Ustedeo, voseo, or *tuteo* in Costa Rica: *Un arroz con mango*

Barbara C. Schmidt-Rinehart, *Ashland University*
Jean W. LeLoup, *U.S. Air Force Academy*

Abstract

An accurate portrayal of contemporary Spanish in Costa Rica necessitates the inclusion of a discussion of forms of address. Costa Rica is commonly listed among the countries that include *voseo* as part of its pronominal paradigm. The present descriptive study elucidates the sociolinguistic reality of *voseo* in Costa Rica and elaborates on the dynamics of second-person singular forms of address or register. Data were derived from a two-part study designed to investigate the use of *usted, vos,* and *tú* together with their corresponding verb forms, with whom and in which contexts are these forms of address used, how might the linguistic landscape be changing, and why. In the initial investigation, 132 in-country person-to-person interviews of native speakers from all seven provinces were conducted and analyzed. The results revealed that *ustedeo* was overwhelmingly the form of choice in all contexts, *voseo* was noticeably present, and *tuteo* rarely appeared in the speech of the interlocutors. Subsequent exploration of the linguistic landscape of the country as evidenced in over 500 tokens of print media and signage indicated a different usage of these forms of address. Results showed that all three forms were prevalent. This incongruence has ramifications for Spanish language instruction as well as those wishing to interact appropriately in the Costa Rican culture.

KEY WORDS: applied linguistics, Costa Rica, forms of address, linguistic landscape, register, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, vos, voseo, tuteo, ustedeo.

Introduction

This article reports on a two-phase project.[1] The first phase sought to provide an accurate portrayal of language use across the seven provinces in Costa Rica (Alajuela, Cartago, Guanacaste, Heredia, Limón, Puntarenas, San José) in terms of register and subject pronoun and concomitant verb use for the second person singular. Specifically, researchers were interested in the fluctuation and potential interplay between and among native speakers' use of

NECTFL *Review*, Number 89, September 2022, pp. 11–25. © 2022 by Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

three potential second person singular pronouns and their concomitant verb forms: *Ud., vos,* and *tú.* From this point forward, said pronoun usage as well as its unique verbal morphology will be referred to as the *ustedeo*, the *voseo*, and the *tuteo*, terms defined by the Real Academia Española (Real Academia Española, n.d.) as appropriate forms of address for *usted, vos,* and *tú,* respectively. While some previous studies have addressed this topic (Hasbún and Solís, 1997; Jara Murillo, 2008; Thomas, 2008), to date no study has systematically investigated *voseo* with an examination of subjects (Ss) who were strategically selected to reflect a diverse geographic and socioeconomic pool. Instead, most studies have involved participants in the Central Valley of Costa Rica (the provinces of Alajuela, Cartago, Heredia, San José) where a large percentage of the country's population resides. The focus of attention of the first phase of the overall project was the interchange of *ustedeo*, *voseo*, and *tuteo* in present-day Costa Rica as a whole. Results of this first study are presented in summary below, as they are germane to the second phase of the project. (A detailed report of this study can be found in Schmidt-Rinehart & LeLoup, 2017).

A second phase of investigation was undertaken and was specifically directed at the linguistic landscape of Costa Rica, in an attempt to see if the pronoun and verb usage established in the first part of the study held true in visual tokens of the linguistic landscape across the Central Valley, the most urban region of the country. Research on the linguistic landscape of urban areas in countries around the world has broadened the scope of sociolinguistic studies, shifting the focus from speakers of the language to the study of space and of places. Such areas are now considered language speakers in their own right (Gorter, Marten, and Van Mensel, 2012).

Review of Literature

The use of *voseo*

The initial portion of this literature review relates to the first phase of the research project that is the foundation of the investigations referenced in this article. As stated above, the focus of the first phase of research concentrated on the interplay between and among the three subject pronouns and verb forms for second person singular in Costa Rica: *Ud., vos,* and *tú*. The concern about the presence or absence of use of each pronoun is of interest because Costa Rica is considered a *voseante* country—where the pronoun *vos* is presumed to be quite prevalent (Cabal Jiménez, 2013; Cameron, 2012, 2014; Jara Murillo, 2008; Kapović, 2007; Morgan et al., 2017; Moser, 2006, 2008; Vargas Dengo, 1974; Villegas, 1963). Indeed, the presence of *voseo* in some Central and Latin American countries and the absence of same in others is largely due to historical events beginning in the 15th century with the Spanish *conquistadores* (Benavides, 2003; Cabal Jiménez, 2013; Kapović, 2007; Rojas Blanco, 2003; Vargas Dengo, 1974; Weyers, 2014). Through the ensuing centuries, *vos* was replaced in Spain by *vuestra merced* as a form of address—which would eventually become *usted*—but this change did not necessarily follow to every place in the New World. Across the ocean from Spain, linguistic as well as sociolinguistic changes were adopted or rejected in different territories according to their degree of contact with the mother country on the Iberian Peninsula. For example, those areas maintaining close contact with Spain (Mexico, the territories of the Caribbean, and Peru) experienced language changes concomitant with the norms in Spain. Consequently, *voseo* is largely or entirely absent in these areas. Other sociological reasons influencing the presence or disappearance of *voseo* in Latin America were the perception of a social hierarchy and the use of linguistic forms that were preferred by members of that group (Benavides, 2003; Kapović, 2007; Rojas Blanco, 2003; Vargas Dengo, 1974). (See Micheau, 1991 and Vargas Dengo, 1974 for a detailed account of the development of *voseo* through the ages.)

