realize he has chosen not to use the V form. In doing so he does not
acknowledge or impose any distance and he conversationally implicates that the
addressee need not feel any distance either.

(3)  Yo a una persona de mi edad o una persona joven la trataría de tú por darle
más confianza. MZ28

I address him/her with ‘TÚ’ because so that he/she feels more comfortable.

AF switches have already been discussed in detail above. This model accounts for
them very well. The emotions and the changes in relationships that are signaled by these
switches boil down to distance or lack thereof. The distance imposed via conventional
implicature in a switch to the V form may be temporary or permanent and
conversationally implicate emotions such as anger. A switch to the T form may take
away distance in order to acknowledge a growing relationship or to show disrespect
toward the addressee. Again, this may be temporary or permanent.
The geographical and sociolinguistic variation reported for the distribution of AFs is easily accounted for under this model. The underlying reason for using the V form is social distance. However the reasons for social distance can vary, as can the priority of these reasons. Moreno (2004) notes that even within the Peninsula there is variation. He explains that in rural dialects the V form is used towards addressees of a younger age than would typically receive the V form in the cities. The reasons for acknowledging distance in each dialect or social group form the basis for the idea that AFs are a conventionalized part of society. The members of each group learn the norms of AF use applicable to that group.

7.2 A Default Form

We have found that the T and V forms do not behave in a parallel fashion in this dialect of Spanish, and our model relies on this very fact. *Usted* is more pragmatically restricted than *tú* because there has to be a reason to use it. The speaker must feel the need to acknowledge or impose social distance between himself and the addressee. If there is no reason to do so, the T form is used. There might be a reason to use the T form, such as a change in relationship or a demonstration of disrespect, but the key is that there doesn’t have to be a reason. Because the V form requires a reason to use it and the T form does not, we can say that the T form is the default form in this dialect. According to Schwenter and Cacoullos (2008), “the default expression is the one that is preferred in the most frequent and, crucially, the least specified contexts.” The information we have discussed in this dissertation points to the fact that there are actually no specifications on the use of the T form; it is simply the “normal” form. The default and the normal go hand
in hand. In fact, Comrie (1976) claimed that in a pair of forms that share the same functional domain, such as tú and usted, “one member is felt to be more usual, more normal, less specific than the other” (11). Support for the idea that the T form is more normal than the V form was seen in Question 15, in which the informants were asked if they used each form because they wanted to or because they felt they had to. Even though they were only given these two options, 8 informants stated that they used the T form simply out of habit while only 1 informant claimed to use the V form out of habit. Comments such as those in (4-5) point to T as being the default form.

(4) Lo hago por inercia, porque en el 95% de los casos es lo que utilizo. WQ50

I do it automatically, because in 95% of cases it is what I use.

(5) Es algo natural. MD29

It’s natural.

63% (22/35) of informants claimed to use the V form because they felt obligated to or out of respect or educación. 15% (6/41) said the same of the T form. This suggests that the V form is the least “natural” of the forms, the one you use when you absolutely have to.

Recall the dictionary definitions of usted (6); we see a leaning towards a claim that there must be a reason to use the V form. According to the RAE these reasons include courtesy, respect, and distance. The definition of usted given by the RAE is shown below with added emphasis.
(6) **usted.** (De vusted). 1. pron. person. Forma de 2.ª persona usada por tú como tratamiento de cortesía, respeto o distanciamiento

**Usted.** (from vusted). 1. pron. person. Second person form used instead of ‘tú’ as courteous, respectful, or distancing address

Compare this to their definitions of **tú** (7). No reasons or requirements for its use are given.

(7) **Tú.** (Del lat. tu). 1. pron. person. Formas de nominativo y vocativo de 2.ª persona singular en masculino y femenino.

**Tú.** (from lat. tu). 1. pron. person. Nominative and vocative second person masculine and feminine singular.

There is no mention of any rules or suggestions for any contexts in which to use **tú**. And in fact the definition of **usted** states that it should be used in the place of **tú** when one wants to express courtesy, respect or distance.

Reports about how AFs are used in various dialects support the theory that T forms are default. The evidence seems to point to the idea that there is always a “reason” to use **usted**, while the reason to use **Tú** seems to simply be the lack of reason to use V.

