

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Language immersion effects in the use of *tú* and *usted* by L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners of Spanish

María Sampedro Mella¹  and Claudia Sánchez Gutiérrez² 

¹Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain; ²University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Corresponding author: María Sampedro Mella; Email: maria.sampedro.mella@usc.es

(Received 14 April 2022; Revised 17 January 2023; Accepted 03 March 2023)

Abstract

The use of the Spanish pronouns of address *tú* and *usted* is an intricate matter for L2 learners due to the many factors that influence their selection at the discourse and interactional level. Although the literature has traditionally focused on the challenges experienced by L1-English learners of L2-Spanish in learning these forms, less is known about speakers whose L1s also present similar (but not identical) pronouns of address. This study thus analyzes the use of *tú* and *usted* by L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners who learn Spanish either in their home countries (i.e., France and Portugal) or in Spain as part of a study-abroad experience. Results indicate that learners in both L1 groups used *tú* more often while in Spain than in their home country. Additionally, students in immersion started adopting more similar criteria to those of L1-Spanish speakers in determining whether *tú* or *usted* would be appropriate in certain contexts.

Introduction

Although English speakers address all interlocutors with the same pronoun (i.e., *you*), independent of a person's age or of their personal proximity with them, Spanish speakers can select from more options. For example, they may say *¿Podrías [tú] pasarme la sal?* [Could you pass me the salt?] when asking a close family member to pass the salt over dinner, but might choose to say *¿Podría [usted] pasarme la sal?* [Could you pass me the salt?] when requesting that a stranger at a restaurant pass the salt from their table, especially if the stranger in question is identified as older. In the first case, the request is made by using a verb form conjugated with the second person pronoun *tú*. In the second scenario, the request is made by using a form conjugated with the distancing pronoun *usted*.

It may initially seem that the distinction between *tú* and *usted* (T/V, in accordance with the Latin etymon, hereafter) is simply a matter of formality, but this is far from being true. Choosing which pronoun of address (PA) is appropriate in a given context

depends on the daily linguistic uses of the speakers in that particular social setting (Sampedro Mella, 2016). Indeed, some groups of speakers may agree that *tú* is the natural option in a certain communicative context, whereas others may consider *usted* to be more appropriate in that same context. For example, many Colombian speakers may choose to use *usted* in daily interactions with family members, whereas most Spanish speakers would prefer *tú* for those contexts (Fontanella de Weinberg, 1999). Speakers across the Spanish-speaking world display a multitude of varied patterns of use when it comes to these PAs, and those patterns quickly change over time (Mas Álvarez, 2021).

Due to the great variability in their use and to the constant changes in how speakers employ them, doubts about which PA to select in specific contexts have been repeatedly documented in second language (L2) learners of Spanish (Marsily, 2022; Mas Álvarez, 2014; Sampedro Mella & Sánchez Gutiérrez, 2019; Soler-Espiauba, 1996). However, little is known about how such difficulties vary depending on students' L1 and on the context in which they learn Spanish. For instance, many studies so far have focused on learners of Spanish whose L1 is English, a language that does not present a T/V distinction (van Compernelle et al., 2016; González Lloret, 2008; Villareal, 2014). These studies bring to light the difficulties that learners encounter when using a more complex PA system in the target language and how they adapt to the new uses throughout their learning process. For example, Villareal (2014) observed an overgeneralization of *tú* in intermediate-level learner's productions, even in formal situations. González Lloret (2008) also documented alternative strategies to the use of T/V forms, such as the first-person plural pronoun *nosotros* [we], in the analysis of elementary Spanish learners.

