Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

El *usted* de solidaridad en Azogues, Ecuador: Un análisis de datos recogidos en Facebook Messenger

Abstract

This study examines the use of *usted* in family context and among friends in the Facebook Messenger (FBM) conversations of two Ecuadorian informants from Azogues, Ecuador. This study contributes to expanding current understanding of how forms of address are used in Ecuadorian Spanish (Placencia 1997, 19998, 2001, 2004, 2007, etc.), particularly in examining data from Azogues, a town in the Cañar Province, both the provincial capital and forming part of the Cuenca metropolitan area. It interprets the use of *usted* among close friends and family as evidence of an *usted* of solidarity (Uber 1984, 1985, 2011). This study finds that the use of *usted* of solidarity by Ecuadorian speakers is similar to its use in Bogotá (Uber 2011). It is characterized by co-occurrence with nominal address forms such as kinship and hypocoristic terms at a higher frequency than with non-solidarity forms of *usted* and *tú*.

Resumen

Este estudio analiza el uso del *usted* de solidaridad en contextos familiares y entre amigos en las conversaciones de dos participantes ecuatorianas en Facebook Messenger (FBM). Este estudio contribuye al conocimiento del uso de formas de tratamiento en el español ecuatoriano (Placencia 1997, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, etc.), en su análisis de datos de Azogues, la capital de la provincia de Cañar y parte del área metropolitana de Cuenca. Este estudio sugiere que el uso de *usted* entre amistades y parientes sea evidencia de un *usted* de solidaridad que se parece al uso de *usted* en ese contexto en el español de Bogotá, Colombia (Uber 1984, 1985, 2011). Los informantes de este estudio utilizan formas de tratamiento nominales de parentesco e hipocorísticas con más frecuencia con el *usted* de solidaridad, lo cual lo distingue del *usted* de no solidaridad y el tuteo en los datos de este corpus.

Palabras Clave

Pronouns of address, nominal forms of address, ustedeo, sociolinguistics, CMC

Key words

Pronombres de tratamiento, formas de tratamiento nominales, ustedeo, sociolingüística, CMC

Lingüística en la red . Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan.Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby.College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o

Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

1. Introduction

Forms of address can exist in many forms, both as nouns and pronouns and can accomplish different social goals, such as expressing politeness, deference and respect, or solidarity between speakers. Various factors can affect the forms of address used by a speaker such as the type of communicative event, the features associated with the type of social activity carried out, commonly shared expectations of participants, and the social distance and power relation between the interlocutors (Blas Arroyo 2005). Additionally, age, sex, social class, level of education, and geography, can influence a speaker's choice of address forms (Blas Arroyo 2003). Forms of address can also be expressed with the pronouns tú or usted or in the use of nominal forms such as kinship terms, names, hypocoristic forms, titles, and nicknames, which can express closeness and solidarity.

This study addresses the following research questions to add to the current understanding of the use of nominal and pronominal address forms in Ecuadorian Spanish.

1. How does the use of *usted* of solidarity used by these Ecuadorian speakers from Azogues similar to or differ from its use in Bogotá, Colombia, as reported by Uber (1984, 1985, 2011)?

2. How is *usted* of solidarity distinguished from *usted* of no solidarity in the conversations from these Ecuadorian speakers from Azogues?

2. Previous work on forms of address

Spanish has two pronouns of address: *tú* (T)*,* used with second person singular verb forms and *usted* (V), used with third person singular verb forms. T and V forms are used to express the dimensions of power and solidarity (Brown and Gilman 1960). *Power* accompanies an asymmetrical treatment in verbal forms, which is manifested through the use of different pronominal forms to express a relative hierarchy of interlocutors. A person with higher rank uses T forms to address those of lower ranks and would receive V forms from lower ranked individuals. Factors such as socioeconomic status, age, physical appearance, sex, social status or familial status are some factors that determine which interlocutors receive V forms. Speakers with equal power equivalence use equivalent forms, mostly T, although V forms can be used in cases where speakers do not have a close relationship (Brown and Gilman 1960: 258). Modern society has led towards the elevation of T forms to emphasize solidarity due to the prominence of egalitarianism (Blas Arroyo 2003; Calderón 2010).

Other researchers have analyzed forms of address as expressing solidarity between interlocutors (Dumitrescu 1975-6, Alba de Diego & Sánchez Lobato 1980; Calderón 2010). Calderón's (2010) analysis noted three degrees with which a speaker can link to by the choice of T forms (either *tú* or *vos*): (1) minimal (solidarity without trust or intimacy; (2) middle (trust), and; (3) maximum (intimacy). The use of T forms implies proximity to the interlocutor in any of these three levels. The use of *usted* indicates distance. *Tú* or *vos* may be used with

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre 16 / 12 / 2017
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan . Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby . College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o   *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook
Messenger

children or adolescents without regard to the three levels of solidarity previously mentioned (Calderón 2010: 233). The speaker relies on social convention or other forms of obligation to judge the right pronominal form in each situation. A misjudgment will result in the perception that the speaker is disrespectful, overreaching in solidarity, or cold, due to be excessively distant.