The linguistic variation found within the forms of *voseo* itself should not be surprising when one considers the vast geography of Latin America. Indeed, several researchers have chosen to investigate these linguistic alternatives and the reasons underlying these distinctions. This body of research provides detailed studies on *voseo* forms and offers several clarifying examples (Congosto Martín, 2004; Hernández, 2007; Kapović, 2007; Moser, 2006, 2008; Thomas, 2008; Vargas Dengo, 1974). The present project deals with *voseo* in general, a construction that is relatively simple to master when compared to the irregular forms for the *tuteo* (Cameron, 2012, 2014; Mason & Nicely, 1995). The studies reported here are primarily concerned with the presence or absence of the forms of address in question, rather than with linguistic variations. Various researchers found *tuteo* largely absent in Costa Rica, thus opening the door for a dual interplay between *ustedeo* and *voseo* (Cabal Jiménez, 2013; Jara Murillo, 2008; Kapović, 2007; Moser, 2008; Murillo Medrano, 2010; Thomas, 2008). Of particular note is the importance of verbal morphology for establishing *vos* vs. *tú* vs. *usted* in Costa Rica, where—unlike in many parts of Latin America—verb forms are enormously helpful in determining which form of address is being employed (Morgan, personal communication, August 23, 2021).

A significant body of research has attempted to identify the variables causing this interplay. Hasbún and Solís (1997) conducted a study of pronouns of address with 94 subjects (Ss) (30 male and 64 females) from different social levels, working at the University of Costa Rica. Data derived from a questionnaire referring to the use in specific conversations and interactions revealed age and gender as the more important factors (rather than social standing) in Costa Rican society. Findings indicated that *ustedeo* was used more with older people and *voseo* with younger people, irrespective of social status. In general, in their data, they report more use of *ustedeo* than of *voseo.* Jara Murillo (2008) conducted a study with 600 Ss spanning four years that used a written questionnaire to elicit Spanish speakers' opinion of the pronoun usage in Costa Rica. Resulting data revealed a fluctuation between *ustedeo* and *voseo*, with the choice being determined by a combination of variables such as differences of age, social status, intent of conversation, directive or receptive position of interlocutor, and context. Another study concentrating on Ss in the Central Valley and San José in particular used data from 40 hours of recordings of Spanish speakers (Moser 2006). Findings revealed that usage varied depending on such factors as age, purpose of conversation, requests, imperatives, and degree of intimacy or perception thereof on the part of all interlocutors.

In another study using 20 recordings of 60 Spanish speakers, Murillo Medrano (2010) found a varying degree of alternation in forms of address. Differences were focused on relations of social distance, solidarity, power, and perception of contextual inequality. In yet another study targeting the Central Valley, Thomas (2008) used a questionnaire with 20 Spanish speakers to determine opinions of pronoun use. In his study, the same kinds of alternation between *ustede*o and *voseo* could be attributed to similar influential factors. Solano Rojas (2012) conducted a study of both adult and child Ss in four different elementary schools in the urban area of San Ramón, in the province of Alajuela in the Central Valley. Adult Ss included administrators and teachers (N=132), and there were 80 student Ss from each of the four elementary schools (N=320). Data were collected from questionnaires, annotated conversations, and observed linguistic interactions between and among students. Student Ss used *ustedeo* overwhelmingly (> 90%), even in interactions with each other. Adult Ss used *ustedeo* the majority of the time, but usage did vary at times with age or perceived position of authority. The use of *voseo* was noted somewhat but at times could be considered rude or vulgar. The use of *tuteo* was deemed effeminate and/or as an affected mannerism.

In general, across these studies, *ustedeo* was used to express solidarity, affection, authority, and trust in several instances. Depending on the interlocutor and the appropriate context, *voseo* was used to indicate trust. In the absence of these affective factors, the use of *voseo* was perceived as insulting. Different factors emphasized in other research include age and educational level of interlocutors, and degree of intimacy and trust as perceived by conversation interlocutors (Benavides, 2003; Cabal Jiménez, 2013; Hernández, 2007; Kapović, 2007; Lotherington, 2007; Moser, 2006, 2008; Murillo Medrano, 2010; Thomas, 2008; Vargas Dengo, 1974). Research questions for the initial phase of the project were as follows:

1. What are the prevalent subject pronouns and concomitant verb forms used in spoken interpersonal communication in Costa Rica?
2. With whom and in which contexts are the forms of address used in interpersonal communication?

The Linguistic Landscape

The second portion of this literature review underpins the segue from the first phase to the second, wherein the researchers chose to investigate the alignment (or lack thereof) of spoken verbal forms of address with those in evidence as written tokens in the linguistic landscape of the Central Valley in Costa Rica. The evolving field of research in linguistic landscape was put on sound footing by the flagship study of Landry and Bourhis (1997), in which they presented the concept of linguistic landscape as a sociolinguistic variable directly related to language planning, ethnolinguistic vitality, and perceptions and behaviors directly affecting and being affected by public signage (Landry & Bourhis, 1997). In their study, the researchers clearly lay out the notion of linguistic landscape: "The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on governmental buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration" (p. 25). They further state that the linguistic landscape serves two basic functions: informational and symbolic. The informational aspect delineates the geographical territory of a language group, while the symbolic aspect relates directly to in-group status and the value of a language relative to other languages that may be present in the geographic area. They found that these two functions of the linguistic landscape could be important factors in language maintenance and language shift, and as such need to be considered by anyone creating and/or adding to a given linguistic landscape.