Concerning the production of Spanish T/V by learners whose L1 displays a similar distinction, Granvik (2005) analyzed five L1-European Portuguese¹ speakers who lived in Madrid and Marsily (2022) studied 60 L1-French from Belgium in nonimmersion². Both authors compared native and nonnative productions and found different uses, including an overuse of *usted* and other polite forms in learners' samples, probably due to a pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992) from their L1s, which often require the use of more formal pronouns. Granvik (2005) highlighted as well that these deviations from L2 uses were gradually reduced when staying in immersion over a longer period. However, no study, to the best of our knowledge, has investigated in detail the specific patterns of Spanish T/V use in both French and European Portuguese speakers, or the effects of the learning context on their pragmatic uses. To address this gap, the present study explores T/V uses by L2 Spanish learners who differ along two dimensions: L1 (i.e., European Portuguese vs. French) and learning context (i.e., immersion vs. nonimmersion). The main hypothesis is thus that L1-French and L1-European Portuguese students of L2-Spanish will display pragmatic transfer from their L1 to their L2. Pragmatic transfer was defined as

¹In this study, we only analyze samples of speakers from France and Portugal. As opposed to English or French, in Portuguese, the grammatical description and prescription have been carried out separately for European and Brazilian standards (cf. Biderman, 2001; Silva, 2020). This is due to the differences between the two varieties in all the levels of the language: grammatical patterns, lexis, phonological system, and also PAs. For these reasons, in research on Portuguese, authors distinguish "Brazilian Portuguese" from "European Portuguese."

²Here, the term "immersion" refers to an international experience in a country where the L2 of the learners is spoken by the general population, whereas nonimmersion refers to an educational experience where a student is learning the target language in a classroom environment in a place where the L2 is not spoken.

the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another, or the transferring from the mother tongue to the target language of utterances which are semantically/syntactically equivalent, but which, because of different “interpretive bias”, tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language. (Thomas, 1983, p. 101)

The expectation is that this pattern of transfer will be stronger in students who learn Spanish in their home countries than in learners who are exposed daily to the more typical T/V uses of Spanish native speakers during a study abroad experience.

Literature Review

Formal aspects of PAs in Spanish, French, and European Portuguese

Address forms are defined as “words and phrases used for addressing” (Braun, 1988, pp. 7–8). They provide information about a number of features related to the interlocutors (e.g., age, sociocultural level, gender), the type of relationship they share (e.g., close friends vs. distant acquaintances), and their relative social roles (e.g., boss vs. employee). Address forms concern three word classes: pronouns (e.g., *tú*, *usted*), verbs (i.e., inflectional suffixes), and nouns (e.g., *doctor*, *mum*, *sir*, etc.). This study focuses on verbal and pronominal expressions of the T/V distinction in Spanish. As Spanish is a pro-drop language, subject pronouns do not need to be expressed and the information about the person is to be found in verbs’ inflectional endings, which correspond with the pronouns (e.g., [*tú*] *come* [eat, in the imperative], [*usted*] *coma* [eat, in the imperative]).

In Spanish, French, and European Portuguese, second person (2P) pronoun systems are grammatically similar due to their common Latin origin. Singular pronouns *tu/tú* accompany conjugated verbs that follow the typical inflectional paradigm of the 2P, but the other singular pronouns—namely *usted* in Spanish, *você* in Portuguese, and *vous* in French—present a different pattern: *usted* and *você* accompany conjugated verbs that follow the third person singular paradigm (3P sg.), and *vous* follows the second plural person paradigm (2P pl.). The common Latin etymon of these latter forms, *vos*, originally corresponded with a 2P pl. pronoun in Latin. In the Middle Ages, the pronoun *vos* was used to address an individual in a formal way in contrast to *tu*, which was used for informal situations. Although French maintained this system, Spanish and Portuguese presented a shift during this period. As a result, some nominal forms from the pronoun *vos* were created in the XV century: *Vuestra Merced* in Spanish and *Vossa Mercê* in Portuguese. As these were nominal forms, they were conjugated in the 3P sg. but used to address a 2P sg. in a highly formal way. Eventually, these composed forms turned into *usted* and *você* and maintained the 3P pl. inflection (see De Jonge & Nieuwenhuijsen, 2006, and Lennertz Marcotulio, 2014, for further information about the Spanish evolution of *usted* and the Portuguese evolution of *você*, respectively).

