



ESTUDIOS LINGÜÍSTICOS

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL AND PRONOMINAL VOSEO AMONG CHILEANS
AND LEARNERS OF SPANISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

ACEPTACIÓN DEL VOSEO VERBAL Y PRONOMINAL ENTRE CHILENOS Y
APRENDIENTES DE ESPAÑOL COMO LENGUA EXTRANJERA

GLORIA TOLEDO VEGA

Universidad Católica de Chile

gtoledo@uc.cl

ORCID: 0000-0003-1031-2844

KATTERINE SILVA ESPÍNDOLA

Duoc UC

kat.silva@profesor.duoc.cl

ORCID: 0000-0001-6712-5682

Recibido: 08-02-2022

Aceptado: 06-07-2022

ABSTRACT

This study highlights the importance of understanding the forms of voseo in Chile in learners of Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) through reflection on the pragmatic use of the language. This understanding is not easy because of the evolutionary nature of voseo, and the diversity of functions of this phenomenon. The study aims to compare the pragmatic judgments on the Chilean voseo between natives and learners of SFL, which was carried out based on the didactic potential that implies understanding the voseo uses. A questionnaire allowed us to observe choices related to the acceptance of the voseo in different situations, considering pragmatic variables among Chileans and SFL learners. After comparing the responses of both groups of participants, a disparity was observed in the acceptance levels of native and non-native speakers, though also a tendency to be cautious with voseo among learners who had spent more time in Chile. At the same time, there was a correlation in judgments regarding voseo as a phenomenon that can show both closeness (verbal) and contempt (pronominal).

Keywords: Pragmatic judgements, Pragmatic understanding, Spanish as foreign language teaching, Chilean voseo.

RESUMEN

Este estudio destaca la importancia de comprender las formas de voseo en Chile en aprendices de español como lengua extranjera (ELE) a través de la reflexión sobre el uso pragmático de la lengua. Esta comprensión no es fácil debido a la naturaleza evolutiva del voseo y a la diversidad de funciones de este fenómeno. El estudio tiene como objetivo comparar los juicios pragmáticos sobre el voseo chileno entre nativos y aprendices de ELE, el cual se realizó con base en el potencial didáctico que implica comprender los usos del voseo. Un cuestionario permitió observar elecciones relacionadas con la aceptación del voseo en diferentes situaciones, considerando variables pragmáticas entre chilenos y aprendices de ELE. Luego de comparar las respuestas de ambos grupos de participantes, se observó una disparidad en los niveles de aceptación de hablantes nativos y no nativos, aunque también una tendencia a ser más cautos con la aceptación del voseo entre los aprendices que habían pasado más tiempo en Chile. Al mismo tiempo, hubo una correlación en los juicios sobre el voseo como un fenómeno que puede mostrar tanto cercanía (verbal) como desprecio (pronominal).

Palabras clave: Juicios pragmáticos, Comprensión pragmática, Enseñanza de español como lengua extranjera, voseo chileno.

1. INTRODUCTION

The voseo phenomenon is a notable characteristic of many regional and social varieties of Latin American Spanish that is defined by the use of pronominal and/or verbal forms derived initially from the second-person plural (Torrejón, 1986; Fontanella, 1977). Unlike verbal variations of voseo: *tenés* (Argentina), *teníh* (Chile), the pronominal forms are uniform in the use of *vos* according to the subject, although in Chile the *-s* is aspirated and sounds more like *voh*. The Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2009) makes two distinctions at the level of analysis of the voseo: (a) based on its grammatical properties, or (b) based on its prestige, the level of language that corresponds to it and the areas in which it is found (2009: 16.17). These distinctions complicate the selection of voseantes forms for Spanish learners for both understanding and use.

Based on the distinct uses observed in regions which employ voseo, the phenomenon can be classified into the categories of mixed voseo, when the pronoun *vos* corresponds to the second-person singular (*vos tienes miedo*); mixed verbal voseo, when the pronoun *tú* used with verbal *vos* forms (*tu teníh miedo*); what Torrejón (1991) terms absolute voseo (pronominal and verbal voseo) and Morales (1998) calls full voseo (*voh teníh miedo*). Fontanella (1999) establishes four pronominal systems in which the variables of confidence and formality intervene for singular and plural forms, as shown in Table 1. The Chilean system corresponds to IIIa, according to Fontanella (1999, 22.2.3).

Table 1

Treatment pronouns according to Fontanella (1999)

Sistem	Variables	Singular	Plural	Places of use
I	Confidence Formality	Tú Usted	Vosotros Ustedes	Most of Spain
II	Confidence Formality	Tú Usted	Ustedes Ustedes	Areas of America and the Iberian Peninsula (Canary Islands, western Andalusia, parts of Córdoba, Jaén and Granada.
IIIa IIIb	Confidence Formality Intimacy Confidence Formality	Vos – usted Usted Vos Tú usted	Ustedes Ustedes Ustedes Ustedes Ustedes	The most widespread in the American regions where voseo and tuteo coexist, including Chile. Uruguay
IV	Confidence Formality	Vos ustedes	Ustedes Ustedes	Argentina, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala and Paraguay

Martín (2005), in identifying the second-person pronominal systems utilized throughout the Hispanic world, places Chilean voseo within a subsystem that includes Chile, much of Bolivia, southern Peru, parts of Ecuador, much of Colombia, western Venezuela, neighboring areas of Panama and Costa Rica, and the Mexican state of Chiapas. This subsystem alternates, without an established functional delineation, the forms of *vos* of *tú*, where the former is more likely to be encountered at a middle sociocultural level, in informal situations; the latter is more likely to be used by more educated speakers, and with greater caution; and the *usted* form is employed in more formal situations, across all sociocultural levels. Regarding Chile specifically, Martín remarks that due to the lack of autonomy of the voseo phenomenon, various pronominal and verbal combinations of tuteo and voseo are generated. In terms of verbal usage, in present-tense *-ar* forms of voseo, the /s/ phoneme is elided, as in *andai* rather than *andás*, while in *-er* and *-ir* forms, the /s/ is aspirated, as in *comih* or *subih* in place of *comés* or *subís*.

The scenario of voseo in Chile is quite complex in terms of combinatorial structures, functional paradigms, and sociocultural distribution. Morales (1998) distinguishes between purely pronominal voseo, purely verbal voseo, and full voseo, and notes that in Chile all three manifestations can be observed. The verbal paradigm of voseo in Chile, according to Navarro Gala (2000), is found in the present indicative, the preterit, in future tenses, and in the imperative. Angulo Rincón (2010), meanwhile, classifies the Chilean forms of voseo in a more comprehensive manner, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Verbal voseo in Chile (adapted from Angulo Rincón, 2010)

Present indicative Voseo/ regular form	Past imperfective Voseo/ regular form	Preterit Voseo/ regular form	Future indicative Voseo/ regular form
cantai(s)/ cantas corrí(s)/ corres viví(s)/ vives	cantabai(s)/ cantabas comíai(s)/ comías vivíai(s)/ vivías	Cantastes/ cantaste Comistes/ comiste Vivistes/ viviste	cantará(s)/ cantarás comerá(s)/ comerás vivirá(s)/ vivirá
Present subjunctive Voseo/ regular form	Imperfect subjunctive Voseo/ regular form	Conditional Voseo/ regular form	
canti(s)/ cantes comai(s)/ comas vivai(s)/ vivas	cantarai(s)/ cantarás comierai(s)/ comieras vivierai(s)/ vivieras	cantaríai(s)/ cantarías comeríai(s)/ comerías viviríai(s)/ vivirías	

Despite the completeness of Angulo Rincón's observations, it could be argued that the only forms regularly employed are the present indicative and present subjunctive, the past imperfective and the imperfect subjunctive (to a lesser degree), and the conditional. For voseo in the future tense, the periphrastic form is preferred, as in *vai a cantar*, *vai a comer*, or *vai a dormir*, and in terms of the preterit, the voseo form presented by Angulo Rincón does not have a clear pragmatic function and is thus debatable as a distinct usage of this form. In this sense, the addition of an -s at the end of the verbal form in question is perceived as a grammatical error rather than an intentional feature of voseo. Added to the grammatical and sociolinguistic variables of the voseo, is the fact that it is a phenomenon in constant evolution (RAE: 16.17r).