Brown and Levinson (1987) consider address forms as a grammaticalized manifestation of courtesy. Both T and V forms have a courtesy function in a conversation. T forms are associated with the domain of positive courtesy, the expression of solidarity in grammaticalized forms of address. The use of V forms is associated with the domain of negative courtesy, which is manifested in deference to the interlocutor through indirect expressions.

2.1. *Usted* in Colombia

The use of V forms with friends and family has been noted in Colombia. This type of usage of V forms to show solidarity have since been noted by other researchers in Cuba, Chile, and Uruguay (Marín 1972) and in Honduras (Castro 2000). Flórez (1965) noted the use of V forms in family interactions in the Santander Department in Colombia. In Bogotá, Montes Giraldo et al. (1998) note that *usted* is used to address a trusted interlocutor more by males than by females and more among younger speakers than older. Uber's (1984, 1985) earlier studies note that the use of *usted* in Bogotá can imply solidarity when used with family members or friends *and* no solidarity when used with others not known to the speaker. Many families used *usted* among members of the family, with pets, and with close friends. The use of *tú* in Bogotá conveys familiarity but with a certain distance implied. This implies a continuum with two opposing uses of *usted,* one use of *usted* implying a lack of solidarity ('*usted* of no solidarity') and social distance and another being an *usted* of solidarity, which implies social proximity and solidarity. *Tú* occupies a middle space between these two types of *usted*. Uber's (2011) later studies confirm that the use of *usted* of solidarity was still common among family and close friends throughout the 90s. This latter study adds that among close friends, either T or V forms may be used and confirms an overall trend in the increase of T forms (Uber 2011).

2.2. *Usted* in Ecuador

Many studies on forms of address in Ecuadorian Spanish focus on Quito (Peñaherrera 1988; Placencia 1996, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010; Quilis 1992; Toscano Mateus 1953; Uquillas 1989). Toscano Mateus (1953) described the variation found in Ecuadorian Spanish with regard to form of address. This variation was noted by differing choices by different speakers, as some children addressed parents with *vos* and others with *usted* and some parents used *usted* with children. Gold (1980: 368) notes that *usted* can be used among friends in the coastal region, particularly to 'honor one's friends', according to his informant. Placencia (1997) analyzed forms of address in Quito by examining telephone calls in a particular social network. Both T/V forms were used in a reciprocal function among friends and family of the same age, *usted* between older speakers and *tú* among

linred

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre 16 / 12 / 2017
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan. Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby. College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

younger speakers. Asymmetric use of pronouns was found between interactions of members of both groups with older speakers using *tú* when addressing a younger speaker and younger speakers *usted* with older speakers. In other studies, Placencia found in a variety of studies that in public interaction, *usted*, is the preferred form in Quito, such as in hospitals (1998), shops (2001, 2004) salons (2007b; Márque Reiter and Placencia 2004).

Toscano Mateus (1953) noted the use of kinship terms, names, hypocoristic forms and titles in Ecuadorian Spanish, including the use of kinship terms, titles, and other address forms. The use of nominal forms of address in Quito has the function of maintaining amicable relations or positive rapport (Aston 1988) among interlocutors. For example, nicknames are a way of expressing intimacy between interlocutors with a closer relationship (Placencia 1997: 180).

3. Methodology

This study analyzes conversations taken from Facebook Messenger (FBM), which is a type of synchronous CMC (Androutsopoulos 2014) in which users expect a quicker response time than in other mediums. This type of instant messenger CMC is regarded as being close to natural conversation (Crystal 2006; Sebba 2012). To the knowledge of the author, FBM data has not been used to analyze forms of address. Two Ecuadorian informants, P1 and P2, provided FBM messages from conversations with other Ecuadorian friends which took place from 2013-2016. This constituted a corpus of data used to analyze the use of forms of address in Azogues, Ecuador. However, the nature of data collected does not permit an extension to describe the speech of the community as such. Yet, the networks of relationships examined in this study presents the use of address forms in one such community of practice in Azogues. The following map (Figure 2) shows the province of Cañar and where Azogues is located in it.

Figure 1. Map of Cañar Province

L i n g ü í s t i c a   e n   l a   r e d . K o e l p u c s j s e q i l g r e   **16 / 12 / 2017**
v l i o c a e d l m d ñ j o **J o r d a n . L a v e n d e r** w y t i m u o x w a l ñ u t o p y
m l ñ p y j h b f b m w a i **C o l b y . C o l l e g e** w ñ u b e i   f ñ o i y l d l y r t l m
v l i n w y t i s d ñ f b x c i e g h ñ b v o t l a q w i o p y j h w x b z ñ q w i c i n m

Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

The corpus gathered from the messages provided by each participant is summarized in Table 1. It must be noted that P2 provided significantly less messages than P1, which limits the comparison that can be made between the two informants. However, her messages provide an insight into how younger speakers use address forms, even if a statistical correlation cannot be established.