As seen in Jaramillo (1990), friends may go for years referring to each other as **tú**, but if those friends should happen to become **compadres** (one friend asking the other to be his child’s godfather), they would begin to refer to each other as **usted**. As one man put it “Ya nos tratamos de usted porque somos [sic] compadres…por el puro respeto de ser compadres” (20).
Jaramillo (1990) provides another example discussed previously in which a woman treats the increase of T forms in the family not as a gain in solidarity, but as a loss of respect and even love. I claim that the fact that the loss is the most notable aspect for this woman suggests that nothing is being gained by using T forms.

The fact that a speaker might address the same interlocutor in different ways in different situations is strong evidence for the default status of T. This was reported in Carricaburo (1997). The situations described involved relationships in which T forms were normally used. However in situations such as debates, meetings, etc. the speakers switch to the V form. This is reported to happen often in professor/student relationships (reported to me by native speakers). The professor and student might generally address each other as tú or vos, but if they find themselves in a meeting or exam type situation, the address form will generally be usted. Again we see a specific reason to use usted.

Being clear that there must be a reason to use the V form, a speaker must know what the reasons are as well as which ones take priority. We have seen several reasons for acknowledging or imposing social distance in this dialect. These include age, relationship, respect, and formality. It seems that the most important of these factors is age. However, the factors themselves as well as their hierarchy will differ from dialect to dialect and a speaker must be familiar with the social norms of the group in order to use the forms appropriately. Many researchers have noted that the factors determining AF choice are not universal and among Spanish dialects this is the case as well.
7.3 Future Research

I hope that this research has opened the door to further investigation into the manner in which AFs contribute meaning to an utterance. There is still much left to be done in this area and I will take the opportunity here to suggest further steps that can be taken.

7.3.1 Language Acquisition

While not a part of this study per se, there is evidence that the T form is the first form learned by children. A comment made by one informant regarding when he learned how to use the two forms appropriately alludes to this. He answered that he learned in school. When I asked him about what he did prior to that, he answered (8). With further research, this might lead further support to the default status of the T form.

(8) No sabía ni que existía el usted. MD30

I didn’t even know that ‘usted’ existed.

7.3.2 Language Change

Evidence supporting the AF model proposed in this dissertation may also be found in the historical development of the forms. There is a wealth of research that has been completed on the development of AFs and we know that the T form was previously the only second person singular AF. There are those, including Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1992), who claim that address systems change by adding V forms in order to be able to designate distance between speaker and addressee. A closer look at the development of AFs might provide insight as to the development of this CI as well as the CVIs associated with the forms.
7.3.3 Hierarchy of Factors involved in AF Choice and Language Variation

There are great possibilities for honing and expanding the model proposed in this dissertation as well. I have discussed the idea that there are many contextual features or motivations for using one form or another. I have not, however, attempted to determine the relative importance of these factors. For example, does age take precedence over respect or vice versa? Does the state of the relationship take precedence over the formality of the situation? I would venture to say that, for these speakers, age is the most significant factor. More research must be completed in order to determine this for sure.

In addition, I hypothesize that the reasons for using the V form and their hierarchical order of precedence vary sociolinguistically. Cross-dialectal research could determine these factors and the relative importance of them. Regardless of what they are or the order of importance, the system should still fit within this model. That is to say, there is one entailed meaning and an array of contextually dependent meanings.

Once a hierarchy of triggers is established, it may be possible to determine the default interpretation of each form. These default interpretations would compare to GCIs in that they will be inferred unless another factor in the context blocks them.

Of great interest would be the expansion of this model into dialects in which the vos and the usted forms are in opposition. Might the vos form be default in these systems? My first instinct is to say that it would, however this must be investigated.

A great complication may arise in the attempt to expand this model to the tripartite address system in which vos, tú, and usted are all used. In this case we might find one default form and two forms with social entailments or we might find that all
three forms have social entailments. I do not believe that we would find more than one
form to be without social entailment because in that case we would have two forms
serving the exact same function.

7.3.4 Plural Address Forms

Another area of interest would be the expansion of this model to plural forms in
this dialect. To my knowledge, no study of Spanish AFs has focused on the plural forms
vosotros and ustedes. Because of this lack of research, it is difficult to predict whether or
not the forms pattern on a par with the singular forms. It has been suggested, however,
that the use of the plural V form in Castilian Spanish is experiencing a reduction in use to
the point that the plural T form is used even toward a group of addressees who might
individually be addressed with the singular V form (Morgan, personal communication). If
this is indeed the case, the model proposed may not be applicable to the plural forms.