In this scenario, this paper intends to highlight the importance of understanding the forms of voseo in Chile in learners of Spanish as a foreign language (SFL), through reflection on the pragmatic use of the language. For this, the objective of this work aims to compare the acceptance of verbal and pronominal voseo between Chilean speakers and learners of Spanish in Chile. The comparison of the pragmatic judgments on the Chilean voseo between natives and learners of ELE, is carried out based on the didactic potential that implies understanding the voseo, widely used in Chile and with diverse functions. In this sense, the relevance of the comparison between HN and HNN has a diagnostic value related to knowing what gaps Spanish learners may have regarding the voseante uses of the target community. In other words, knowing what to teach learners in an immersive context, in highly variable sociocultural contexts as occurs with the uses of voseo.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Studies of the use of voseo in Chile throughout history

In terms of the history of voseo in Chile, it is known that Bello (1940) spoke of it in disparaging terms in his campaign to improve linguistic standards in the country. Bello's campaign had some effect, yet in the mid-twentieth century, mixed verbal voseo increased among educated young people, while its censure decreased on the part of older speakers. The condemnatory approach to the pronominal form, meanwhile, may have contributed to both the widespread use of mixed verbal voseo observed today and the attribution of negative characteristics to the pronominal usage.

According to Branza (2012), who compares various studies from 1972 to 2005, an 8.4% increase in tuteo can be ascertained in Chile during this period; a 30.1% increase in voseo; and a 37.7% decrease in the use of the usted form. The change in attitude toward voseo can also be observed in the advancement of relevant research. Rona (1967), for example, maintains that during the sixties voseo was considered vulgar and rustic. In a study from 2004, D'Ambrosio comments that in Chile voseo represents a complex arena of language use with significant geographical and social variation. This work also claims that only the pronominal voseo is considered vulgar. According to D'Ambrosio, verbal voseo is used more frequently than tuteo among young people of both sexes and, more generally, in moments of anger, provided that the speakers are not spouses. In situations of happiness, greater variation is not observed among women or men, but voseo predominates; in terms of the expression of happiness, voseo is used among relatives (though less between partners). In neutral situations, voseo predominates among young men and tuteo among young women. Meanwhile, in a 2006 study, Valencia demonstrates that among older adults, the use of vos is a sign of contempt, aggression, and ignorance, while in younger generations it is a mark of trust and friendship. Stevenson (2007) and Rivadeneira (2009) note that men produce more forms of voseo, but Stevenson also points to a high level of use of verbal voseo among upper-class young women.

In a 2011 paper, Della Constanza (2011) distinguishes between the use of authentic voseo (pronominal and verbal), as a derogatory form, and verbal voseo, which is employed in symmetrical relationships by the better-educated. In addition to more habitual usages of voseo, Cautín-Epifani and Valenzuela (2018) report three instances of its use for the present indicative of the verb *ser*: *soi* (the "standard" form for voseo), *erih*, and *soh*. The use of *erih* had been observed previously by Oyanedel and Samaniego (1998), González (2002), Angulo Rincón (2010), and Rivadeneira (2016). Their observations point to its use by young people in middle-upper to upper socioeconomic strata. The form *soh*, meanwhile, observed by Cautín-Epifani and Valenzuela, presents diatopic characteristics typical of the youth language of the southern regions of Chile, accompanied by *voh*, indicative of friendship.

In terms of the expansion that this phenomenon has undergone, those who have studied voseo in Chile claim that its use has intensified over time (Cautín-Epifani, 2011; Helincks, 2010, Rivadeneira, 2009; Stevenson, 2007; Torrejón, 1986). Paradoxically, this expansion has occurred alongside that of certain prejudices that persist regarding voseo. For example, Bishop and Michnowicz (2010) draw attention to the fact that while Chileans stigmatize voseo (including verbal voseo), they likewise use it with great frequency. This corresponds with Hummel et al. (2010), who observes a contradiction between the unacceptability of the non-standard feature and its continued use. According to this author this might be explained by the fact that in Chile there are social norms and community norms whose associated usages differ from one another. Helincks (2012) remarks that this negative perception of voseo is reflected in the fact that it is not used with children, although children use it amongst themselves frequently as well as with some adults.

Considering the background established thus far—the coexistence of various forms of voseo for the same verb, the variety of usages and functions of voseo, the distinct conjugations that accompany it depending on different tenses and modes, and the evolutionary character of this phenomenon-- it follows that this linguistic feature would be problematic for non-native Spanish speakers in Chile. Nevertheless, the voseo has pragmatic functions widely used in Chile, so its understanding is an integral part of the content that Spanish learners should have.

Torrejón (1991) offers a series of schemes which, though running the risk of being reductionist, could serve as tools for explaining the use of tuteo and voseo from a pragmatic perspective. To outline his observations, he distinguishes between social and age-related variables with distinct interlocutors, as illustrated in Table 3. Here, for example, in terms of usage between spouses, the following relationship is shown regarding tuteo (T), verbal voseo (TV), the use of usted (U), and authentic, pronominal, or absolute voseo (VV).

Table 3

Diagram of pronominal usage based on communicative situation and interlocutors

Better educated level	Less educated level
Man Woman $T \leftarrow \rightarrow T$ $TV \leftarrow \rightarrow TV$ $U \leftarrow \rightarrow U$	Man Woman $VV \leftarrow \rightarrow VV$

We suggest this type of diagram as a sound manner of explaining voseo to non-native speakers of Chilean Spanish; however, it is necessary to establish the perception of voseo among various other interlocutors, considering positions of power, familiarity, and social distance. To complement this type of scheme

considering different pragmatic variables, we introduced such variables in the questionnaire that we designed to explore the pragmatic judgments of native and non-native speakers regarding voseo (Appendix 1).

2.2. The pragmatic functions of voseo

Cuba and Miranda (2013) indicate that the appropriate use of the linguistic forms in question according to level of formality facilitates communication, while inadequate use can lead the interlocutor to feel uncomfortable. Arroyo (1994), meanwhile, claims that the change from one level of formality to another via change of pronouns with the same person, during the same conversation, can signal a change of context and thus be an index of contextualization. Viewed in this way, it would appear important to teach these forms to Spanish language learners in Chile, but the question remains of how to reckon with the complexities and subtleties involved in the use of voseo and whether learning about it would in fact be worthwhile pedagogically.

Regarding the validity of teaching voseo, D'Ambrosio (2004) argues that it should be included within the norms of politeness and that the importance of pragmatics in its use should be highlighted. In effect, by all indications the best way to approach the use of voseo with non-native speakers is from the perspective of its use in interaction. This perspective could demonstrate the importance of the phenomenon in terms of individual identity and at the same time allow for the understanding of a wide variety of interactions that reveal local idiosyncrasies. According to Arroyo (1994), the sociopragmatic interpretation of pronouns allows the understanding of formality and familiarity based on common courtesy to be epistemologically simplified. In a pragmatic vein, Morales (1998) and Páez (1981) associate voseo with situations of solidarity, courtesy, trust, respect, and familiarity.