As evidenced in Table 1, European Portuguese presents an additional set of forms of address (i.e., *o senhor* [the male person]/*a senhora* [the female person]), which serve to conjugate verbs in a way identical to the 3P sg. *você*. These nominal forms convey an even greater distance between the interlocutors than *você* and mark gender distinctions (i.e., *o senhor* for masculine, *a senhora* for feminine).

Table 1. 2P pronoun systems in Castilian Spanish, French, and European Portuguese

	Castilian Spanish		French		European Portuguese	
	2P sg.	3P sg.	2P sg.	2P pl.	2P sg.	3P sg.
2nd p. sg.	Tú	Usted	Tu	Vous	Tu	- Você - O senhor / a senhora

Patterns of PA use in Spanish, French, and European Portuguese

In spite of the existence of relatively similar T/V forms, PA use differs across the three languages. Politeness and cross-cultural pragmatics studies (Briz, 2007; Haverkate, 2004; Sampedro Mella, 2019) have shown that some cultures, such as the Spanish, focus on proximity and solidarity between participants and thus tend to use more positive politeness forms like imperatives, compliments, nicknames, or jokes (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Other cultures, such as the French or Portuguese, tend to use more mitigation strategies as well as negative politeness forms including conditional sentences, apologies, modal verbs, indirect forms, etc. to show greater distance and formality (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Such differences directly affect PA use in the languages spoken in those cultures, as was demonstrated in Brown and Gilman's (1960) seminal article where they compared German, French, and Italian social norms and their respective uses of T/V. These authors found that increased uses of T in the Italian language were related to a social preference for symmetrical social relationships and the valorization of interpersonal solidarity. In French and German, alternatively, the importance given to the identification of power structures and the ensuing need to establish hierarchies between collocutors resulted in a predominant use of V over T.

As expected based on these findings, in French³ and in European Portuguese, the use of 3P distancing forms (i.e., *vous* and *o senhor/a senhora*) is more generalized than in Castilian Spanish (see sections below). Although in European Portuguese and French the unmarked form is the 3P⁴ (Cook, 1997; Hammermüller, 1993; Hughson, 2003; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2005; Maingueneau, 1994), in Spanish it is the 2P (Carrasco Santana, 2002; Hickey & Vázquez Orta, 1990; Sampedro Mella, 2016, 2022).

In reference to French, Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2005) underlines that the use of V is greater in France than in most neighboring countries where Romance languages are spoken. Coveney (2010, p. 138) adds to this line of thinking when stating that “one can readily accept that V is ‘unmarked’ in the sense that most French people opt for T only if they are addressing an adult belonging to their network of family, friends and colleague—and even then, not all of these.” However, he also recognizes that “reciprocal T is normal among children, adolescents and often—though not universally—students” (2010, p. 139). Concerning European Portuguese, most authors point to the hierarchical organization of Portuguese society (Aldina Marques, 2010; Araújo Carreira, 2003; Cintra, 1986/1972; Lennertz Marcotulio, 2014) to explain the extended use of distancing nominal forms, or forms of reverence (e.g., *o senhor, o senhor doutor, a senhora*

³We are referring to the varieties of French spoken in France, specifically in the Île-de-France region.

⁴Note that there are some differences in the use of the unmarked form (3P) in European Portuguese and French: in European Portuguese the unmarked form is the 3P of verbal endings without subject pronoun (e.g., *desculpe, pode vir?* [excuse me, can (you ∅) come here?]) (cf. Paiva Raposo et al., 2020), whereas in French, apart from the verbal endings, the subject pronoun must always appear in the sentence (e.g., *excusez-moi, est-ce que vous pouvez venir?* [excuse me, can you come here?]).

dona Ana, Vossa Excelência). In this highly hierarchical context, the use of the 2P *tu* is limited to very intimate contexts.