With the rise of studies of linguistic landscapes as a field in its own right, the term "linguistic" has taken on a broader meaning, no longer limited to verbal and written language but amplified to include analyses of semiotic, sociological, political, geographic and even economic spaces (Barni & Bagna, 2015). Again, the focus has shifted from human speakers of the language to the examination of space and places, which are now considered "speakers" themselves (Gorter, et al., 2012). The issue then becomes how to study these spaces in order to make sense of the linguistic landscape present in them and the purposes behind uses of the language(s) that appear therein. Without a framework from which to proceed, this would seem to be a challenging task—as often the linguistic landscape seems to reflect chaos more than order in terms of language usage (Ben-Rafael & Ben-Rafael, 2015). Indeed, a term often heard in Costa Rica to reflect this lack of order is "*un arroz con mango*," an expression used to indicate a situation as atypical and inexplicable as eating rice with a mango. Many researchers have settled on an approach that employs both qualitative as well as quantitative analyses, because they feel that merely counting linguistic occurrences within the landscape without further analysis is simply not enough (Barni &

Bagna, 2015). In order to truly understand the linguistic landscape of a place, one must also consider and understand its context. Basically, research on linguistic landscapes poses the compelling questions of who puts up what sign(s) where, in what language(s), and, last but not least, why (or why not)? (Marten, et al., 2012).

In a study of public spaces or downtowns of three different cities (Brussels, Berlin, and Tel Aviv), Ben-Rafael and Ben-Rafael (2015) analyzed the linguistic landscape by focusing on the naming of commercial establishments. Their unit of analysis was that of stores bearing Big Commercial Names (BCNs). They explored the language used for signage of the BCNs and found that it did reflect the societal context of each area. Some languages were privileged over others, indicating a strong sociocultural or socio-ethnic influence and/or bias. Hassa and Krajcik (2016), referring to Scollon and Scollon's (2003) theory of geosemiotics, also examined signs in their social and cultural context to make sense of their meaning. Their analysis involved 646 photographs of 429 store signs with 4,035 words in a Dominican neighborhood of New York City. Signs were photographed, words counted, and frequency of each determined. These signs were then categorized by three factors: language, type of business, and location. Their data reveal a language hierarchy showing a preference for one language over another, in particular giving superior status to English over the minority languages of the residents of the area. Pavlenko and Mullen (2015) also reference Scollon and Scollon—in particular their principles of indexicality, which proposes that signs derive their meaning in part from their placement in time, and dialogicality, which suggests that an understanding of one sign requires a consideration of other signs in the same area. Pavlenko and Mullen feel these principles promote the approach of a one-day viewing of all signs on a particular street, which may not yield true linguistic landscape data. They propose an additional consideration of diachronicity, which entails (1) looking at all signs over time and (2) acknowledging that the viewer has also seen other similar signs that may or may not exercise influence. This additional dimension broadens the perspective of the study of individual signs and the reasoning behind language selection of those signs.

In a study of the composition of shop signs in Athens, Greece, Nikolaou (2017) identified 96 different business types and analyzed their language(s). He found that the linguistic landscape serves both a symbolic and informational function, as noted in Landry and Bourhis (1997). In some instances conveying a high degree of specialized information, Greek was used almost exclusively. But in others such as businesses specializing in products and services related to modern lifestyles, other languages such as English, Italian, and French were used as symbolic expressions of values and ideologies associated with those foreign cultures. Przymus and Kohler (2018) used their eponymous SIGNS (Semiotic Index of Gains in Nature and Society) as a framework to investigate how the linguistic landscape in a particular geographic area influences language and race ideologies and educational opportunities. They found that linguistic messages in the landscape of school neighborhoods do influence these ideologies and consequently affect language planning and policy in those neighborhood schools.

In an analysis of 317 signs from three shopping malls located in a Hispanic neighborhood of Charlotte, NC, Roeder and Walden (2016) took a synchronic approach and used a model of conceptual frames of discourse and indexicality to explain their data. They placed signs in the following categories: the civic frame, the commercial frame, and the community frame. For them, ". . . frame is a schema of interpretation or a conceptual reference point that influences and shapes thought and interpretation" (p. 122). Signs in the civic frame were government-mandated, professionally manufactured, expensive

to produce, were created for long-term use, and were notably in English (p. 129). Signs categorized in the commercial frame represented the most linguistic diversity and were used to convey practical information and to sell products. The language used on these signs was based on a target audience, in this case Spanish speakers. While a large number of signs presented information in English only, in bilingual signs Spanish was the dominant language. The third frame, community, contained signs of either nationalist or Latino affiliation. The former referenced particular Latin American cultures (e.g., Mexican) and the later demonstrated a hybrid of English and Spanish with a more general Latin American social identifer rather than a specific country or cultural affiliation.

Malinowski (2015) offers a conceptual framework of "thirdness" (p. 95) as a way for language learners to explore multiple meanings present in a linguistic landscape. He references Lefebvre's (1991) three-part paradigm of conceived, perceived, and lived spaces and reinterprets it for pedagogical purposes in order to enable investigations of the discourse of place in the second language classroom and beyond, in the real world. This directly relates to the Communities Standard of ACTFL's World Readiness Standards (The Standards Collaborative Board, 2015), whereby an examination of signs in a particular neighborhood exemplifies using language beyond the school setting to study and learn. Research of this type takes language learners out of the classroom and into the neighborhoods where the language on signs is real, exists, makes meaning, and is interpreted in many different ways by a variety of viewers.

Sayer (2010) also sees the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource for his language classroom. He constructed a data set of 250 texts (photos of signage in English) in Oaxaca for use in his English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. He analyzed the signs according to intended audience and purpose: either cross-cultural or intracultural communication. The signs in the former grouping were used to convey information to foreigners. The signs in the latter grouping conveyed local social meaning and fell into either iconic (English in corporate slogans, etc.) or innovative (use of English with a variety of meanings) categories. He presents this study as a model for use in the EFL classroom as a project with students as the investigators of the linguistic landscape in their own environment. As such, the model could easily be replicated in a variety of foreign language classrooms. The learner becomes the researcher, using language creatively and analytically to explore their own surroundings and become more cognizant of their own sociolinguistic context. This could, in turn, have a definite impact on language learners' awareness of the use of language in public spaces and how it influences language planning as well as policy (Shohamy, 2015).