In terms of social standing, we agree in part with Helincks (2012), who reports that the sociocultural level of informants no longer plays a significant role in the use of voseo. From a perspective based on educational level, verbal voseo expresses solidarity and trust within the informal educated norm, while the pronominal form reflects vulgarity and offense, which is in line with the results of Stevenson (2007), Rivadeneira (2009), and Torrejón (2010).

From another pragmatic perspective, one associated with strategies for politeness, Arroyo (1994) proposes the use of *usted* as a mechanism associated with the tact maxim and negative politeness, while *tú* is used for seeking agreement or sympathy, linked with positive politeness. Given that these uses differ between cultures and are unstable within them, though, disagreement could arise between interlocutors if they have internalized the concepts differently. Arroyo does not address the use of voseo, but its use in terms of positive politeness is far more complex than that of tuteo, at least in the case of Chile, as elaborated above.

2.3. Studies on voseo and SFL

In the sphere of teaching and learning Spanish as a second or foreign language (SFL), there are few Spanish textbooks that address the topic of voseo, and for the most part, those that do only consider the Río de la Plata regional variety (as used in Buenos Aires). On one hand, it is worth noting that the vast majority of publications in this area come from the United States or Spain and, on the other hand, addressing each use of voseo in each Spanish-speaking community would be a practically intractable task for an SFL textbook. In this sense, Martín (2005) states that U.S. textbooks disregard voseo due to difficulties in teaching it, among other reasons including the following: that voseo is not considered a standard form in the majority of Hispano-American countries; that those who use voseo use *tú* with foreigners; that voseo is used mainly by the lower classes; or that Spanish immigrants in the United States do not use voseo for the most part, reflecting a tendency to view the Spanish community as the paradigm of the linguistic standard of Spanish. In this panorama, it seems pedagogically profitable that Applied Linguistics related to foreign languages, focuses on knowing the uses of this phenomenon for its eventual explanation to foreign language learners.

In general, SFL textbooks address the phenomenon in question with a brief mention if at all, without describing its geographical distribution or the verbal paradigms of voseo (Martín, 2005; Álvarez y de Compostela, 2014). The Curricular Plan of the Cervantes Institute (PCIC, 2006) defines verbal voseo at the A1 level and details the regions and countries in which it is present (García, 2010). However, this leads once again to the question of whether it is productive to teach these forms, and if they are taught, whether the teacher should aim for their comprehension or use. In this regard, Moreno (2000) comments that the teaching of voseo “can be done with students who are going to carry out their communicative activities in zones where voseo is well esteemed” (2000, 92), also appreciating that in advanced classes, all students should understand the existence of this phenomenon. Moreno's commentary captures the fact that voseo varies among speech communities, and as echoed by Andión Herrero (2007), this complicates its conceptualization for a linguistic model in SFL. Taking this into consideration, Andión Herrero proposes teaching aspects that are sufficiently perfectible for the learner, worthwhile to acquire actively or passively, and sufficiently wide-ranging in their validity and effective use. This would point toward learners at least having a sociolinguistic awareness of voseo, even if they do not use it themselves (Shenk, 2014).

In light of the pragmatic significance of its use and varieties in Chile, it is important for Spanish language learners to be capable of recognizing the contextual uses of voseo. This will contribute to pragmatic competence, which does not only consist of execution, but also of interpretation of language functions and speech acts (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995), enabling learners to avoid misunderstandings within the target community of native speakers of a certain variety of Spanish. The

pragmatic component of voseo is related to the lexical dimension, which, according to Agustín (2006), may not be possible to develop based on the norms that govern classroom interaction or the few opportunities that learners typically have, to practice the target language outside of school. The meager existing coverage of voseo is linked to the primacy of books as sources of material and classwork and the lack of facilitation of authentic opportunities to recognize this phenomenon in classes (Mata, 2006). On the other hand, Mata also suggests that there could be a hidden resistance on the part of learners to develop pragmatic competence based on awareness of appropriateness, as they often focus only on linguistic correctness.

A final factor is that it can be quite challenging to learn the morphology of voseo to the point at which students would be capable of communicating with this linguistic feature with pragmatic correctness, whether in terms of contempt, familiarity, or otherwise (Bachelor, 2016).

3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Participants

Our study sample was comprised of two groups: 73 native speakers of Chilean Spanish (NS) and 39 non-native speakers (NNS), all of whom were selected through purposive sampling. The NS group was divided into three subgroups based on gender: women and men (self-identified); by age (from 21 to 29, from 30 to 39, from 40 to 49, and over 50); and educational level (completed secondary education or some level of tertiary education). The NNS group belongs to one age group (21 to 29), one educational level (completing tertiary education), and was subdivided in subgroups according to length of time in Chile, divided into four periods: less than three months (13 participants); from three to six months (16 participants); from six months to one year (6 participants); and more than one year (2 participants).

The NS Chileans were residents of Santiago, the country's capital city, and the NSS were exchange students at Pontifical Catholic University in Chile, ranging from B2 to C1 levels in SFL, with distinct mother tongues: mainly English, as well as Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, and German. We selected participants within this range of SFL proficiency to work with learners who possess knowledge and capability in Spanish that would allow them to distinguish various forms of voseo in Chilean speech. We did not consider the mother tongue as a variable, given that our objective was instead the length of stay in Chile of the NNS. Considering the NNS mother tongue would have required a separate study, with a balanced group formation for that purpose.

The variables that we consider in the NS group: gender, age, and level of education, respond to the variables involved in the questionnaire of pragmatic judgments that we applied to our informants to account for different situations of power, social distance, and familiarity. The variable regarding the length of time

spent in Chile was considered for the NNS group to know if this is related to more acceptance of voseo among the learners. The gender variable was also considered in this last group to see if there were differences. In summary, the variables among the informants agree with the variables exposed in the questionnaire. Likewise, these variables affect the voseo, as seen in this work's theoretical framework.

3.2. Instrument

A preliminary version of the instrument that we employed was piloted with 20 participants (10 native speakers and 10 non-native speakers of Spanish). Based on this pilot attempt, we eliminated the inclusion of situations that repeated variables (gender, age, and social distance); clarified the instructions, emphasizing that the questionnaire was not asking about the use of a form but of its acceptability in general; and added an open section for participants to judge each of a set of three alternatives with a qualifier, in each of the 18 situations posed. We also clarified some of the situations that seemed more ambiguous. To improve comprehension for the NNS participants, we replaced certain lesser known words with others that are more commonly used (see appendix 1).

Then, the instrument that we used to compile data was a closed questionnaire on pragmatic perception that presented 18 different situations. Each posed three choices that included the acceptance of verbal voseo, pronominal voseo, or tuteo. However, we omitted the analysis of tuteo, because our focus was on the acceptance of voseante forms. In this sense, the tuteo functioned only as of the alternative that showed the rejection of any voseante forms. The questionnaire results considered gender, age, and educational level (with or without higher education) for native speakers and gender and length of time in Chile for non-native speakers.

Meanwhile, the situations in the questionnaire called for the consideration of three variables: judgement of voseo based on age, judgement based on gender, and judgement based on social distance. Five speech acts were considered: asking for something, reprimanding, apologizing, thanking, and telling something. As noted above, we took special care to explain to participants that they should select the alternative that seemed most acceptable to them in general instead of the one they would use. This was due largely to the fact that many of our initial respondents indicated to us that they would never use certain forms in question (all related to pronominal voseo), reaffirming the condemnatory perception of this phenomenon reported by Hummel et al. (2010) and Helincks (2012).