Table 1. Data from Facebook Messenger participants

	P1	P2	Total
Number of friends on FBM	32	12	44
Number of words constituting a corpus	23,860	8,786	32,646
Number of messages	2,044	573	2,617
Number of conversations analyzed	115	30	145

P1 and P2 were both born in Azogues and have university education (although P2 has completed two degrees). P1 works for a dry-cleaning company and P2 is now a teacher -- however, her messages are taken from before 2016, when she was still a student. P1's FBM friends, who are not family members, are friends from work or other friends who work in other jobs such as construction, other service industry jobs, as taxi drivers, or at a call center. P2's friends tend to be students, although some had begun working jobs when messages were collected. P1 was 41-44 (considering the messages were posted between 2013-2016) and P2 was 19-22. P1's friends are around the same age as P1 and P2's friends are around the same age as her, meaning that P1's friends constitute a group of speakers between 40-50 and P2's friends constitute a group of speakers between 20-30.

P1 and P2's FBM friends constitute a variety of 'real-life' relationships, which has been simplified below into three categories: (1) friends; (2) family, and; (3) acquaintances. FBM 'friends' were classified into these categories in consultation with P1 and P2. 'Family' is a simplified category that includes both nuclear family, extended family, and 'very distant' family, such as second cousins, great aunts, etc.

Table 2 presents the breakdown of sex and relation of the FBM friends of each participant.

linred

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan . Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby . College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. artículo | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

Table 2. Informants of the study

		P1	P2	Total
Sex	Male	16	7	23
	Female	17	5	22
Relation	Friends	11	4	15
	Family	20	6	26
	Acquaintance	1	2	3
Total (including P1 and P2)		**33**	**13**	**46**

4. Results

Table 3 shows the number of occurrences of both the use of V and T forms with certain groups addressed by P1 and P2. There is little variation with regard to address, only occasionally an exploratory situation at the beginning of a conversation. However, all conversations between P1 and P2 and their friends resolve the issue of address within the initial sequence of a conversation. The numbers below try to capture, in a quantitative sense, the distribution of address forms used in overall interactions so that each conversation is not quantified but the overall pattern of address. For instance, P1 and her daughter communicate in more than 100 messages in the corpus, yet, the use of *usted* between them is coded as '1' below.

Table 3. Address Forms by FBM friend

	P1		P2	
	V forms used	T forms used	V forms used	T forms used
Family	17	3	1	5
Friends	7	2	0	4
Acquaintances	3	0	2	0
Total	27	5	3	8

Table 3 shows the widespread use of V forms with friends and family, particularly by P1, although this usage is also present in P2's interactions with two cousins in which P2 uses asymmetrical forms when addressing one and exhibits variation in addressing another. P1's interactions are characterized by a preference for V forms in

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre 16 / 12 / 2017
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan . Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby . College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

all interaction, except in rare cases where T forms are used. One of the essential claims of this study is that the use of pronominal address forms, particularly the *usted* of solidarity, can be distinguished by analyzing the use of nominal address forms in conjunction with pronominal address forms. The following section will show how nominal address forms are used by informants in FBM conversations and in conjunction with pronominal address forms.

4.1. Nominal address forms

Table 4 summarizes the use of nominal address forms in the data from both P1 and P2 and their friends. The use of nominal address forms is summarized through the use of four categories: names, kinship terms, hypocoristics and titles. Each category includes a number of subcategories such as in cases where the personalized form *mi* is added to the use of a title or hypocoristic form. Additionally, in the category of "title" the use of title and names is included in this category so that the use of *Señor N* would be coded as "title" rather than name. The use of nicknames is also included in the category of "name." The absolute and relative frequencies of each category are included as well so that horizontally the total of nominal forms from each category is found on the far right, while at the bottom of the table, the total number of occurrences of nominal forms is recorded. Each horizontal row shows the relative frequency of distribution of that type of nominal form in the data.

Table 4. Use of nominal address forms

	Use with V	Relative frequency (%)	Use with T	Relative frequency (%)	Total
Names	30	44.11%	38	55.85%	68
Kinship terms	189	61.96%	116	38.03%	305
Hypocoristics	85	68.54%	39	31.45%	124
Titles	16	59.25%	11	40.74%	27
Total			**524**		

Table 4 reveals several patterns with regard to the use of nominal address forms in conjunction with pronominal forms. First, it shows the overall lack of use of titles in the data of this study and, for this reason, their use will not be discussed in depth in the analysis of the data in this study. Second, it shows that both kinship terms and hypocoristic forms are used more frequently in conjunction with *usted* forms than with *tú*, yet, both are frequently used with *tú* by both groups of speakers. Third, the use of names as a nominal address form is more equally distributed between T and V forms but with a slightly larger number of occurrences with T forms.