In a study specifically directed toward the use of *voseo* in advertising in Costa Rica, Quintanilla Aguilar and Rodríguez Prieto (2014) surveyed 151 Costa Ricans of different ages and educational levels, mostly residents in San José, about the increased use of *voseo* in advertising and the media. They found that the growing use of *voseo* in Costa Rican advertising is related to a positive attitude toward this pronoun and to national identity. Their Ss rejected the use of familiarity indicated by *tuteo* and tended to see *voseo* as a sign of trust and Costa Rican linguistic identity. The use of *voseo* most definitely appears in a large part of the linguistic landscape of this country. As shown in these studies and seconded by Shohamy (2015), the linguistic landscape of any particular area is not random or arbitrary but rather is systematic and consistent with the goals and intents of those placing the signage. Taken a step further, Shohamy argues that linguistic landscape research points to a de facto execution of language policy that may have far-reaching effects beyond the local neighborhood. It would seem from the studies and articles above, the linguistic

landscape of a place (in the present study, the Central Valley of Costa Rica) takes on a new and significant importance that potentially has a significant impact on a large population. It follows, then, that a natural progression of research is to ascertain whether or not pronoun usage in Costa Rica, as determined by previous studies and in particular the first phase of research discussed above, is borne out by the linguistic landscape that is ever-present in the Central Valley.

The research question of the second phase of this project, dealing with linguistic landscape data, is as follows:

> Does the use of forms of address in the linguistic landscape align with the interpersonal communication use of Costa Ricans?

Method: The Interview Project

Tapping into everyday interactions between native speakers provided a rich data set to investigate the use of the second-person singular forms of address. In order to ascertain the interlocutor's choice of *ustedeo, voseo,* or *tuteo* the researchers interviewed 132 Costa Ricans – posing a scenario in which they were prompted to address various interlocutors: family members, friend, co-workers, strangers, shopkeepers, babies, someone younger, and pets. (See Appendix for sample scenario prompts.) At the end of the interview, participants were asked to explain their choice and their perceptions of the use of *ustedeo, voseo* and *tuteo* in Costa Rica.

Participants were carefully chosen to include a cross-section of the population based on gender, age, geography, and profession. All seven provinces were represented, 57 percent were female, 43 percent male, and ages ranged between 15 and 76. Access to participants was facilitated through the researchers' in-country contacts, and the 20-minute interviews took place in educational centers as well as public venues (e.g., restaurants, the street, hotels, etc.) Quantitative data analysis involved recording the forms of address chosen by each interlocutor. For qualitative purposes, the interviewees' comments were linked to these data, then grouped into categories that had been used in previous studies: respect, formality, solidarity, intimacy, and context. (Cabal Jiménez, 2013; Congosto Martín, 2004; Hernández, 2007; Kapović, 2007; Lotherington, 2007; Shenk, 2014).

Results: The Interview Project

Results - *Ustedeo* in the Interviews

Ud. and its forms emerged as the choice in most categories and across all provinces. Addressing their parents with *Ud.* was reported by 71-100% of the interviewees and 50% or more (≥ 50% was the target to denote "dominant") with strangers, shopkeepers, children, and pets. The use of *ustedeo* with siblings was dominant in five provinces (Heredia, Puntarenas, Limón, Cartago, and Alajuela), with a spouse in four of the provinces (Guanacaste, Puntarenas, Cartago, and Limón), with co-workers in four (San José, Guanacaste, Puntarenas, and Limón), with someone younger in four (Heredia, Limón, Guanacaste and Alajuela) and with friends in two provinces (Alajuela and Heredia). When participants were asked to give an explanation for their choice, the most salient comments centered around *respect*– for family, older people, co-workers, subordinates, children. *Ustedeo* was viewed as more *formal* – someone one is not close to, someone who is providing a service, or to create a distance. The issue of *solidarity* also arose with the choice of *Ud.*; examples of comments from participants were: "*Ud.*– *Ud.*is for ticos [I am very tica]," "we almost always use *Ud.*in Costa Rica, not *vos* or *tú.*"

Results - the *voseo* in the Interviews

Although Costa Rica is commonly listed among the *voseante* countries, the results of the interviews for this project revealed only two instances of *voseo* as the dominant choice (≥ 50%): with a spouse in Heredia and with friends in Cartago. A perusal of the qualitative data provides a window into their use and non-use of *voseo* revealing contradictory perspectives in play. Below are representative samples of their perceptions:

- *Formality:* "We use it very little here—it's like you're talking in another form. It's offensive and sounds ugly"
- *Intimacy* – "*vos* is softer," "it is disrespectful to use *vos* with someone you don't know," "I use it every once in a while with my friends"
- *Solidarity* – "it is our custom. We shouldn't lose our roots with *Ud.*and *vos,*" "*vos* is the essence of the culture," "*vos* is ours"
- *Context* – "Friends from my infancy, we use *Ud.* with my friends now, sometimes we use *vos,*" "I usually use *Ud.* with my mom, but if I use *vos*, it softens her."

Results - The *tuteo* in the Interviews

The use of *tuteo* was the choice in very few instances across all provinces and all relationships. Only in Guanacaste did interviewees show a preference for *tuteo* in any situation at all: 60% reported that they use *tuteo* with babies. When probed for an explanation, comments revealed that they simply do not think of *tuteo* as Costa Rican and only use it in very particular situations, primarily to denote *intimacy*. Some sample comments were: "I use *tú* with someone that is really close," "someone I have a lot of trust in," "My grandkids speak to me in *tú* sometimes. They think it sounds closer." Some reported using *tú* with friends and family from other *tuteo* countries (The Dominican Republic, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, etc.). Many commented that they regarded the use of *tú* as a lack of *solidarity*: "*tú* isn't normal," "we never use *tú* here," "*tú* isn't Costa Rican," "I don't like it. It's a cultural disgrace," "*tú* rubs me the wrong way," "it's ridiculous, a disaster," "I think *tú* is used in publicity to attract people from the U.S. or a certain category of people," "People use *tú* to sound more refined." These findings and comments demonstrate once again a lack of uniformity in usage throughout the country.