Together with the alternatives offered, and as an addendum to the closed component of the questionnaire, we asked participants to assign an adjective to each alternative for each situation. As mentioned, the alternatives proposed using tuteo, verbal voseo, or pronominal, or absolute voseo (Torrejón, 1991), the latter labelled as such considering that in this context, it combines the use of the pronoun *voh* with the voseo verb form. We excluded the formal *usted* option to avoid complicating

results with a variable that is far removed from the voseo phenomenon and whose use would be improbable in the situations posed. As we already pointed out, we include alternatives with tuteo only to show the rejection of any voseante form, but not to analyze the acceptance of the tuteo forms themselves, whose acceptance in Chile is already apparent.

3.3. Procedure

The analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire on pragmatic judgements consisted of the following parts:

1. Closed questionnaire: selection of alternatives based on what is most acceptable.
 - a. Verbal voseo, pronominal voseo and tuteo in NS considering gender, age, and educational level.
 - b. Verbal voseo, pronominal voseo and tuteo in NNS considering gender and length of residence in Chile.
2. Open questionnaire: assigning judgements on verbal and pronominal voseo among native and nonnative speakers of Chilean Spanish.

The analysis of Part I included a tally of selections, expressed in percentages, concerning the total sample distributed based on gender, age, and educational level for NS and gender and length of time in Chile for NNS. For the analysis of Part II, we identified the types of adjectives repeated most frequently for each alternative and each situation, that is, in a total of 54 instances. The analysis of both sections considers judgements about the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verbal voseo based on gender (directed at a man or a woman) - verbal voseo based on age (directed at someone older, younger, or of similar age) - verbal voseo based on social distance (directed at someone with greater or lesser closeness and/or social standing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pronominal voseo based on gender (directed at a man or a woman) - pronominal voseo based on age (directed at someone older, younger, or of similar age) - pronominal voseo based on social distance (directed at someone with greater or lesser closeness and/or social standing)
---	---

4. RESULTS

4.1. Acceptance of verbal and pronominal voseo among native speakers (NS)

4.1.1. Verbal/pronominal voseo based on gender.

Table 4 shows the percentage of acceptance of verbal and pronominal voseo based on gender, in different conditions (far left column) and with distinct speech acts

(far right column). The participants, who were all Chilean, included 28 men and 45 women.

In terms of verbal voseo, the most remarkable acceptance occurred in the case of men reprimanding women and women reprimanding others of their gender (in a lower proportion). The percentage of acceptance of verbal voseo for reprimand dropped conspicuously for men when it was against their gender, standing in relief to the far higher acceptance of this use among women.

Table 4

Acceptance on verbal/pronominal voseo based on gender

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO %			ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO %		
Voseo toward	Men	Women	Men	Women	Speech act
Woman	46.4	42.2	28.5	22.2	Reprimanding
Man	10.7	33.3	39.2	22.2	Reprimanding
Unknown/ same age	28.6	28.8	4	0	Telling something
Familiar/ same age	35.7	26.7	3.5	0	Asking for something
Unknown/ younger	21.4	20	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ younger	25	24.4	5.6	2.2	Asking for something
Unknown/ older	3.5	2.2	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ older	10.7	2.2	0	0	Asking for something
Greater social distance	17.8	8.9	3.5	6.7	Asking for something
Less social distance: friend	32.7	27.6	14.2	15.5	Reprimanding, thanking, asking for something
Less social distance: partner	21.4	22.1	0	0	Asking for something
Less social distance: one's child	10.7	10.8	0	8.9	Reprimanding

As shown in Table 4, the most accepted uses correspond to verbal voseo in reprimanding situations. The question of the questionnaire in which the absolute voseo was used the most, on the other hand, was to recriminate in a particularly aggravating situation: "You are driving, and another man / woman driver cuts you off, causing a fender bender. Your reaction is..." Facing this situation, the form of reprimand and most accepted by women was *¿Voh soi tonta o qué?* ("Are you stupid or what?"), while for men it was *¿Tú eres hueón o qué?* ("Are you a dumbass or what?"). Meanwhile, the lowest acceptance of voseo among men occurred in the

case of telling something to an unknown, older person. Among women, the lowest acceptance rates were shared between telling something to an unknown, older person and asking for something from an older, familiar person. The total average of the acceptance rates of all forms of voseo among men was 21.7%. In comparison for women, it was 29.6%, which does not correspond with the findings of Valencia (2006), J. Stevenson (2007), or Rivadeneira (2009) on the lower acceptance of voseo among women.

In terms of the pronominal voseo, as expected, and coinciding with most of the research on voseo in Chile, this study revealed a much lower level of acceptance than the verbal voseo. The greatest acceptance of the pronominal voseo among men was recorded in reprimanding others of their gender. At the same time, women reported the most remarkable acceptance in reprimanding other women and other men, with equal percentages. At any rate, acceptance of pronominal voseo did not exceed 40% in any case for either gender. The average acceptance was 8.2% among men and 6.4% among women, both considerably lower than the acceptance percentages for verbal voseo.

4.1.2. Verbal/ pronominal voseo based on educational level.

Table 5 illustrates the difference in acceptance of voseo among NS participants who had completed secondary education (SE) only and those who additionally had some level of tertiary education (TE), groups of 17 and 56 people, respectively.

The greatest acceptance of verbal voseo, with a significant percentage, was recorded among the group without tertiary education and fell into the category of reprimand toward women. On the other hand, in the TE group, the greatest acceptance was of verbal voseo as reprimand toward men, though with a far lower percentage than that of the SE group toward women.

Table 5

Acceptance of pronominal/verbal voseo based on educational level

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO			ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO		
Voseo toward	SE	TE	SE	TE	Speech act
Man	47	33.9	17.6	30.3	Reprimanding
Woman	76.4	17.8	11.7	28.5	Reprimanding
Unknown/ same age	17.6	32.1	0	1.7	Telling something
Familiar/ same age	23.5	32.1	0	1.7	Asking for something
Unknown/ younger	17.6	21.4	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ younger	23.5	25	0	0	Asking for something
Unknown/ older	0	3.5	0	0	Telling something

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO			ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO		
Familiar/ older	0	7.1	0	0	Asking for something
Greater social distance	0	16	0	7.1	Asking for something
Less social distance: friend	10.5	32.1	16.1	1.7	Reprimanding, thanking, asking for something
Less social distance: partner	20.5	22.3	0	0	Asking for something
Less social distance: one's child	11.7	1.7	0	0	Reprimanding

The lowest acceptance of verbal voseo among the SE group was recorded in acts of telling something to an unknown person, asking for something from a familiar person, or asking for something from an older, unknown person, all with 0% selection. Among the TE group, the lowest use was in the act of reprimanding a child. In any case, the acceptance of voseo toward children is very shallow among Chileans in general, as reported by Helincks (2010).

The total average of acceptance of all forms of voseo in these groups was 20.6% for those with only secondary education and 19.8% for the group with some form of tertiary education.

Table 5 also exhibits the scarce acceptance of pronominal voseo, whose highest percentage was among the TE group in the act of reprimanding a woman using *voh*.

The total average of acceptance of pronominal voseo recorded in the SE group was 3.7%, while for the TE group, it was 5.9%.

4.1.3. Verbal/pronominal voseo based on age range.

Table 6 shows the acceptance of verbal/pronominal voseo within four age ranges: 21-29, with 24 participants; 30-39, with 15 participants; 40-50, with 19 participants; and over 50, with 2 participants. Among them, the group that showed the highest acceptance of verbal voseo was the youngest group with a 27.94% total average. In contrast, the older group showed the lowest acceptance, with an average of 11.52%. The group aged 30 to 39 averaged 14%, and the group aged 40 to 50 averaged 19.3%.