These observations should be broken down by participant and friend group usage, though, as each group uses nominal forms differently. Table 5 presents the ways in which nominal address forms are used in P1 and her friends' conversations. In P1's sample, the use of nominal forms is more clearly tied to the use of V forms but with a similar division to Table 4.

Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

Table 5. P1 and her Friends

P1 and friends	Use with V	Relative frequency (%)	Use with T	Relative frequency (%)	Total
Names	30	90.09	3	9.09	33
Kinship terms	185	73.41	67	26.58	252
Hypocoristics	82	70.08	35	29.91	117
Title	12	80.0	3	20.0	15
Total				417	

Table 6 presents the use of nominal address forms in the conversations between P2 and her friends. The results of Table 6 show that for P2 and her friends, the overall frequency of occurrences of nominal forms is nearly reversed, in every case, so that they more frequently occur with T forms than V forms. This is due to the fact that T forms are used more frequently by P2 and her friends.

Table 6. P2 and her Friends

P1 and friends	Use with V	Relative frequency (%)	Use with T	Relative frequency (%)	Total
Names	0	0	35	100.0	35
Kinship terms	4	7.54	49	92.45	53
Hypocoristics	3	42.85	4	57.14	7
Title	4	33.34	8	66.67	12
Total				107	

The previous tables show how each group of speakers uses nominal address forms differently, both in the types preferred by each group and how they are used with pronominal forms. P1 and her friends use *usted* much more and with more use of hypocoristic forms, while P2 and her friends use *tú* and more use of names and nicknames with less frequent usage of hypocoristics.

4.2. Expressing solidarity with address forms

The following sections will show the use of various pronominal and nominal forms of address in the data through the presentation of extracts from various conversations between the participants and friends.

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

The best example of the *usted* of solidarity is found in conversations between P1 and her daughter. While the use of V forms when addressing her mother is to be expected and P2's reciprocal use of V forms constitutes *usted* of solidarity.

(1) P1 and Informant 29[1]
01 **Inf. 29**: Buenos días *amor*!
02 **Inf. 29**: Espero que **este** mejor
03 **P1**: Gracias *guapa mi muñeca preciosa*
04 **P1**: Sin **usted** q sería de mi vida

This study asserts that the use of V forms by P1 in this type of interaction is evidence of an *usted* of solidarity (Uber 2011) in Ecuadorian Spanish, particularly in Azogues. the use of V forms is a way of achieving even greater intimacy by creating a special and non-expected interaction (Placencia 1997).

P1's use of *usted* with other family members is also evidence of an *usted* of solidarity.

(2) P1 and Informant 1
01 **P1**: Hola *querida prima* para desear**le** q esté nuevo año **le** venga cargado de bendiciones para su hogar especialmente de salud y prosperidad.

P1's use of *usted* extends to conversations with close friends, which is interpreted in this analysis as *usted* of solidarity.

(4) P1 and Informant 27
01 **P1**: Hola mi *N* no me sentia a gusto con solo aceptarnos como amiga digo **le** voy a textiar x q no es solo una amiga de redes sociales si una amiga, compañera de niñez compartimos el mismo pueblo q nos vio nacer.y me da gusto volver**la** a ver felicidades se ve radiante, linda etc..Cuidese mi *N* y q Dios **lo** proteja siempre
02 **Inf. 27**: Gracias mi *P1* que lindas palabras pué sí de niñas compartimos jutas somos como de la familia usted igual se ve tan linda con su maravillosa familia un ejemplo a seguir primero Dios a ver si en algun momento nos Juntamos cuidese saludos a *A* y sus niños

The previous extracts and following extracts show the use of hypocoristic and kinship terms in conjunction with *usted* of solidarity. The use of these types of nominal address forms is more frequently used with *usted* forms than with *tú* forms by P1 and her friends, as Table 5 showed in the previous section. The use of hypocoristics and kinship terms in a greater frequency with *usted* is further interpreted as an *usted* of solidarity when comparing different conversations in the corpus. The strongest evidence for *usted* of solidarity is the conversations between P1 and her daughter, in which P1 uses *usted* forms to address her daughter. This conversation is subsequently contrasted with a conversation between P1 and an acquaintance who she does

---

[1] Conversations are produced as collected, which results in several non-standard orthographic variations found in the extracts presented in this paper.

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan.Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby.College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

not know but who contacts her on Facebook as they are both from the same small town in the rural area of the province.

Extract (1) above and the following extracts will show the presentation of evidence for an *usted* of solidarity, which is highlighted by a more frequent usage of hypocoristic and kinship terms in comparison with both *tú* and *usted* of no solidarity.