Despite a lack of 100% uniformity in usage, overall findings point solidly to *ustedeo*, followed by *voseo.* The second phase of the project sought to verify these results as reflected in the linguistic landscape of the country, primarily in the Central Valley.

Method: The Linguistic Landscape

For the present study, the researchers spent approximately two weeks on the ground in Costa Rica, primarily in San José and in surrounding smaller towns and villages in the Central Valley (where the majority of the Costa Rican population lives), collecting examples of forms of address. They canvassed neighborhoods, city centers, highways, commercial enterprises (e.g., restaurants, supermarkets, and department stores), and any public gathering places where this pronoun and verb use appeared in written form. Their aim was to collect as many different instances as possible in order to compare, contrast, and analyze pronoun and concomitant verb use. Researchers gathered data both digitally (photos) and in hard copy (later digitized for ease of analysis).

In order to interpret systematic patterns in the register exhibited in the tokens collected, the researchers considered several paradigms in use by previous research studies, such as those mentioned above in the review of literature (Landry & Bourhis, 1997; Malinowski,

2015; Nikolaou, 2017, 2016; Roeder & Walden, 2016; Sayer, 2010). The researchers ultimately turned to the field of marketing and publicity for a paradigm to explain the choice of *ustedeo, voseo,* or *tuteo* in public spaces in Costa Rica. According to Nogués, Coordinator of the School of Design and Visual Communication at the University of Veritas, San José, Costa Rica (personal communication, February 17, 2016), there are three factors to consider in a marketing or publicity campaign: (a) the *product or information* being publicized, (b) the *target audience*, and (c) the *concept* of the campaign. Thus, the 500+ tokens collected, with their concomitant pronominal and verb forms, were categorized and analyzed following these three factors. First, the *products or information* conveyed in the tokens (examples of register use in the written word available to the public via street signs, advertising, etc.) were sorted into categories according to purpose or type of business. The following categories were prevalent:

- public service announcements (e.g., fasten your seatbelt)
- telecommunications ads (e.g., WhatsApp)
- social media announcements (e.g., Facebook)
- graffiti
- companies from other countries
- Costa Rican companies and local businesses (e.g., hair salons, tailor shops, car mechanics)
- educational institutions
- banks
- employment opportunities.

Next, the researchers sought to ascertain the *target audience* and the *campaign concept* of the tokens. Given prior research indicating the predominance of *ustedeo,* the findings of these subsequent analyses were surprising as all three forms were in evidence in the tokens. A discussion of these analyses follows.

Results – The Linguistic Landscape

Results – The use of *ustedeo* and *voseo* in the Linguistic Landscape

The researchers hypothesized that *ustedeo* would be the form of choice in most cases, *voseo* in very specific instances and *tuteo* rarely. Indeed, as expected, *ustedeo* emerged in all categories, regardless of the *target audience* or the *concept* of the campaign. (See the *ustedeo* column in Table 1.) A most unexpected outcome, however, was seen in the prominence of *voseo* in the tokens collected. In the interview data, *voseo* was the form of address selected only in the most intimate of relationships (e.g., spouse, close friends). In the linguistic landscape, *voseo* was used across all categories: public service announcements, telecommunications, social media, company signs (both national and international/ foreign), banks, educational institutions, and graffiti. (See the *voseo* column in Table 1.) It could be posited that the *target audience* for the tokens collected that contained *voseo* were Costa Ricans, whose cultural identity is aligned with this form of address. The message was brought closer to them (lessening the social distance, made more intimate) by using a form they considered their own, indicating the *campaign concept* of solidarity and respect. The *information* was conveyed in a more informal way, perhaps. Therefore, *voseo* in the linguistic landscape may indicate a specific marketing goal of appealing to either a younger audience or to highlight the cultural/linguistic tradition commented on by several Ss in previous studies.

Table 1
Tokens collected by Purpose or Type of Business and Pronoun/Verb Form Used

Token	*ustedeo*	*voseo*	*tuteo*
Purpose or Type of Business	• Public service announcements • Telecommunications • Social Media • Costa Rican companies • Companies from other countries • Banks • Educational institutions	• Public service announcements • Telecommunications • Social media • Costa Rican companies • Companies from other countries • Banks • Educational institutions • Graffiti	• Public service announcements in tourist areas • Employment opportunities • Companies from other countries • Businesses in upscale neighborhoods • Real estate in upscale neighborhoods

Results – The use of *tuteo* in the Linguistic Landscape

In stark contrast to the data gleaned from the interpersonal interviews, *tuteo* was prevalent in the linguistic landscape. Both Nogués (personal communication, February 17, 2016) and the interviewees of this study indicated that *tuteo* is used to sound foreign, imported or refined, to attract or interact with a particular socioeconomic group or visitors from abroad, and/or to appeal to the younger generation. Many instances of *tuteo* were found when the *target audience* was a higher socioeconomic group: *products* of companies from other countries (e.g., Sears, Toyota, Uber, Mobil, Starbucks, Victoria's Secret, Nestle), real estate in upscale neighborhoods and signage in an upscale mall (for parking, store club memberships, pubs, shoe stores, spas, etc.). Public service announcements containing *tuteo* were found in tourist areas, where it could be hypothesized that the *target audience* was from other countries. The appearance of *tuteo* for employment opportunities seemed to be directed at a younger audience (toy store, clothing, supermarket, Starbucks). The concept of the *campaign* when *tuteo* was selected was consistently one in which the message was intended to sound foreign, more refined, informal, fashionable or a distraction/diversion. (See the *tuteo* column in Table 1.)