7.3.5 The Indexical Field

Further research must also be completed in order to better distinguish between
conversational implicatures and the notion of an indexical field. I would predict that CVIs
are more likely in occasions in which a particular AF is being used for the first time, in
AF switch, and in other situations in which the contrast between the forms becomes
salient. When a form is used on a habitual basis between the same speaker and addressee,
it may simply index a contextual feature that is part of the indexical field of the forms. In
addition, I predict that the T form, being the default form, is more likely to lack a
conversational implicature than the V form. The V form therefore is less likely to merely
be an indexical feature. As demonstrated above, the V form is highly more likely to affect
the context than the T form and I believe that this difference is related to its likelihood of being used to convey a CVI.

An area of particular interest here is that of the effect of the relative age of the speaker and the addressee. This area appears to be especially interesting because of the fact that age-related content is often inferred even when not implicated by the speaker. Several examples of people inferring content not implicated by the speaker were seen in this dissertation. Understanding the interaction between the indexical field and CVIs would help explain this phenomenon.

7.3.6 Methodology

Finally, this has been the first study to quantitatively and qualitatively investigate AFs in this manner. The methodology used was highly innovative in its design to the fields of both AFs and implicatures. The informants were presented with relatively open-ended tasks designed to determine the meaning and function of these forms from the informants’ point of view, without influence from the researcher. Because of the novelty of the methodology, it is expected that there is room for improvement of or perhaps greater specification in the methodology used. The majority of the questions asked in this study were open-ended. The use of that strategy has made it so that some of the conclusions of this dissertation are actually based on negative evidence. For example, social distance was not canceled in any of the interviews or questionnaires; however the informants were never specifically asked to do so. Now that the model has been established, more specific questions and tests can be used to verify the conclusions drawn here.
In conclusion, this research opens the door into a new area of AF research and offers a basis from which to work in determining the manner in which AFs contribute meaning to an utterance.
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Appendix A: Oral Interview Questions

Sexo __________________________________________

Edad __________________________________________

Lugar de nacimiento _____________________________

Años de residencia en Madrid ________________

Profesión _______________________________________

1. a. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

   b. Imagínate que estás en la calle en una ciudad donde no conoces a nadie y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” ¿Cómo le responderías?

   c. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Usted es amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de usted. ¿Cómo le responderías?

   d. Imagínate que estás en la calle y una señora se acerca y te dice “Eres amigo de mi hijo/a/hermano/a, ¿verdad?” Tú crees que es la madre/hermana de tu amigo, pero consideras que no debía haberte tratado de tú. ¿Cómo le responderías?

2. a. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de usted. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de tú?

   b. Piensa en una persona a la que tratas de tú. ¿Quién es esta persona? ¿Qué pasaría si mañana lo trataras de usted?

3. a. Imagínate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de usted, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del usted, pero usando el tú?
b. Imagínate una situación en la que quieres pedirle direcciones a alguien en la calle. Quieres tratarle de tú, pero esta forma ya no existe. ¿Cómo podrías expresar el mismo efecto del tú, pero usando el usted?

4.  a. Estás en la calle con un amigo. Alguien pasa y le dice a tu amigo “Se le ha caído la billetera.” Tu amigo no lo ha escuchado y te pregunta “¿Qué me ha dicho?” Tú respondes “Dijo que ____________________ _.”
   b. ¿Qué dirías si quisieras que tu amigo supiese que el hombre le había tratado de usted?
   c. ¿Te puedes imaginar una situación en la que querrías que alguien supiera que ha sido tratado de usted? ¿Te puedes imaginar una situación en la que querrías que alguien supiera que ha sido tratado de tú?

5.  a. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor González ha dicho que le quiere ver en su oficina.”
   ¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de usted? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?
   b. Un compañero de trabajo te dice “El Señor González ha dicho que te quiere ver en su oficina.”
   ¿Quién es el que te ha tratado de tú? ¿El compañero o el Señor González?

6.  a. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de usted pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tratado de usted pero ________________________________.
   b. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de tú pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tuteado pero ________________________________.

7.  a. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de usted, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?
   “Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que _____________________.

   b. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de tú, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?
   “Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que _____________________.