(3) P1 and Informant 29
01 **Inf. 29**: **Le** quiero *amor*!...
02 **Inf. 29**: Besitos
03 **Inf. 29**: Gracias por todo
04 **P1**: Chao *amor* **cuidese** besitos **tenga** un lindo día

The use of nominal address forms is a courtesy strategy by using in-group membership markers (Brown and Levinson 1987). It also is a strategy that highlights the indexicality of language to call upon social and cultural meanings through the connection of signs to contexts (Blommaert et al. 2005: 204). P1's use of hypocoristics here indexes closeness and solidarity with her daughter. The same strategy can be seen in the following extract between P1 and a close friend.

(4) P1 and Informant 30
01 **P1**: Gracias *mi amiga del alma* que esté dia sea flechada por su cupido que **le** asesine a puro besos
02 **P1**: Disfruté al máximo chula vida que **tenga** un lindo día
03 **Inf. 30**: Gracias *mi querida amiga* como siempre **usted** apoyándome mutuamente **te** quiero mucho besos y abrazos desde la distancia y que **pase** de lo mejor junto a **su** *querida familia*

When these conversations between a close family member and a close friend are contrasted with a conversation with an unknown person, the differences between the two types of *usted* can be noticed more clearly. In this extract, there is a complete lack of nominal address forms, which is the extreme opposite of the extracts above. The conversations that are interpreted as being *usted* of no solidarity share this characteristic or demonstrate a significantly lower frequency of kinship and hypocoristic terms.

(5) P1 and Informant 31
01 **Inf. 30:** Hola mi nombre es N su nombre me suena conocido y su esposo tambien
02 **P1:** Creo q compartimos a lo mejor del mismo pueblo q nos vio crecer.
03 **Inf. 30:** O no estuve equivocado que chevere saver de nuestra gente gustaso
04 **P1:** Si un gusto a lo mejor se recuerde mis padres son N y N y el suedro N...
05 **P1:** Bueno ha sido un gusto saber q esta bien adelante con sus proyectos tenga una linda tarde y saludos a su familia.

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan . Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby . College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o
Usted of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

06 **Inf. 30:** Muchas gracias saludos tambien a ustedes gusto saber que nuestra gente del pueblo esta bien y siempre para adelante haciendo la diferencia luchando por el objetivo que estamos aca y no se pierda

A similar pattern is noted in the following extract between P1 and an acquaintance. In this case, P1 does use her interlocutor's name.

(6) P1 and Informant 3
01 **P1**: Hola *N* un gusto saludar**lo** a los tiempos imposible olvidar a *nuestra gente* y gracias a la tegnologia podemos compartir acontecimientos de nuestro diaro vivir… **Se cuidan** y q Dios **los** bendiga ese bonito hogar q tienen.
02 **Inf. 3**: muchas. Gracias x compartir **su** amistad ,, Todos mis amigos añaden un gran significado a mi vida diaria. *Saludos*. Y felicidades. **Usd** tambien tiene una Hermoza familia.

P1's use of T forms must now be discussed in conjunction with the presentation of data above supporting the assertion that the use of *usted* between close family and friends constitutes an *usted* of solidarity. As Tables 4-6 showed, the use of T forms is less prominent in P1's network and is characterized by a less frequent use of nominal address forms. There are 5 conversations with T forms in the data. Two of five have no observable nominal address forms. One is characterized by exclusive use of kinship terms. The other two conversations are noticeably different. In one conversation with Inf. 14, P1 uses a number of hypocoristic forms but less frequently than in conversations with V forms. P1's conversation with Inf. 10 is the main source of nominal forms used with T forms in the data and resembles much closer the conversations between close friends with V forms. This could present a deviation from an otherwise regularized pattern. T forms are unique in that the use of the word *mija* by P1 and friends is nearly exclusively used with T forms, as in the following extract.

(7) P1 and Inf. 10
01 **Inf. 10:** Hola *prima de mi corazón* como estad
02 **P1:** Hola *preciosa* como estás. Mi reina no puede contestar en seguida estaba de andariega….
03 **Inf. 10:** Gracias x el regalito qe me as mandado
04 **P1:** Si *mija* ahora q ya conoce el camino la madre espero q venga con más frecuencia

P2 uses forms characteristic of younger speakers through her use of T forms with friends and V forms with older family members. Uber (2011) noted that there was a rise in the use of T forms by younger speakers, which might be occurring in Ecuador. P2's 'solidarity' form is completely aligned with T forms. P2 and her friends' use of nominal address forms with T shows that a solidarity form will be accompanied by some use of nominal address forms. However, as noted in Table 5, P2 and her friends use a different set of nominal forms to accomplish this goal.

In general, P2 and her friends prefer the use of kinship terms and names/nicknames, used in conjunction with T forms, as the preferred way of expressing solidarity. The following extract shows how the use of names

Lingüística en la red. Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan. Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby. College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger

and nicknames is used by P2 and her friends, which typically occur in adjacent pairs in such a way that they are expected by both interlocutors. In this case, Inf. 4 uses a nickname for P2 and P2 responds with Inf. 4's name.