Table 6

Acceptance of verbal/pronominal voseo based on age range

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO					ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO				
Voseo toward	21-29	30-39	40-50	<50	21-29	30-39	40-50	<50	Speech act
Woman	25.9	26.6	63.2	60	41.6	35.7	5.3	12.5	Reprimanding

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO					ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO				
Man	12.5	20	42.1	26.6	45.8	42.8	10.5	12.5	Reprimanding
Unknown/ same age	45.8	0	13.3	0	0	7.1	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ same age	62.5	0	13.3	0	0	7.1	0	0	Asking for something
Unknown/ younger	25.9	26.6	5.3	20	0	0	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ younger	33.3	26.6	26.3	6.7	0	0	0	0	Asking for something
Unknown/ older	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Telling something
Familiar/ older	7.1	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Asking for something
Grea- ter social distance	20.8	20	5.3	0	8.3	3.5	0	6.3	Asking for something
Less social distance: friend	41.9	28.3	22.2	18.3	11.4	71.4	57.9	75.1	Reprimanding, thanking, asking for something
Less social distance: partner	31.7	13.3	26.3	6.7	0	0	0	0	Asking for something
Less social distance: one's child	20.8	0	15	0	8.3	7.2	0	6.3	Reprimanding

The highest percentages of acceptance of verbal voseo were recorded when something was being asked for from a familiar person of similar age (among the youngest group) and, following the trend of previous variables, when reprimanding a woman (oldest two groups). The least accepted condition was telling something to an older, unknown person or asking for something from an older, familiar person.

Regarding pronominal voseo, the two most important percentages of acceptance in the whole table are registered in the age groups of 30 - 39 years in situations of reprimand, gratitude and asking a friend for something. Precisely, the highest percentage corresponds to the situation of telling a friend to stop making a scene at a party. In the youngest group, by contrast, the greatest acceptance of the use of *vo/h* was for the act of reprimanding a man.

In decreasing order, the highest total acceptance of pronominal voseo was among the 30-39 group at 14.5%; the youngest group, at 9.6%; the oldest group, at 9.4%; and lastly, the 40-50 group, at 6.1%.

4.2. Acceptance of verbal and pronominal voseo among NNS

4.2.1. Verbal/pronominal voseo in NNS considering gender.

Table 7 exhibits the percentages of acceptance of verbal and pronominal voseo based on gender for the NNS participants. These Spanish language learners included 24 women and 15 men ranging in proficiency level from B2 to C1 (according to MCER, see Consejo de Europa, 2002).

The table shows that the most remarkable acceptance of verbal voseo among NNS men corresponded to using it to ask for something from a partner. In the case of women, it was most frequently accepted for telling something to a younger, unknown person. In neither group was any preference recorded that coincided with Chilean speakers.

Table 7

Acceptance of verbal/pronominal voseo based on gender among NNS

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO			ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO		
Voseo toward	Men	Women	Men	Women	Speech act
Woman	33.5	16.6	13.3	12.5	Reprimanding
Man	6.7	8.3	26.7	12.5	Reprimanding
Unknown/ same age	33.3	29.2	0	8.3	Telling something
Familiar/ same age	33.3	4.2	20	16.7	Asking for something
Unknown/ younger	33.3	41.7	20	4.2	Telling something
Familiar/ younger	46.7	29.2	20	33.3	Asking for something
Unknown/ older	13.3	8.3	26.7	37.5	Telling something
Familiar/ older	20	29.2	20	29.2	Asking for something
Greater social distance	33.3	33.2	20	12.5	Asking for something
Less social distance: friend	48.3	28.9	9.8	15.6	Reprimanding, thanking, asking for something
Less social distance: partner	60	31.2	6.7	22.9	Asking for something
Less social distance: one's child	26.7	20.8	0	4.2	Reprimanding

Regarding the pronominal voseo, NNS were distributed in their greatest level of acceptance between reprimanding a man and telling something to an unknown, older person (one of the least accepted alternatives among Chileans). NNS

women, meanwhile, accepted voseo most often when asking for something from an unknown, older person (again, far from the most acceptable option recorded among native speakers). The only choice that coincided between NS and NNS participants was among men, in the act of reprimanding.

The total average acceptance of verbal voseo was 32.3% among NNS men, higher than the average among Chilean men, and 23.4% among NNS women, lower than the average among Chilean women. In the case of pronominal voseo, the total average acceptance was 15.2% among NNS men and 17.4% among NNS women, which are much higher than the acceptance rates recorded for the Chilean (NS) participants in this study.

4.2.2. Verbal/pronominal voseo in NNS considering length of time in Chile.

According to M. Agustín (2006), the best method of developing the comprehension of voseo is through practice in the target language outside the context of language classes. Table 8 demonstrates, in line with this claim, that the group of NNS who had spent the most time in Chile were far more cautious in their judgements regarding voseo, especially the pronominal form.

Table 8

Acceptance of verbal/pronominal voseo based on length of time in Chile

Voseo toward	ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO				ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO				Speech act
	<3m	3-6m	6m-1y	>1y	<3m	3-6m	6m-1y	>1y	
Woman	15,4	25	33,3	0	7,7	12,5	16,7	0	Reprimanding
Man	7,7	6,3	16,7	0	7,7	12,5	50	0	Reprimanding
Unknown/ same age	23,1	31,3	66,7	0	0	6,3	16,7	0	Telling something
Familiar/ same age	0	18,8	50	0	7,7	31,3	16,7	0	Asking for something
Unknown/ younger	46,2	37,5	33,3	0	15,4	6,3	16,7	0	Telling something
Familiar/ younger	30,8	31,3	66,7	0	30,8	37,5	16,7	50	Asking for something
Unknown/ older	23,1	6,3	0	0	38,5	31,3	33,3	0	Telling something
Familiar/ older	30,8	25	0	50	30,8	31,3	16,7	0	Asking for something

ACCEPTANCE OF VERBAL VOSEO					ACCEPTANCE OF PRONOMINAL VOSEO				
Greater social distance	38,5	31,3	50	50	7,7	25	0	0	Asking for something
Less social distance: friend	38,4	35,9	33,3	25,5	9,6	10,9	12,5	0	Reprimanding, thanking, asking for something
Less social distance: partner	19,2	40,6	25	50	19,2	25	0	0	Asking for something
Less social distance: one's child	15,4	31,3	33,3	50	0	6,3	0	0	Reprimanding

The total average acceptance of verbal voseo among the NNS groups according to the length of time in Chile was 24% for the first group (least time), 26.7% for the second group, 34% for the third group, and 18.7% for the fourth group (most time). Meanwhile, the average acceptance of pronominal voseo was 14.5% in the first group (least time), 19.6% in the second group, 6.3% in the third group, and 4.1% in the fourth group (most time). It might have been thought that a more extended stay in Chile would have resulted in a greater general acceptance of the voseo; however, the results show an acceptance consistent with that of Chileans. We could venture that at the time of this questionnaire, the first group still did not understand and perhaps did not even discern the forms of voseo used in Chile. The second group might have distinguished the forms but not their appropriate use. Meanwhile, the two groups with the most time in the country were the most cautious in accepting pronominal voseo, suggesting a heightened understanding. Although expected, these results are also relevant since they show that the teaching of voseante forms should be progressive; that is to say, it is not possible to teach all the uses in a few classes, no matter how high the language is the level of the learners.