It is important to raise the issue that it is possible that the use of *tú* was not intentional at all, especially for the foreign companies. Two explanations are plausible: (1) the translators/creators for these tokens simply were not aware of *vos*eo in Costa Rica, and/or (2) the publicity was part of a mass marketing campaign used in many countries (including those where *tuteo* is prominent).

Discussion

Results of phase one of this project corroborate findings of previous research that found that *ustedeo* was the form of address chosen for second person singular address in interpersonal communication in Costa Rica (e.g., Hasbún & Solís, 1997; Murillo Medrano, 2008; Solano Rojas, 2012). Because *ustedeo* was so overwhelmingly the choice of the speakers, the variables indicated by other studies such as age, social status, intent or purpose of the conversation, and context (Moser, 2006; Jara Murillo, 2008; Thomas, 2008) did not surface. The use of *voseo* did emerge in the category of trust, but was far less frequent than *ustedeo* in the interview data. The absence of *tuteo* was consistent with most

researchers' findings. Because of this corroboration, the most unexpected outcome of the project's second phase, investigating the linguistic landscape of the Costa Rican Central Valley, was the manifestation of all three forms of address in the tokens collected. Indeed, *ustedeo* was predicted to be the most prominent usage and *voseo* can be explained by the desire of the creators to connect to the Costa Rican's cultural identity. In addition, *ustedeo* has featured prominently as the default form in numerous studies of usage in Costa Rican Spanish. Nevertheless, the linguistic landscape that employed *tuteo* is clearly a divergence from what speakers reportedly use in their daily interaction. In fact, the qualitative data of the interview phase of this project as well as previous research (Quintanilla Aguilar and Rodríguez Prieto, 2014) regard the use of *tuteo* in Costa Rica in a negative light. The appearance of *tuteo* in the signage adds to the *arroz con mango* nature of the interplay of the three pronouns and their verb forms in Costa Rica and warrants more analysis.

The pedagogical implications of this research are clear. It is time for the issue of register to be updated in language learning environments. The results of this study and others reveal that a simple paradigm for pronoun and corresponding verb use in Costa Rica and elsewhere is inadequate. Even when countries are identified as *voseante*, the traditional explanation of *ustedeo* for formal 'you' and *voseo* for informal/familiar falls short. In the case of Costa Rica, the interview data indicated a much more complex interplay among the three choices – *ustedeo*, *voseo*, and *tuteo.*

Furthermore, the linguistic landscape should be a sociolinguistic field of interest to any language teacher or student. Whether in-country for study, work, or pleasure, the signage will be immediately apparent. At first glance, the observer may only notice the content (e.g., an advertisement for cell service), but with further examination it becomes a rich source of insight into the choices made that reflect cultural traditions. Teachers should make students aware of the register issue facing each and every signage creator (whether it be for marketing, publicity, or other information), much like they do when focusing on appropriate interpersonal or presentational communication.

Heretofore, the teaching of *voseo* has been conspicuously absent in the U.S. Spanish classroom. In a study to investigate the place of *voseo* in the Spanish language curriculum, LeLoup and Schmidt-Rinehart (2018) discovered that it is simply not taught, even though a third of the Latin American population use it (Morgan et al., 2017; Shenk, 2014). In this day and age of sociolinguistic appropriateness, it would behoove the teaching profession not only to address that gap, but also to include the linguistic landscape as a fascinating piece to the puzzle.

Learners interested in doing study abroad programs in Central American *voseante* countries should be made aware of and expect the reality of the pronominal paradigm of *ustedeo*, *voseo*, and *tuteo* in Costa Rica. Such learners would benefit from formal instruction on this sociolinguistic phenomenon as forms of address have distinct functions that could impact interpersonal communication there. Additionally, knowledge of the verbal morphology associated with the pronoun might prevent misconceptions. Given the similarity in voseo and *tuteo* forms, one might confuse the two. For example, one could read a sign like "*antojate de cualquier sabor*" [fancy a taste] from a Pops ice cream store sign and, at first glance, think it is a *tuteo* expression. Awareness of *voseo* in Costa Rica and knowledge of its corresponding verb forms enables the reader to see that there is no orthographic accent on penultimate-stressed *antojate* (as there would be for the antepenultimate-stressed *tú* form: *antójate*) and that *te* is the object pronoun for *vos* as well. In all fairness, people read signs quickly – and miss the nuances of messages like *La tecnología que buscás* [the technology you are looking for] from a Chevrolet sign. *Buscas* would be the *tuteante* form

and *buscás* is clearly *voseante* to the trained eye. The public signage reader who is tuned in to these differences will recognize the following banking announcement as *vos*, rather than *tú*: "*Solicitá tu préstamo*"[apply for your loan].

Conclusion

Although Costa Rica is characterized as a *voseante* country, the reality discovered by this project is very complex and cannot be easily explained. The traditional symmetry between the second-person singular as *ustedeo* for formal and *voseo* for informal/familiar does not manifest itself in the interpersonal communication of the Costa Ricans. In other words, the standard grammatical explanation indicates that in a *voseante* dialect, the second person singular is *ustedeo* for formal and *voseo* for informal/familiar. In phase one, *ustedeo* emerged as the unmarked form, *voseo* marked in one direction (i.e., intimacy) and *tuteo* highly marked in another (i.e., foreignness, refinement). The participants did express, however, that they recognized *voseo* as being Costa Rican and part of their cultural linguistic identity (in contrast to *tuteo*). In phase two, the analysis of signage in the linguistic landscape revealed a different framework entirely, with all three forms of address in evidence. This stark difference in usage between interlocutor pronoun and verb selection in conversations and pronoun and verb choice for signage in public spaces is surprising and bears further investigation. A more detailed examination of the tokens collected for this phase of the project is needed in order to tease out the rationale and/or motivation for pronoun and verb use in the linguistic landscape that does not follow traditional Costa Rican spoken language custom.