    (8) P2 and Inf. 4
        01 **Inf. 4:** hola P2/nickname como vas
        02 **P2:** Hola N yo estoy bien empezando la escuela en sexto curso y que tal la u ? Todo buen por alla ☺

This is not to say that P2 completely abandons *usted* of solidarity, as she does use *usted* of solidarity in one conversation with a female cousin around the same age. However, there is asymmetry between forms used, as Inf. 10 chooses to address P2 with T forms.

    (9) P2 and Informant 10 (Distant cousin)
        01 **Inf. 10**: Hola *mija*...disculpa q **te** moleste me puedes decir cuanto vale la compu... y tambien x fa dara viendo q este todos los accesorios..como maleta, mouse, cargador, tal vez algunos CDs, o no se como sabrán dar allá, pero bueno *mija*..igual muchas gracias x todo..
        02 **Inf. 10**: Hola **q tal**
        03 **P2**: Como **esta**
        04 **P2**: Y ya **esta** en vacaciones

However, P2 uses hypocoristic forms in this conversation in a similar way to the manner in which they are used by P1 and her friends.

    (10) P2 and Informant 10
        01 **Inf. 10**: uuuyyy si debe ser feo...es insoportable mucho calor....y q vende en **su** trabajo..
        02 **P2**: Mi trabajo consiste en ser cajera y encargada de un negocio de lavado en seco son la unica en el trabajo y responsable por lo que pase
        03 **P2**: Bueno *señorita* ahora me tengo que ir **cuidese** y saludos a la familia
        04 **Inf. 10**: ok *mija* q **pase** bien chao.

The presentation of extracts from conversations in this section has shown how speakers from Azogues use nominal address forms in conjunction with pronominal forms to create solidarity through the choice of hypocoristics and kinship terms.

L i n g ü í s t i c a   e n   l a   r e d . K o e l p u c s j s e q i l g r e **16 / 12 / 2017**
v l i o c a e d l m d ñ j o **J o r d a n . L a v e n d e r** w y t i m u o x w a l ñ u t o p y
m l ñ p y j h b f b m w a i **C o l b y . C o l l e g e** w ñ u b e i f ñ o i y l d l y r t l m
v l i n w y t i s d ñ f b x c i e g h ñ b v o t l a q w i o p y j h w x b z ñ q w i c i n m

. a r t í c u l o | *Usted* **of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger**

5. Discussion

The data collected from FBM suggests a dual function of *usted* in Azogues, that of solidarity and of no solidarity, similar to what has been documented in Colombia (Uber 1984, 1985). Uber (1985) devises the following scale to show how the three types of address forms are used in Bogotá.

Usted of no solidarity → *tú* → *usted* of solidarity

This scale implies that *usted* of no solidarity expresses more solidarity than *tú,* for those speakers who use *usted* of solidarity. P1 and her FBM friends use *usted* of solidarity, which can be observed in such examples as the use of *usted* of solidarity between P1 and her daughter, close friends and other family members. The use of *usted* of solidarity was accompanied by nominal address forms, particularly terms of affection, in this data.

This study relates to work done by other researchers on address forms used in the Venezuelan Andes, where there is a preference for *usted* between friends and family, which competes with a growing acceptance of *tuteo*, particularly in certain media outlets (Álvarez & Barros 2001; Freites-Barros 2008; Obediente Sosa 2010). Álvarez and Barros (2001: 24) suggest that the use of *usted* in such contexts is not related to the type of relationship between interlocutors or due to a conservative character of Andean Spanish. The use of *usted* is an identity marker as a linguistic elements that has a connotation with group membership and speakers can shift to *tú* when addressing individuals from other regions. Freites-Barros (2008: 293) suggests a similar tripartite division of address functions between *usted* of no solidarity (reverence) - *tú* (cordiality) - *usted* of solidarity (intimacy).

Examining the data from Azogues in this light would suggest that the prevalence of *usted* results from identity work. Textual evidence in the conversations shows the importance of Ecuadorian Andean identity to the informants of this study. Deviation from *usted* to *tú* could result from two processes. First, as noted by Álvarez and Barros (2001), *tuteo* is gaining ground in the Venezuelan Andes, therefore, the use of *tú* by some of P1's friends and nearly all of P2's friends would indicate that the same pattern exists in Ecuador. This seems to be a generational difference, although further research would need to be conducted to be able to ascertain the extent of *tuteo* in Azogues. The use of *tuteo* in the data could also be a shift of function from expressing intimacy to cordiality.

An analysis of the use of *usted* of solidarity in Ecuadorian Spanish could benefit from a comparison with studies on Portuguese address forms. Cook (1997, 2012, 2013) reinterprets Brown and Gilman's (1960) analysis of T/V forms.