As was mentioned earlier, in Castilian Spanish, the 2P *tú* is the unmarked address form (Carrasco Santana, 2002; Hickey & Vázquez Orta, 1990; Sampedro Mella, 2016, 2022), and the use of *usted* has been steadily declining since the 70s (Alba de Diego & Sánchez Lobato, 1980; Aguado Candanedo, 1981 Borrego et al., 1978). In this respect, more recent studies have confirmed that the use of *tú* in Spain is now spreading to communicative contexts where speakers used to prefer *usted* not long ago, such as service encounters or teacher–student interactions (Blas Arroyo, 1998; Molina Martos, 2002; Sanromán, 2006). There is no consensus among researchers to explain this change in favor of *tú*, but some historical events have been associated with this trend, such as the presence of an equality police during the Second Republic in the 30s (Alonso, 1968; Hickey & Vázquez Orta, 1990; Molina Martos, 2002), the end of World War II (Alba de Diego & Sánchez Lobato, 1980; Brown & Gilman, 1960), or the transition to democracy after Franco’s dictatorship in the late 70s (Aguado Candanedo, 1981).

PA use in Castilian Spanish

Choosing T/V forms depends on some variables related to both the speaker and the hearer. In Castilian Spanish, specifically, most studies agree on placing the age of the interlocutor as the first and most relevant variable to take into account when making decisions about which PA to use (Aguado Candanedo, 1981; Alba de Diego & Sánchez Lobato, 1980; Borrego et al., 1978; Molina Martos, 2002; Sampedro Mella, 2016). According to these studies, this variable is closely followed, in terms of its relevance, by the sociocultural level of the addressee. Concretely, the use of *usted* is related to the older age and higher status of the person being addressed, whereas *tú* is associated with younger interlocutors whose sociocultural status is considered to be lower by the speaker. In cases where age and sociocultural level come into conflict, such as when an interlocutor is older but also has a lower sociocultural status, age will be the most relevant variable in deciding whether to use *tú* or *usted* (Aguado Candanedo, 1981; Borrego et al., 1978; Sampedro Mella, 2016, 2022). Additionally, some researchers have found that the gender of the addressee may also come into play when deciding whether to use *tú* or *usted*. For instance, in Schwenter (1993) or Sampedro Mella (2016), women tended to be addressed more often as *tú*, whereas men tended to more often be addressed as *usted*. However, these findings have not been corroborated by other studies where no differences were found when comparing T/V uses when addressing women or men (Aguado Candanedo, 1981; Borrego et al., 1978; Sanromán, 2006).

As for other variables that are related to the context of communication such as the formality of the situation, the hierarchical relations between the collocutors in that specific context, or the level of interpersonal proximity between participants, these have tended to be studied separately (Alba de Diego & Sánchez Lobato, 1980; Blas Arroyo, 1998; Molina Martos, 2002; Sanromán, 2006; Schwenter, 1993), resulting in a lack of clarity when it comes to establishing which of these variables has the strongest influence on PA selection. However, the literature has consistently confirmed the relevance of personal proximity on the use of *tú* in that this pronoun is often preferred when addressing someone close to the speaker, such as a friend or family member. Alternatively, situations that are seen as highly formal, especially when addressing a person who is considered as being higher in the hierarchy and/or is unknown to the speaker, will trigger the use of *usted* more often.

PA use in French

The usage of 2P pronouns in France underwent significant changes throughout the history of the nation, especially following the French Revolution or the sexual revolution, both of which changed the social structure of the country. However, in spite of these changes, the unmarked PA in contemporary French is still *vous*. The use of *tu* is still limited to the counted situations where social factors related to the hearer (e.g., age, gender, status, etc.) or the relationship type (e.g., family, friends, close people, etc.) make it appropriate.

Overall, the literature on French T/V tends to relate the use of *tu* with the lower age of the interlocutor (Bustin-Lekeu 1973, Gardner-Chloros, 1991; Guigo, 1991; Havu, 2006) such that younger people are more often addressed as *tu* than older people. Other variables such as the relationship between the participants and the roles played by the collocutors are also important in PA choice (Havu, 2006; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1992). Alternatively, the sociocultural level and gender of the interlocutor seem to not have the same influence as in Castilian Spanish (Isosävi, 2010). Finally, several cases remain where native speakers of French doubt in choosing between *tu* and *vous* in French (Havu, 2005). For instance, when addressing a younger hearer who holds a superior position at one's job, the competition between the age variable, which would indicate that *tu* should be used, and the variable related to the hierarchical position, which would favor *vous*, would result in opposed T/V decisions in L1 French speakers.