Ten of the SFL learners explicitly mentioned their ignorance and discomfort regarding voseo forms in filling out the questionnaire. As Mata (2006) indicated, non-native speakers will tend to prefer more conventionally correct forms and avoid other forms that are more ambiguous in their usage.

4.3. Judgments regarding voseo among NS and NSS

As mentioned previously, the questionnaire used with study participants also included an open portion, together with each alternative, which provided a margin in which they could assign an adjective that would describe the use of voseo or tuteo in the specific situation proposed. The most frequent type of answers provided by

native speakers and non-native speakers regarding voseo (verbal and pronominal) are shown in Table 9.

We grouped the following adjectives in semantic categories to define the most frequent judgements assigned by NS and NNS. Hence, the adjectives *cercanía* and *familiaridad* were comprised in *closeness*; *desprecio*, *menosprecio*, *desaire* in *contempt*; *rabia* y *enojo* in *anger*; and *amistad* was comprised in *friendship*.

Table 9

Judgments regarding voseo among NS AND NNS

Question	Type of voseo	Most frequent judgment assigned by NNS and NS	Percentage of judgements attributed to voseo	
			Percentage NNS	Percentage NS
1	Verbal	Closeness	27,60%	61,70%
	Pronominal	Contempt	20,70%	27,70%
2	Verbal	Closeness	34,50%	46,80%
	Pronominal	Contempt	17,20%	27,70%
3	Verbal	Closeness	27,60%	55,30%
	Pronominal	Contempt	27,60%	36,20%
4	Verbal	Closeness	31%	61,70%
	Pronominal	No consensus	24,10%	0
5	Verbal	Closeness	31%	55,30%
	Pronominal	No consensus	13,80%	0
6	Verbal	Closeness	17,20%	25,50%
	Pronominal	Anger	10,30%	36,20%
7	Verbal	Anger	0	23,40%
	Pronominal	Contempt	10,30%	27,70%
8	Verbal	Closeness	24,10%	42,60%
	Pronominal	Contempt	10,3	40,40%
9	Verbal	Closeness	17,20%	38,30%
	Pronominal	Contempt	13,80%	31,90%
10	Verbal	Closeness	17,20%	27,70%
	Pronominal	Contempt	6,90%	29,8
11	Verbal	Closeness	24,10%	36,20%
	Pronominal	Contempt	0	23,40%
12	Verbal	Anger	10,30%	27,70%

			Percentage of judgements attributed to voseo	
Question	Type of voseo	Most frequent judgment assigned by NNS and NS	Percentage NNS	Percentage NS
	Pronominal	Anger	0	29,8
13	Verbal	Closeness	27,60%	51,10%
	Pronominal	Contempt	10,30%	19,10%
14	Verbal	Closeness	13,80%	34,00%
	Pronominal	Contempt	0	25,50%
15	Verbal	Friendship	17,20%	25,50%
	Pronominal	Friendship	10,30%	21,3
16	Verbal	Anger	13,80%	38,30%
	Pronominal	Anger	10,30%	44,70%
17	Verbal	Anger	10,30%	44,70%
	Pronominal	Contempt	6,93%	42,60%
18	Verbal	Closeness	20,70%	34,00%
	Pronominal	Closeness	10,30%	23,40%

As exhibited in this table, the most significant agreement cases between Chilean participants (over 50%) relate to the meanings attributed to verbal voseo. This level of agreement applied to the sense of closeness in nearly all cases, specifically in questions 1, 3, 4, 5, and 13, which correspond to the following types of situations: (1) asking for something from a familiar person of similar age; (3) asking for something from a familiar person who is younger than you; (4) asking for something from your partner; (5) apologizing to your partner; and (13) asking something to your partner.

As for the pronominal voseo, although there was no full agreement among the Chilean participants, the tendency was to associate it with contempt, among other negative connotations.

Meanwhile, the NNS participants coincided with the NS in the situations mentioned above in terms of the type of adjective provided most frequently, attributing the same meaning to verbal voseo in the situations discussed above: those seen as related to closeness. This characteristic is related to the trust and solidarity that Páez (1981) and Morales (1998) refer to. No consensus was observed only in the types of adjectives related to pronominal voseo in questions 4 and 5.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The present study considered the historical evolution of the voseo in Chile, to account for the changing nature of this phenomenon; the pragmatic functions of

the voseo, to understand its functional value; and the teaching of voseo in SFL, to calibrate what to teach about this phenomenon, in what context and based on what understanding gaps of the learners. Aiming at the latter, this work intended to highlight the importance of the pragmatic knowledge of the voseante forms in Chile for teaching-learning of SFL. This study showed the difficulty in comprehension that this phenomenon presents to non-native speakers of Chilean Spanish, even those with high proficiency levels in SFL. The preceding demonstrates the need to teach these forms, widely used in Chile, from a pragmatic point of view that aims to improve learners' understanding.

General results indicate that Chileans, both men and women, show more acceptance of voseo for reprimanding. Men and women also coincide in the less acceptance of voseo to tell something to an older stranger. There is more acceptance of voseo among Chilean women, and both men and Chilean women show less acceptance for pronominal voseo than verbal.

Based on education, there is more acceptance of verbal voseo among the group without tertiary education. The less significant acceptance of voseo in every group is for reprimanding a child, especially among the group with tertiary education.

Based on age, there is more acceptance between the younger group and less among the older. The more significant acceptance is when asking for something from a relative of the same age (among the younger group) and reprimanding women among the other two older groups. In general, more acceptance of pronominal voseo is related to reprimanding, thanking, or asking for something in situations of solidarity. The less acceptance among all groups is related to asking for or telling older people something.

Among NNS, distinctions based on gender show there is no coincidence with Chilean informants. Men consider verbal voseo more acceptable when asking for something from a partner, and women when telling something to a young but unknown person. On the other hand, contrary to Chilean women, women NNS accept less verbal voseo. Related to pronominal voseo, men consider it more acceptable to reprimand a man and telling something to an older unknown. On the other hand, women consider that pronominal voseo is acceptable to ask something to an older unknown. NNS men generally show more acceptance than Chilean men to pronominal voseo. The only coincidence with NS is the acceptance of voseo for reprimand.

Moreover, results suggest that a greater length of time in Chile for SFL learners does not guarantee the use of voseo forms because acceptance was generally associated with more precaution among those learners who had been in the country longer. In other words, these learners' improved understanding of voseo compared to those who had spent less time in Chile was manifested through an attitude of lower acceptance of the phenomenon in distinct situations and contexts, corresponding more closely to native speaker views. A study like this reinforces the importance of context for determining the uses of voseo, as Arroyo (1994) indicated.

There seems to have been agreement among Chilean native speakers and non-native speakers in associating verbal voseo with greater closeness and pronominal voseo with contempt. Although these results are expected, they are also relevant since they show that the teaching and learning of voseante forms should be progressive and very contextualized. In this sense, a study like this serves to understand the gaps in NNS' understanding of the voseo phenomenon and identify the most idiosyncratic uses among Chileans so that these uses could be taught in more advanced stages of stay in Chile.

Bearing these results in mind and returning to the question of whether it is worthwhile from a pedagogical point of view to teach the form in question to learners of Chilean Spanish, our answer comes in the same vein as Andión Herrero (2007) and Moreno (2000). The optimal route is to teach what is most perceptible about voseo in a given context and not require its various forms but rather its comprehension. This will allow learners to access implicit significations which reveal an essential part of our culture and idiosyncrasies.