> These symbols [T/V] may no longer stand for a power-driven stance and a vertically asymmetrical relation, i.e., one of dominance-subservience between superior and inferior. Instead, they may be expected to convey a same level relation, i.e., a horizontal widening or narrowing of social space in relation to the addressee. Distance will be appropriate between strangers; closeness will be reserved for those sharing affinity on the grounds of kinship, friendship or membership of the same professional or recreational association. V/T dynamics can be negotiated from platform N (Cook 2013: 278).

Lingüística en la red . Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo **Jordan . Lavender** wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai **Colby . College** wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

This 'N-V-T' approach, "takes neutrality, N, as a noncommittal platform, while still considering V and T shades of formality or informality" (Cook 2013: 278). Cook's analysis of Brazilian Portuguese suggests that *você* would typically function as the N (neutral) form, *o senhor* (and related forms) would constitute V (formal) forms, and either *tu* or *você* with accompanying *tu* forms (i.e. blending of 2nd person accusative or possessive forms with nominal 3rd person *você*, '*Você estava no aeroporto? Eu não **te** [instead of **lhe**] vi lá.*", Were you at the airport? I didn't see you there') constituting T (informal) forms. *Tu* and *você* are used in a similar way to *vos* and *tú* in Spanish in regions where they are both used, meaning that *tu* implies more familiarity than *você* (Thomé-Williams 2004). The variation in the tone of *você* as either neutral or informal resembles in some sense the use of *usted* of solidarity by P1 and P2. What distinguishes the use of pronouns by these speakers from Brazilian Portuguese is the lack of a lexicalized form such as *o senhor*. The system in Azogues resembles Cook's (2013) analysis of Portuguese address forms, particularly in the variation in usage of *você* to be both N and T forms. The use of *usted* of solidarity for T forms and of *usted* of no solidarity for V forms mirrors this usage. The only remaining question is if *tú,* in this paradigm, would constitute N (neutral) forms. This does not seem to be the case. It seems that *usted* of no solidarity would function as either V or N, depending on context, given that *usted* is the default form for most interactions. This would allow *tú* and *usted* of solidarity to both be T forms, offering different shades of familiarity between speakers and the desire intimacy that one wishes to express in an interaction, similar to Freites-Barros (2008)'s analysis mentioned above.

6. Conclusion

This study has analyzed conversations taken from two Ecuadorian speakers and their friends on FBM. The use of *usted* by these speakers in contexts with friends and family suggests the use of an *usted* of solidarity, which replaces *tú* as the preferred form to show intimacy and solidarity. It subsequently suggests a dual function for *usted* in this context, which has been found in Bogotá, Colombia (Uber 1984, 1985, 2011) and in other Andean communities (Álvarez and Barros 2001, Freites-Barros 2008), as a type of identity marker used by speakers from these areas. Its use is similar to its use in these other communities in that it is used with close friends and family as the preferred solidarity form, instead of *tú*. The use of *usted* of solidarity is a characteristic of one group of speakers in this study, that of P1 and her friends, who more frequently use *usted* in this context. However, this should not be immediately interpreted as a generational effect, due to the lesser number of messages compiled from P2, and, thus, a much smaller sample from younger speakers. This study analyzed the use of nominal address forms used in conjunction with pronominal forms of address and noted a general pattern that is characterized by the use of nominal address forms more frequently with the preferred solidarity form. For P1 and her friends this implies more frequent use with *usted* than with *tú* forms, and the opposite for P2 and her friends. The use of nominal address forms with the non-solidarity form, either *tú* or *usted*, depending on group, is not inexistent but occurs with less frequency. Additionally, among P1 and her friends, the use of *usted* of solidarity is contrasted with *usted* of no solidarity through the observation of the frequency of nominal forms

Lingüística en la red.Koelpucsjseqilgre **16 / 12 / 2017**
vliocaedlmdñjo**Jordan.Lavender**wytimuoxwalñutopy
mlñpyjhbfbmwai**Colby.College**wñubei fñoiyldlyrtlm
vlinwytisdñfbxcieghñbvotlaqwiopyjhwxbzñqwicinm

.**a r t í c u l o**

Usted **of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook
Messenger**

used in conversations. The non-solidarity form tends to lack nominal address forms in a way that is similar to how *tú* is used.

Jordan Lavender
Colby College, Waterville, ME
Jordan.lavender@colby.edu

Works cited

Alba de Diego, Vidal & Jesús Sánchez Lobato (1980): "Tratamiento y juventud en la lengua hablada: aspectos sociolingüísticos", *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 60, pp. 95-130.

Álvarez, Alexandra and Ximena Barros (2001): "Sistemas en conflicto: las formas de tratamiento en la ciudad Mérida, Venezuela", *Lengua y Habla,* 6, pp. 9-32.

Aston, Guy (1988): *Learning comity: An approach to the description and pedagogy of interactional speech*, Blogna: CLUEB.