PA use in European Portuguese

The PA system in European Portuguese is more complex due to the presence of three alternatives: *tu*, *você*, and nominal forms (i.e., *o senhor*, *a senhora doutora*), with the latter expressing even more distance and hierarchy than *você* (Paiva Raposo et al., 2020). The pronoun *você* is thus used as an intermediate form between *tu* and *o senhor/a senhora* (Guillermé & Lara Bermejo, 2015), and it has many different uses in speech, depending on contexts and geographical areas (see Guillermé & Lara Bermejo, 2015, or Hammermüller, 1993, for more information).

In European Portuguese, variables related to the social context, such as formality (Cook, 1997; Duarte, 2010; Hammermüller, 1993), hierarchy (Araújo Carreira, 2003; Aldina Marques, 2010; Cintra, 1986/1972; Lennertz Marcotulio, 2014), or personal closeness (Duarte, 2010) drive PA choices. Previous studies have also pointed to the influence of the interlocutor's gender, age, and socioeconomic status (Aldina Marques, 2010; Duarte, 2010; Thomé-Williams, 2004). In this respect, a man, an elderly person, or an individual with a high sociocultural status would more often be addressed with a 3P form than a woman, a young person, and/or an individual with a lower sociocultural status.

Communicative misunderstandings when using PAs

Although many of the variables that affect PA choice in the three languages are common, some cultural differences (i.e., proximity in Spain vs. distance in France and Portugal) and how much importance is given to each variable may create misunderstandings caused by pragmatic transfer, or “pragmatic failure” (Thomas, 1983, p. 91). For instance, because the age of the interlocutor is perceived as the primary factor to use *usted* in Castilian Spanish, being addressed as *usted* tends to be interpreted as a sign that the speaker considers you to be old, as stated by the RAE & ASALE (2011):

El uso de *usted* puede hacer sentir incómodo al interlocutor si, en lugar de como forma de respeto, se interpreta como medio para marcar distancia o como señal de que se considera persona de edad. [the use of *usted* can make the interlocutor feel uncomfortable if, instead of a sign of respect, it is interpreted as a mark of distance or an indication that the speaker believes that the interlocutor is old]. (p. 322)

In this context, L2 learners from Portugal or France may easily and completely involuntarily commit communicative mishaps when overusing the 3P in Spanish by transferring the patterns of their L1s, either as an acknowledgment of the perceived hierarchical superiority of the addressee, or as an indication of formality and politeness. Thus, although intending to show respect, they may actually make the interlocutor feel somewhat annoyed if the use of *usted* is viewed as a sign that the person considers them an older person. To avoid such situations, it is important for Spanish L2 learners to know how Spanish T/V use differs from that of their L1.

PA in L2 Spanish teaching

Given the multiple variables that need to be taken into account when deciding which PA to use, the inherent variability in T/V use across communities of speakers, and possible mismatches between the students' L1 and L2, research has shown that appropriately using these forms in L2 Spanish is far from easy for many learners (Marsily, 2022; Más Álvarez, 2014; Navarro Gala, 2000; Ramos-González & Rico-Martín, 2014). Consequently, researchers have called for more attention to the teaching of PAs in L2 Spanish. For instance, Soler-Espiauba (1996) emphasized that the complex dynamics that underlie PA selection can only be addressed through explicit instruction and adequate and repeated practice with specific activities that tap into the influential variables involved in PA choice in different contexts.