Note

[1]Institutional Review Board approval for this research project was obtained (04-28-15-#085 A), and an amendment to an existing Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) between both institutions was secured (CRADA 13-297-AFA-01, between the United States Air Force Academy and the Ashland University).

References

Barni, M. & Bagna, C. (2015). The critical turn in LL: New methodologies and new items in LL. *Linguistic Landscape 1* (1/2), 6–18. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi 10.1075/ll.1.1-2.01bar

Benavides, Carlos. (2003). "La distribución del voseo en Hispanoamérica." *Hispania 86*(3): 612-623.

Ben-Rafael, E. & Ben-Rafael, M. (2015). Linguistic landscapes in an era of multiple globalizations. *Linguistic Landscape* 1:1/2 (2015), 19–37. https://doi 10.1075/ll.1.1-2.02ben

Cabal Jiménez, M. (2013). *From deference to face: The evolution of Usted in Costa Rican Spanish*. (Doctoral dissertation). http://hdl.handle.net/2142/44812

Cameron, R. D. (2012). "Why It's Time to Teach *Voseo* and How to Start." *Academic Exchange Quarterly,* 72-77.

_____. (2014). *Voseo* and *Tuteo* in Print Advertising in Post-free Trade Costa Rica: A Case Study of Two Central Valley Pulperías. *Southern Journal of Linguistics*, *38*(2), 150-162.

Congosto Martín, Y. (2004). "Notas de Morfología Dialectal en los Manuales de Español Como Segunda Lengua: Los pronombres de Segunda Persona." *Las gramáticas y los diccionarios en la enseñanza del español como segunda lengua: Deseo y realidad.* Actas del XV Congreso Internacional de ASELE. 212–21.

Gorter, D., Marten, H., & Van Mensel, L. (Eds.). (2012). *Minority languages in the linguistic landscape*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi: 10.1057/9780230360235

Hasbún, L. & Solís, M. (1997). Análisis de los usos asimétricos de las formas de tratamiento pronominal en una comunidad costarricense. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica.* Vol. XXIII. No. 2. San José, Costa Rica. University of Costa Rica, 139-152.

Hassa, S. & Krajcik, C. (2016). "Un peso, mami!" Linguistic landscape and transnationalism discourses in Washington Heights, New York City. *Linguistic Landscape 2*(2), 157-181.

Hernández, J. E. (2007). Ella me dijo, Seguí adelante, sigue estudiando: Social and semantic differentiation in casual form of address variation. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 84*(6), 703-4. http://search.proquest.com/docview/232626717?accountid=11496

Jara Murillo, C. V. (2008). Lingüística popular: El español de Costa Rica según los ticos y algunos centroamericanos residentes en el país. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, *6*(11), 55-99.

Kapović, M. (2007). "Fórmulas de Tratamiento en Dialectos de Español; Fenómenos de *Voseo* y *Ustedeo*." *Hieronymus* (1): 65-87.

Landry, R., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *16*(1), 24–49. https://doi: 10.1177/0261927X970161002

Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. Basil Blackwell Ltd.

LeLoup, J. W., & Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C. (2018). Forms of address in the Spanish language curriculum in the United States: Actualities and Aspirations. *Hispania 101*(1), 10-24.

Lotherington, H. (2007). "Diary of an Edu-tourist in Costa Rica: An Autoethnographical Account of Learning Spanish." *TESL Canada Journal 24*(2): 109-131.

Malinowski, D. (2015). Opening spaces of learning in the linguistic landscape. *Linguistic Landscape 1* (1/2), 95–113. https://doi 10.1075/ll.1.1-2.06mal

Marten, H. F., Van Mensel, L., & Gorter, D. (2012). Studying Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape. In D. Gorter, H. F. Marten & L. Van Mensel (Eds.) *Minority Languages in the Linguistic Landscape* (pp. 1-15). Palgrave-MacMillan.

Mason, K. & Nicely, K. (1995). "Pronouns of address in Spanish-language textbooks: The case for *Vos*." *Foreign Language Annals 28*(3): 360-367.

Micheau, C. (1991). "The *voseo* in Latin America: Insights from historical sociolinguistics" in C. A. Klee & L. A. Ramos-García (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics of the Spanish-Speaking World:* Iberia, Latin America, United States (pp. 77-91). Bilingual Press.

Morgan, T. A., López-Alonzo, K., Potowski, K., & Ramos, Z. (2017). "El primer censo del voseo," paper presented at the XVIII Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de América Latina (ALFAL), Bogotá, Colombia, July 24-28, 2017.

Moser, K. (2006). La variación entre formas ustedeantes y voseantes a nivel del discurso familiar en la clase media y alta de San José — Costa Rica: ¿Una estrategia de cortesía? In M. Schrader-Kniffki (Ed.,), *La cortesía en el mundo hispánico* (pp. 97-116). Iberoamericana.

Moser, K. (2008). Tres hipótesis acerca de la (des)cortesía en el tratamiento diádico informal-familiar de San José, Costa Rica. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, *6*(1), 129-145.

Murillo Medrano, J. (2010). Cortesía, negociación de imagen y uso de los pronombres de segunda persona singular en el español de costa rica. *Español actual, 94*, 141-165.

Nikolaou, A. (2017). Mapping the Linguistic Landscape of Athens: The Case of Shop Signs. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 14*(2), 160-182.