REFERENCES

- Agustín, M. P. (2006). La competencia pragmática y los errores pragmático-léxicos en la clase de ELE. En A. Álvarez, C. de la Hoz, L. Barrientos, I. Iglesias, M. Braña, P. Martínez, V. Coto, M. Prieto, M. Cuevas, y A. Turza (Eds.), *La Competencia Pragmática o la Enseñanza del Español como Lengua Extranjera. Actas del XVI Congreso Internacional ASELE* (pp. 96-102). Ediciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/asele/pdf/16/16_0096.pdf
- Álvarez, I. y de Compostela, S. (2014). Formas de tratamiento y enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera. *RedELE: Revista Electrónica de Didáctica ELE*, (26), 86-102.
- Andión Herrero, M. A. (2007). Las variedades y su complejidad conceptual en el diseño de un modelo lingüístico para español L2/LE. *ELUA. Estudios De Lingüística. Universidad De Alicante*, (21), 21-33. <https://doi.org/10.14198/ELUA2007.21.02>
- Angulo Rincón, L. A. (2010). Voseo, el otro castellano de América. *Revista historia de la educación latinoamericana*, (14), 267-288. <https://doi.org/10.19053/01227238.1558>
- Arroyo, J. (1994). Los pronombres de tratamiento y la cortesía. *Revista de Filología de la Universidad de la Laguna*, (13), 7-36.
- Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. (2009). *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Espasa.
- Bachelor, J. W. (2016). La Interdependencia pragmático gramatical en el aprendizaje de español como lengua extranjera (ELE). *Lenguaje*, 44(2), 147-175. <https://doi.org/10.25100/lenguaje.v44i2.4619>
- Bello, A. (1940). Advertencias sobre el uso de la lengua castellana, dirigidas a los padres de familia, profesores de los colegios y maestros de escuela. El español en Chile. Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana VI: 52-76 (original publicado en 1856).
- Bishop, K. y Michnowicz, J. (2010). Forms of address in Chilean Spanish. *Hispania*, 93(3), 413-429. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25758211>

- Branza, M. (2012). La variación 'circular': La diacronía del voseo chileno y las causas de su actual difusión. *Colindancias. Revista de la Red de Hispanistas de Europa Central*, (3), 141-153. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=274881>
- Cautín-Epifani, V. (2011). El voseo chileno en interacciones mediadas por computadora: un estudio exploratorio. *Actas del XIX Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Chilena de Lingüística (SOCHIL) Valparaíso, Chile*.
- Cautín-Epifani, V. y Valenzuela, M. (2018). Variación sociolingüística del voseo verbal chileno en interacciones escritas en la Biografía Facebook. *Onomázein*, (4), 49-69. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.add.07>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z. y Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated framework with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L462005216>
- Consejo de Europa (2002). Marco común europeo de referencia para las lenguas: aprendizaje, enseñanza, evaluación. Secretaría General Técnica del MECD-Subdirección General de Información y Publicaciones, y Grupo ANAYA.
- Cuba, L. y Miranda, Y. (2013). De la teoría a la práctica formas de tratamiento desconocimiento o descortesía verbal. Monografías. <https://www.monografias.com/trabajos106/teoria-practica-formas-tratamiento-desconocimiento-o-des-cortesia-verbal/teoria-practica-formas-tratamiento-desconocimiento-o-des-cortesia-verbal.shtml>
- D'Ambrosio, H. (2004). Pragmática sociolingüística de pedagogía de los pronombres de tratamiento en lengua española. *Estudios de Lingüística Aplicada*, (39), 37-52.
- Della Constanza, M. (2011). El voseo auténtico en el habla culta de Chile: un anacronismo despectivo. En C. Albizu, H. Dohla, L. Filipponio, M. Sguaitmatti, H. Volker, V. Ziswiler, y R. Zollner (Eds.), *Anachronismen – Anachronismes – Anacronismi – Anacronismos* (pp. 55-67). ETS.
- Fontanella, M. (1977). La constitución del paradigma pronominal de voseo. *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, 32(2), 227-241. http://bibliotecadigital.caroycuervo.gov.co/539/1/TH_32_002_015_0.pdf
- Fontanella, M. (1999). Pragmática de los pronombres de tratamiento. En I. Bosque y V. Demonte (Dir.), *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* (Vol. I: 1414-1418; 22.5). Espasa.
- García, E. (2010). El tratamiento de las variedades de español en los manuales de ELE2/LE [Memoria de Máster]. UNED. <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/mc/redele/biblioteca-virtual/numerosanteriores/2010/memoriaster/2- semestre/enriquegarcia.html>
- González, C. E. (2002). La variación 'erih'/'soi' en el voseo verbal de Santiago de Chile. Un estudio exploratorio. *Onomázein*, (7), 213-230. <https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.7.11>
- Helincks, K. (2010). La variación estilística y dialectal del voseo chileno [Tesina inédita propuesta para la obtención del diploma de Master Taal- en Letterkunde: Nederlands – Spaans, Faculteit Letteren en Wijsbegeerte, Universiteit Gent]. Faculteit Letteren en Wijsbegeerte. <https://lib.ugent.be/en/catalog/rug01:001457969>
- Helincks, K. (2012). La variación social y estilística del voseo chileno en diferentes géneros televisivos. *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana*, 10(19), 185-211. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41678491>
- Hummel, M., Kluge, B. y Vázquez, M. E. (2010). *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico*. El Colegio de México. (Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios)

- Instituto Cervantes (2006). *Plan Curricular del Instituto Cervantes. Niveles de referencia para el español*. Madrid. Biblioteca Nueva
- Martín, Y. (2005). Notas de morfología dialectal en los manuales del español como segunda lengua: los pronombres de segunda persona. En A. Castillo, O. Cruz Moya, J. M. García, y J. P. Mora (Eds.), *Las gramáticas y los diccionarios en la enseñanza del español como segunda lengua, deseo y realidad: Actas del XV Congreso Internacional de ASELE* (pp. 212-221). Universidad de Sevilla, Secretariado de Publicaciones. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1421169>
- Mata, J. (2006). Transferibilidad de la competencia pragmática. Implicaciones derivadas de la enseñanza de español como segunda lengua (E/SL) a niños inmigrantes. En A. Álvarez, C. de la Hoz, L. Barrientos, I. Iglesias, M. Braña, P. Martínez, V. Coto, M. Prieto, M. Cuevas, y A. Turza (Eds.), *La Competencia Pragmática o la Enseñanza del Español como Lengua Extranjera: Actas del XVI Congreso Internacional ASELE* (pp. 298-307). Ediciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/asele/pdf/16/16_0298.pdf
- Morales, F. (1998). Panorama del voseo chileno y rioplatense. *Boletín de Filología (Santiago)*, 37(2), 835-848. <https://revistas.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/21489>
- Moreno, F. (2000). *Qué español enseñar*. Arco/Libros.
- Navarro Gala, R. (2000). Una propuesta teórico-práctica para la enseñanza de las formas de tratamiento de segunda persona en las clases de ELE. En M. A. Martín y C. Díez (Eds.), *Qué español enseñar?: norma y variación lingüísticas en la enseñanza del español a extranjeros: Actas del XI Congreso Internacional ASELE* (pp. 551-558). ASELE / Universidad de Zaragoza. https://cvc.cervantes.es/ensenanza/biblioteca_ele/asele/pdf/11/11_0551.pdf
- Oyanel, M. y Samaniego, J. (1998). Notas para un nuevo perfil lingüístico del español de Santiago de Chile. *Boletín de Filología*, 37(2), 899-913. <https://revistas.uchile.cl/index.php/BDF/article/view/21496>
- Páez, I. (1981). *Historia y geografía hispanoamericana del voseo*. La casa de Bello.
- Rivadeneira, M. (2009). El voseo en medios de comunicación de Chile. Descripción y análisis de la variación dialectal y funcional [Tesis para optar al grado de doctor en Filología]. Universitat Pompeu Fabra. <https://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/7510>
- Rivadeneira, M. (2016). Sociolinguistic variation and change in Chilean voseo. In M. Moya y S. Rivera-Mills (Eds.), *Forms of Address in the Spanish of the Americas* (pp. 87-118). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ihtml.10.05riv>
- Rona, J. (1967). *Geografía y morfología del voseo*. Pontificia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul.
- Shenk, E. (2014). Teaching Sociolinguistic Variation in the Intermediate Language Classroom: "Voseo" in Latin America. *Hispania*, 97(3), 368-381. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2014.0089>
- Stevenson, J. (2007). The sociolinguistic variables of Chilean voseo [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Washington.
- Torrejón, A. (1986). Acerca del Voseo Culto de Chile. *Hispania*, 69(3), 677-683. <https://doi.org/10.2307/342781>
- Torrejón, A. (1991). Fórmulas de tratamiento de segunda persona singular en el español de Chile. *Hispania*, 74(4), 1068-1076. <https://doi.org/10.2307/343770>