Despite the increased use of communicative language teaching or task-based language teaching in Europe, which are promoted by the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001, 2020) and seek to develop students' communication skills, L2 Spanish textbooks in Europe still often dismiss pragmatic matters, such as T/V uses (Más Álvarez, 2014, 2021; Navarro Gala, 2000; Sampedro Mella, 2016). This is illustrated in Sampedro Mella & Sánchez Gutiérrez (2019), who analyzed 15 beginner L2 Spanish textbooks and found that only 13.3% included an adequate approach for teaching T/V. Most books in their study (53.3%) did not include any reference to T/V uses, and 33.3% introduced a brief mention to how *tú* and *usted* are not used in the same contexts but limited their explanations to stating that *tú* should be used in informal settings and *usted* should in more formal ones. No specific description was provided of the variables that determine whether a communicative context is formal or informal. More importantly in the case of Castilian Spanish, no mentions were ever made to the fact that *tú* is more used than *usted* or that *usted* can be interpreted as an indicator of the older age of the interlocutor.

L2 Spanish use of forms of address during study abroad

Due to the limited attention given to pragmatics, which importantly includes PAs, in explicit Spanish language teaching, study abroad (SA) has been seen as a means of addressing such gaps and complementing language learners' education. Indeed,

researchers have looked into the effects of participating in SA programs on the use of more locally appropriate norms when performing specific speech acts, especially requests, apologies, and compliments (Bataller, 2010; Cohen & Shively, 2007; DiBartolomeo et al., 2019; Félix-Brasdefer & Hasler-Barker, 2015; Hernández, 2018; Hernández & Boero, 2018; Shively, 2011). Findings indicate that SA contributes to achieving such goals, but many studies insist that learners' incidental exposure to relevant input while abroad may not be sufficient and recommend the inclusion of explicit classroom-based pragmatic treatments, either pre-SA or during SA (Morris, 2017). This need for additional explicit teaching may be observed because most research was carried out with students who participated in "sheltered" SA programs, where learners complete courses with peers and instructors from their home institution. In this type of program, extensive interaction with native speakers is not guaranteed and greatly depends on the goals, positioning, and investment of the individual learners (Quan, 2019).

In the specific context of the L2 development of T/V distinctions, Kinginger and Farrell (2004, p. 24) stated that "address form competence is as much a matter of language *socialization* as it is of *acquisition*," pointing to the importance that repeated meaningful social interactions may have in adopting local norms of PA use. Therefore, the fact that some studies did not find significant change in the use of Spanish T/V during SA (Shively, 2011) may result from the limited opportunities for meaningful socialization offered by sheltered SA programs as well as the relatively short length of such programs (i.e., typically between four and 14 weeks). In the present study, participants of both L1-French and L1-European Portuguese who were in a linguistic immersion context lived in a small city in Spain, without the support of a group from their home country or university, and were enrolled in academic programs at the local public university. Additionally, they had already stayed in Spain for a minimum of six months, but generally longer, and were studying advanced language-related majors, probably resulting in a more advanced proficiency than that of the participants in most SA studies related to T/V uses so far.

Objectives and research questions

Although French and European Portuguese display a T/V distinction, as does Spanish, the frequency of use of both PAs, as well as the variables that determine their use, are different from the patterns in Spanish. In this context, it is important to investigate whether those L1 patterns appear in the L2's T/V use and, if so, whether said patterns change when learners are in an immersive educational context. This study analyzes Spanish T/V uses by L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners of Spanish who are studying their L2 either in their home country, a nonimmersive context, or in Spain, an immersive context. The objective of this design is to respond to the following research questions:

1. Do L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners of Spanish present different frequency patterns in their use of T/V in their L2 when participating in an educational immersive experience in Spain compared with students who learn the language in their home countries?
2. What variables influence T/V choice in L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners of L2-Spanish when they learn the language at home versus during an immersive educational experience in Spain?