Pavlenko, A. & Mullen, A. (2015). Why diachronicity matters in the study of linguistic landscapes. *Linguistic Landscape, 1*(1/2), 114-132. https://doi 10.1075/ll.1.1-2.07pav

Przymus, S. D. & Kohler, A. T. (2018). SIGNS: Uncovering the mechanisms by which messages in the linguistic landscape influence language/race ideologies and educational opportunities. *Linguistics and Education, 44*, 58-68.

Quintanilla Aguilar, J. R. A. & Rodríguez Prieto, J. P. (2014). El voseo en la publicidad de Costa Rica: Un análisis de las actitudes de los hablantes. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, *12*(1), 109-119.

Real Academia Española. (n.d.). El diccionario de la lengua española: Edición del Tricentenario. Madrid: Author. http://dle.rae.es/

Roeder, R. & Walden, B. C. (2016). The changing face of dixie: Spanish in the linguistic landscape of an emergent immigrant community in the New South, *Ampersand 3*, 126-136.

Rojas Blanco, L. (2003). A propósito del voseo: Su historia, su morfología y su situación en Costa Rica. *Revista Educación 27*(2), 143-163. https://doi: 10.15517/revedu.v27i2.3882

Sayer, P. (2010). Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource. *ELT Journal, 64*(2): 143-154.

Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C. & LeLoup, J. W. (2017), Register and Forms of Address in Costa Rica: Sociolinguistic Realities and Pedagogical Implications. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(1), 159-176. https://doi:10.1111/flan.12247

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. Routledge. https://doi: 10.4324/9780203422724

Shenk, E. M. (2014). Teaching Sociolinguistic Variation in the Intermediate Language Classroom: *Voseo* in Latin America." *Hispania 97*(3), 368-381. https://doi: 10.1353/hpn.2014.0089

Shohamy, E. (2015). LL research as expanding language and language policy. *Linguistic Landscape, 1*(1/2), 152–171. https://doi 10.1075/ll.1.1-2.09sho

Solano Rojas, Y. (2012). Las formas pronominales: vos - tu = usted en costa rica, análisis de una muestra. *Revista Pensamiento Actual, 1*(1), 43-57.

The Standards Collaborative Board (2015). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Thomas, J. A. (2008). Reflexiones metalingüísticas acerca del voseo costarricense. *Spanish in Context, 5*(2), 182–195. https://doi: 10.1075/sic.5.2.03tho

Vargas Dengo, C. A. (1974). El uso de los pronombres '*vos*' y '*usted*' en Costa Rica. *Revista de ciencias sociales, 8*, 7–30. http://revistacienciassociales.ucr.ac.cr/wp-content/revistas/8/vargas.pdf

Villegas, F. (1963). The voseo in Costa Rican Spanish. Hispania, 46, 612–615. https://doi: 10.2307/336870

Weyers, J. R. (2014). The *tuteo* of Rocha, Uruguay: A study of language pride and maintenance. *Hispania*, *97*(3), 382-395. https://doi: 10.1353/hpn.2014.0087

Appendix

Sample Scenario Prompts

The following scenarios / prompts are examples of those that were directed to each interviewee for interaction with:

> **Your son or daughter:** You are in your home in the kitchen getting ready for dinner. It's time to call your son/daughter to the table. What would you say to get him/her to the table: *Venga, vení*, or *ven*?
>
> ***Su hijo o hija:*** *Ud. está en casa en la cocina preparando la cena. A la hora de comer, ¿cómo llama Ud. a su hijo/a para que venga a la mesa? ¿Dice Ud. «venga», «vení» o «ven»?*

> **Your co-worker:** You are working on a project at the office and want your co-worker's advice. What would you say to have him/her come over to your desk: *Venga*, *vení* or *ven?*
>
> ***Su compañero/a de trabajo:*** *Ud. trabaja en un proyecto en la oficina y quiere el consejo de su compañero/a. ¿Qué le dice Ud. a su compañero/a para que venga a su escritorio para ayudar: «venga», «vení» o «ven»?*

> **Your friends:** Your friends are gathered at your house to watch a movie together. One person has gone into the kitchen and you want to start the movie. What would you say to get him/her to the living room: *Venga, vení*, or *ven*?
>
> ***Amigos:*** *Un grupo de amigos están en su casa para ver una película. Una persona está en la cocina y Uds. quieren empezar la película. ¿Qué le dice Ud. a su amigo para que venga a la sala: «venga», «vení» o «ven»?*

> **A shopkeeper:** Suppose you are in Palí (a supermarket chain in Costa Rica) and needed assistance from a store clerk in locating an item. How would you ask the clerk for help? : *Venga*, *vení*, or *ven*?
>
> ***Un empleado de una tienda****: Ud. está en Palí (un supermercado de Costa Rica) y necesita ayuda para encontrar algo. ¿Qué le dice Ud. al empleado para que le ayude: «venga», «vení» o «ven»?*

Barbara C. Schmidt-Rinehart (Ph.D., The Ohio State University) is Professor Emerita of the Department of Foreign Languages, Ashland University, Ashland, OH. Her scholarly work focuses on forms of address and the linguistic landscape in Costa Rica, professional development abroad for U.S. teachers of Spanish, and the homestay component of study abroad. At her university, she directed study abroad programs for 30 years in Mexico and Costa Rica and taught summer graduate courses for U.S. teachers of Spanish in Mexico, Venezuela, and Costa Rica.

Jean W. LeLoup (Ph.D., The Ohio State University) has taught Spanish at the junior high, senior high, and college levels for more than 40 years and is currently Professor of Spanish in the Department of Foreign Languages at the United States Air Force Academy. Her current areas of research are the *voseo*, language immersion in the classroom, and the World Language edTPA.