- Torrejón, A. (2010). *Nuevas observaciones sobre el voseo en el español de Chile*. In *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico* (pp. 755-770). El Colegio de México.
- Valencia, A. (2006). Formas pronominales de tratamiento en Santiago de Chile. En M. Sedano y A. Shiro (Eds.), *Haciendo lingüística: Homenaje a Paola Bentivoglio* (pp. 569-581). Universidad Central de Venezuela.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Gloria Toledo Vega contributed to its conception, realization, and development, as well as to obtaining the data, the interpretation of the results, its writing and revision.

Katterine Silva Espíndola contributed to its realization and development, as well as to obtaining the data, its writing and revision.

APPENDIX 1: PRAGMATIC JUDGEMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Muchas gracias por completar este cuestionario.

Por favor indique:

Sexo:

Hombre ____ Mujer ____

Edad:

Entre 15 y 20 años __/ Entre 21 y 29 años __/ Entre 30 y 39 años __/ Entre 40 y 50 años __/
Mayor de 50 años __

Nivel educacional:

Enseñanza básica completa __ Enseñanza media completa __ Educación técnica o superior __

1. Seleccione cuál de estas opciones le parece la más adecuada para la situación propuesta (elija una)
2. Juzgue las expresiones a, b y c, al lado de cada una, según usted crea que son: señal de cercanía, señal de cariño, señal de enojo, señal de menosprecio, señal de amistad, señal de dominio u otro.

Ej: Pedirle a alguien de la familia (de su edad) que compre pan

- a. ¿Podíh comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? cercanía
- b. ¿Puedes comprar el pan en la tarde porfa? amistad
- c. ¿Voh podríai comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? cariño

Escriba la opción elegida __b__

1. Pedirle a alguien de la familia (de su edad) que compre pan

- a. ¿Podíh comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____
- b. ¿Puedes comprar el pan en la tarde porfa? _____
- c. ¿Voh podríai comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

2. Pedirle a alguien de la familia (mayor) que compre pan

- a. ¿Podíh comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____
- b. ¿Puedes comprar el pan en la tarde porfa? _____
- c. ¿Voh podríai comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

3. Pedirle a alguien de la familia (menor) que compre pan

- a. ¿Podíh comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____
- b. ¿Puedes comprar el pan en la tarde porfa? _____
- c. ¿Voh podríai comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

4. Pedirle a tu pareja, cónyuge que compre pan

- a. ¿Podíh comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____
- b. ¿Puedes comprar el pan en la tarde porfa? _____
- c. ¿Voh podríaí comprar el pan a la tarde porfa? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

5. Pedir disculpas/ perdón por llegar tarde donde el/la pololo/polola

- a. ¿Me disculpai? No fue mi intención. _____
- b. ¿Me disculpas? No fue mi intención. _____
- c. ¿Voh me perdonaríaí? No fue mi intención. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

6. Recriminar a un amigo que pide prestado tu notebook después de haber roto tu celular y no haberlo pagado

- a. Oye, tú me echastes a perder la cuestión el otro día. _____
- b. Voh me echastes a perder la cuestión el otro día. _____
- c. Tú me echaste a perder la cuestión el otro día. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

7. Pedirle a un desconocido que se calme porque está haciendo un escándalo en una fiesta

- a. ¿Podíh calmarte por favor? _____
- b. ¿Puedes calmarte por favor? _____
- c. ¿Voh podíh calmarte por favor? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

8. Pedirle a un amigo que se calme porque está haciendo un escándalo en una fiesta

- a. ¿Podíh calmarte por favor? _____
- b. ¿Puedes calmarte por favor? _____
- c. ¿Voh podíh calmarte por favor? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

9. A un desconocido menor que usted, le cuenta algo increíble que le pasó el día anterior.

- a. Voh no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- b. Tú no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- c. No vas a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

10. A un desconocido mayor que usted, le cuenta algo increíble que le pasó el día anterior.

- a. Voh no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- b. Tú no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- c. No vas a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

11. A un desconocido de la misma edad suya, le cuenta algo increíble que le pasó el día anterior.

- a. Voh no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- b. Tú no vai a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____
- c. No vas a creerme lo que te voy a contar. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

12. Castigar a un hijo por tener dos promedios rojos

- a. Te vas a quedar sin Nintendo, sin tele y sin salir de la casa salvo pa ir al colegio.

- b. Vai a quedarte sin Nintendo, sin tele y sin salir de la casa salvo pa ir al colegio.

- c. Voh te vai a quedar sin Nintendo, sin tele y sin salir de la casa salvo pa ir al colegio.

Escriba la opción elegida _____

13. Preguntarle a la pareja/ cónyuge, qué va a hacer el fin de semana.

- a. ¿Qué vai a hacer este fin de semana? _____
- b. ¿Qué vas a hacer este fin de semana? _____
- c. ¿Voh teníh algún plan pa este fin de semana? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

14. Pedirle a un empleado que le compre pasajes para un viaje próximo a realizar.

- a. ¿Tú me compraríai los pasajes pa la otra semana? Estoy re ocupado.

- b. ¿Voh me compraríai los pasajes para la otra semana porfa? Es que estoy re ocupado

- c. ¿Tú me comprarías los pasajes pa la otra semana? Estoy re ocupado.

Escriba la opción elegida _____

15. Agradecer a un amigo por hacerte un gran favor personal

- a. Te pasastes. Voh soy el/la más bacán. _____
- b. Te pasaste. Eres el/ la más bacán. _____
- c. Te pasaste. Eríh el/ la más bacán. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

16. Va manejando y otro conductor hombre le echa el auto encima y le da un topón fuerte.

La reacción de usted es:

- a. ¿Voh soi tonto o qué? _____
- b. ¿Tú eres hueón o qué? _____
- c. ¿Tú soi tonto o qué? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

17. Va manejando y otra conductora mujer te echa el auto encima y te da un topón fuerte.

La reacción de usted es:

a. ¿Voh soi tonta o qué? _____

b. ¿Tú eres hueona o qué? _____

c. ¿Tú soi tonta o qué? _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

18. Pedir disculpas/perdón por haber echado a perder un artefacto eléctrico costoso de un amigo.

a. ¿Me disculpai? No fue mi intención. _____

b. ¿Me disculpas? No fue mi intención _____

c. ¿Voh me perdonaría? No fue mi intención. _____

Escriba la opción elegida _____