Blas Arroyo, José Luís (2003): "Perspectivas (socio) lingüísticas complementarias en el estudio de la variación y el cambio lingüístico en español", *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 4 (2), pp. 653-692.

Blommaert, J., J. Collins, and S. Slembrouck (2005): "Spaces of multilingualism", *Language & Communication, 25,* pp. 197-216.

boyd, danah m. [sic] and Nicole B. Ellison (2008): "Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship", *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 13, pp. 210-230.

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

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

Calderón Campos, Miguel (2010): "Formas de tratamiento", Milagros Aleza Izquierdo & José María Enguita Utrilla (coords.), *La lengua española en América: normas y usos actuales*, Valencia: Universitat de València, pp. 195-222.

Cook, Manuela (1997): "Uma Teoria de Interpretação das Formas de Tratamento na Língua Portuguesa", *Hispania* 80(3), 451-464.

Cook, Manuela (2013): "Portuguese Pronouns and Other Forms of Address, from the Past into the Future — Structural, Semantic and Pragmatic Reflections", *Journal of Lusophone Studies,* 11, pp. 267-290.

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

Dumitrescu, D (1975-1976): "Notas comparativas sobre el tratamiento en español y rumano", *BSRLR,* XI, pp. 81-86.

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

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

García, Angela Cora & Jennifer Baker Jacobs (1999): "The eyes of the beholder: Understanding the turn-taking system in quasi-synchronous computer-mediated communication", *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 32(4), pp. 227-367.

Hirst, Graeme (1991): "Does Conversation Analysis have a role in computational linguistics?", *Computational Linguistics*, 17(2), pp. 211-227.

Márquez Reiter, Rosina & María Elena Placencia (2004): "Displaying closeness and respectful distance in Montevidean and Quiteño service encounters", Rosina Márquez Reiter & María Elena Placencia (eds.), *Current trends in the pragmatics of Spanish,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 121-155.

linred

L i n g ü í s t i c a   e n   l a   r e d . K o e l p u c s j s e q i l g r e   **16 / 12 / 2017**
v l i o c a e d l m d ñ j o **J o r d a n . L a v e n d e r** w y t i m u o x w a l ñ u t o p y
m l ñ p y j h b f b m w a i **C o l b y . C o l l e g e** w ñ u b e i f ñ o i y l d l y r t l m
v l i n w y t i s d ñ f b x c i e g h ñ b v o t l a q w i o p y j h w x b z ñ q w i c i n m

. a r t í c u l o   *Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook
Messenger

Montes Giraldo, José Joaquín, Jennie Figueroa Lorza, Siervo Mora Monroy, Mariano Lozano Ramírez, Ricardo Aparicio Ramírez Caro, María Bernarda Espejo Olaya, and Gloria Esperanza Duarte Huertas (1998): *El español hablado en Bogotá: análisis previo de su estratificación social.* Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Murray, Denise F (1989): "When the medium determines turns: Turn-taking in computer conversation", H. Coleman (ed.), *Working with Language. A Multidisciplinary Consideration of Langauge Use in Work Contexts*, Berline: Mouton de Gruter, pp. 317-337.

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

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

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

Placencia, Maria Elena (1997): "Opening up closings - the Ecuadorian way", *An interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse,* 17 (1), pp. 53-81.

Placencia, María Elena (1998): "Pragmatic variation: Peninsular vs. Ecuadorian Spanish", *Spanish Applied Linguistics,* 2, pp. 71-106.

Placencia, María Elena (2001): "Percepciones y manifestaciones de la (des)cortesía en la atención al público: el caso de una institución pública ecuatoriana", *Oralia: Análisis del Discurso Oral,* 4, pp. 177-212.

Placencia, María Elena (2004): "Rapport-building activities in corner shop interactions", *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 8, pp. 215-245.

Placencia, María Elena (2007): "Entre lo institucional y lo sociable: *conversación de contacto* identidades y metas múltiples en la peluquería", *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana,* 5(9), pp.139-161.

Placencia, María Elena (2010): "El estudio de formas de tratamiento en Colombia y Ecuador", Martin Hummel, Bettina Kluge & María Eugenia Vásquez Laslop (eds.), *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico*, México, D. F.: El Colegio de México, pp. 341-374.

Quilis, Antonio (1992): "Rasgos generales sobre la lengua española en el Ecuador", César Hernández Alonso (coord.), *Historia y presente del español de América,* pp. 593-606.

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

Thomé-Williams, Ana Clotilde (2004): "Sociolinguistic aspects of Forms of Address in Portugal and Brazil: Tu or Você?", *Intercultural Communication Studies,* 8(3), pp. 85-99.

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

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

Uber, Diane R (1985): "The dual function of *usted*: Forms of address in Bogotá, Colombia", *Hispania,* 68, pp. 388-392.

. a r t í c u l o | ***Usted* of solidarity in Azogues, Ecuador: An analysis of data from Facebook Messenger**

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

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