Methods

Participants

A total of 168 learners of L2 Spanish, 27 men and 141 women, participated in this study. Of these, 87 were French speakers, with 39 being in an immersive context in Spain and 46 in a nonimmersive context in France. The remaining 81 participants were L1-European Portuguese speakers, of whom 35 were in Spain at the time of testing and 48 in Portugal. Participants' age ranged between 22 and 24 years old. All participants had been enrolled in formal Spanish language instruction for a minimum of 4 years and were completing university majors in Spanish, translation, or linguistics. Although we cannot attest to their proficiency based on the results of a test, all participants were enrolled in classes taught fully in Spanish and that required an advanced command of academic Spanish to be able to complete the coursework. All learners in the immersion group were participating in SA programs in Salamanca, Spain, which lasted at least 6 months. These programs were completed individually in that students were not part of a group that traveled together from their home country. They were all enrolled in university programs that focused on linguistics or translation, just as their counterparts at home.

Twenty-five L1-Spanish speakers from Salamanca also participated in the study. This group was composed of five men and 20 women between the ages of 20 and 24 years old who were completing a Spanish major at the University of Salamanca. Therefore, these speakers shared a similar age range, were enrolled in similar programs, and lived in the same city as the L2-Spanish learners in immersion.

Testing materials

Participants completed a Discourse Completion Test (DCT; Cyluk, 2013; Nurani, 2009) and a demographic questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire included a series of questions that gathered information about their age, gender, academic background, nationality, and general linguistic background (i.e., L1, L2, length of stay in Spain, length of study of L2 Spanish).

A DCT is a "written questionnaire containing short descriptions of a particular situation intended to reveal the pattern of a speech act being studied" (Kasper & Dahl, 1991 as cited in Nurani, 2009, pp. 667–668). DCTs have been broadly used in empirical investigations related to pragmatic competence (Ivanovska et al., 2016; Nurani, 2009) as well as in L1 and L2 contrastive studies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Cohen & Olshtain, 1981). Although natural data, as that found in corpora, provides more direct and realistic measures of speakers' linguistic practices, elicitation tasks such as DCTs, oral DCTs, and role plays also have their advantages (Bataller, 2013; Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Sampedro Mella, 2021). Indeed, these types of tasks offer a systematic approach to both data collection and data analysis processes. Unlike speech corpora, DCT data uniquely tap into the variables of interest and allow for the collection and comparison of larger amounts of data under controlled conditions. Because all participants respond to the same questionnaire with identical elicitation tasks, no other contextual variables can affect the results. Among elicitation tasks, although role plays provide results that may be closer to natural data (cf. Félix-Brasdefer, 2007), they are limited in the number of different scenarios that can be covered with each participant. Therefore, in this study, the DCT was selected as the most appropriate method, as it allows to combine a wide range of situations in different scenarios and makes it possible to include more

Table 2. Variables considered in the DCT questionnaire

Variables	Variants	
Interlocutor's age	Young	Old
Interlocutor's social status	Low	High
Interlocutor's gender	Man	Woman
Familiarity with the interlocutor	Known	Unknown
Formality of the situation	Formal situation	Informal situation

participants in a shorter time, which results in the collection and comparison of a larger amount of data.

The items included in this study's DCT were created *ad hoc*, with the intention of obtaining answers that included *tú*, *usted*, or a verbal inflectional form corresponding to either *tú* or *usted*. Each of the 16 situations described in the DCT tapped into one or more sociolinguistic variables that are known to influence L1-Castilian Spanish speakers' T/V decisions (see Table 2).

Examples 1 and 2 illustrate the type of items included in the test. In example 1, the variables of interest are the age (old) and gender (woman) of the interlocutor as well as the degree of familiarity with the speaker (known) and the formality of the situation (informal). In example 2, the variables of interest are the relative social status (high) and the gender (man) of the hearer, the relationship between participants (unknown), and the formality of the situation (formal). The complete test can be found in Appendix 1.

Example 1. *Encuentras a tu vecina, una mujer mayor, cargada con bolsas y decides ofrecerle tu ayuda, ¿qué le dices?*

[You run into your neighbor, an elderly woman, loaded with bags and you decide to offer to help her, what do you tell her?]

Example 2. *Has faltado al trabajo porque estás enfermo. Pídele al médico que te ha atendido en el hospital, que te firme un justificante.*

[You have missed work because you are sick. Ask the doctor who examined you at the hospital to sign a doctor's note.]