8.  a. Completa la siguiente frase: “Te debo tratar de usted, pero no lo hago porque _____________________.

   b. Completa la siguiente frase: “Podría tutearle, pero no lo hago porque _____________________.

9.  ¿Has tratado a alguien de usted aunque no querías?
10. ¿Has tratado a alguien de usted que no respetabas?

11. a. No te trato de tú porque tengamos confianza, sino porque ________________.
    b. No le trato de usted simplemente por respeto, sino ________________.

12. a. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te a ha dicho que le tutearas pero no te sentiste cómodo de tutearle?
    b. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te a ha dicho que le trataras de usted pero no te sentiste cómodo de hacerlo?

13. a. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de usted para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de tú?
    ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?
    b. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de tú para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de usted?
    ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

14. ¿En algún momento te ha enseñado alguien cuándo usar usted y cuándo usar tú?

15. a. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de usted, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de usted o porque crees que es necesario o requerido?
    b. Cuándo te refieres a alguien de tú, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de tú o porque crees que es necesario o requerido?

16. ¿Hay situaciones en las que crees que tienes que tratar a alguien de usted? ¿Y de tú?

17. ¿Hay momentos en los cuales quieres tratar a alguien de usted? (¿De tú?)

18. ¿Por qué crees que alguien te trataría de usted? ¿De tú?

19. ¿Hay alguien que quieres que te trate de usted?

20. ¿Qué opinas de la pérdida del uso de usted hoy día?
Por favor, contesta las siguientes preguntas:

1. a. Piensa en una persona específica a la que siempre tratas de usted. ¿Quién es esta persona? ____________________________________________
   ¿Qué pasaría si la próxima vez que lo veas le trataras de tú? ___________

   b. Piensa en una persona a la que siempre tratas de tú. ¿Quién es esta persona? _________________________________
   ¿Qué pasaría si la próxima vez que lo veas le trataras de usted? ___________

2. ¿Has tratado a alguien de usted aunque no querías? ¿Quién?

3. ¿Hay gente que quieres que te trate de usted? ¿Quién?

4. ¿Has tratado a alguien de usted que no le respetabas? ¿Quién? ¿Por qué?

5. a. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le trataras de usted pero no te sentiste cómodo de hacerlo?

    b. ¿Te ha pasado que alguien te ha dicho que le tutearas pero no te sentiste cómodo de tutearle?

6. a. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de usted para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de tú? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

    b. ¿Se puede tratar a alguien de tú para indicarle que no se le quiere tratar de usted? ¿Podrías proporcionar un ejemplo?

7. a. Cuando te refieres a alguien de usted, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de usted o lo ves como obligación?

    b. Cuando te refieres a alguien de tú, ¿es porque quieres tratarle de tú o lo ves como obligación?

Por favor, llena el espacio en blanco para completar cada frase.
8. a. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de usted pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tratado de usted pero _______________________________________.

   b. Imagínate que alguien te ha tratado de tú pero no crees que debería haberlo hecho. ¿Cómo continuarías esta respuesta?
   Me has tuteado pero _______________________________________________.

9. a. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de usted, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?
   Te he tratado de usted, pero no quería decir que ________________________.

   b. Imagínate que has tratado a alguien de tú, pero esta persona se sorprende por el tratamiento. ¿Cómo completarías esta respuesta?
   Le he tratado de tú, pero no quería decir que ________________________.

10. a. Te trato de tú no porque tengamos confianza, sino porque _________________.

    b. Le trato de usted no simplemente por respeto, sino ____________________.

Por favor, proporciona la siguiente información sobre ti:
Edad ___________    Carrera o profesión: __________
Lugar de nacimiento _______________    Años de residencia en Manzanares ______
Sexo ___________________________
Appendix C: Informants for the Oral Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD1</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD2</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD3</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD4</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD5</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD6</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD7</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD8</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD9</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD10</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD11</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD12</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD13</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD14</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD15</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD16</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ17</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ18</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ19</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ20</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ21</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ22</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ23</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ24</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ25</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ26</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ27</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MZ28</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD29</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD30</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD31</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD32</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD33</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD34</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD35</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD36</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD37</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD38</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD39</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Informants for the Written Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WQ1</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ2</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ3</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ4</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ5</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ6</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ7</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ8</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ9</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ10</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ11</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ12</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ13</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ14</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ15</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ16</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ17</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ18</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ41</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ42</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ43</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ44</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ45</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ46</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ47</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ48</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ49</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ50</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ51</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ52</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ53</td>
<td>Manzanares</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>