As evidenced in these examples, the variables were considered as binary: young versus old, low versus high social status, formal versus informal situation, etc. Although these variables always appear in each item of the DCT, not all items include explicit information about all the variables. For instance, in Example 1, no explicit information is given about the sociocultural level of the interlocutor and, in Example 2, the same occurs with the age of the interlocutor. The lack of this explicit information is also used to analyze the T/V choices in these situations. This design decision was made because there are situations in real life where some relevant information about the interlocutor may be missing, such as when one talks with an unknown person, and other situations where one may be unsure about the age or social status of the people we address. In those circumstances, speakers still need to decide whether to use *tú* or *usted*. Therefore, including some items that do not explicitly offer details about certain variables is important to study what learners of L2-Spanish do when they are unsure about someone's age or someone's social status. Do they default to *tú* or to *usted*?

Procedures

One of the researchers carried out all data collection efforts at the three universities where participants were recruited in order to ensure that all data were collected in the exact same way. Participants completed the demographic questionnaire and the DCT during normal class time without a time limit. On average, participants took 20–30 min to complete the questionnaire. They were asked to respond in Spanish and were not informed of the goal of the research until the survey was completed by all participants in order to avoid response biases.

Results

Data processing

The data collected from the DCT was processed in Microsoft Excel, where the PAs used by each participant in response to each item were tallied. Although participants almost always used a PA in their responses, some of them revealed other structures that did not require any PA, such as impersonal sentences. Additionally, some utterances included both *tú* and *usted*. All the address forms collected were classified under five categories: (1) *tú*, (2) *usted*, (3) neither *tú* nor *usted* (i.e., use of alternative linguistic structures), (4) *tú* and *usted* (i.e., both *tú* and *usted* in the same utterance), and (5) no response (i.e., empty or completely unrelated answers that were not analyzed).

Examples of responses that would fit in category 3 (i.e., neither *tú* nor *usted*) would be *Necesito un justificante para mi trabajo* [I need a doctor's note for my work] or *¿Hay más cuadernos?* [Are there any more notebooks?]. In both cases, the participant avoided using a PA and used alternative linguistic resources to ask a question or make a request. Cases like *Perdone, ¿podrías limpiar el suelo delante de mi puerta?* [(Usted) excuse me, could you (*tú*) clean the floor in front of my door?] were included in category 4, since both *tú* and *usted* were used to address the same person.

Amount and context of use of *tú* and *usted* in immersion versus nonimmersion contexts

To address Research Question 1, Table 3 presents the distribution of response types in each participant group (i.e., L1-French immersion, L1-French nonimmersion, L1-Portuguese immersion, L1-Portuguese nonimmersion, native speakers). In addition to this descriptive information, Table 4 presents the results of a binomial linear regression where only L2-learners' responses that included either *tú* or *usted* are used in order to assess whether the choice of one or the other varies according to two independent variables: (1) L1 (i.e., French vs. European Portuguese) and (2) immersion context (i.e., immersion vs. nonimmersion). In the model, *usted* is used as the reference level.

Table 3. Response types by total participants in each group

	<i>Tú</i>	<i>Usted</i>	No T/V	<i>Tú</i> and <i>usted</i>	No response
Immersion + French	35.7%	50.9%	6.1%	6.4%	0.9%
Nonimmersion + French	31.1%	57.6%	8.2%	1.8%	1.3%
Immersion + Portuguese	28.4%	49.7%	11.5%	8.7%	1.8%
Nonimmersion + Portuguese	17.3%	67.7%	9.4%	4.1%	1.6%
Spanish native speakers	47.8%	42.5%	6.3%	2%	1.5%

Table 4. Parameter estimates and derived values from the linear regression model $T/V \sim L1 \times \text{Context}$

	Estimate	SE	z	p
(Intercept)	0.61	0.08	7.66	<.001***
Language Portuguese	0.75	0.13	5.88	<.001***
Immersion yes	-0.26	0.12	-2.13	.03*
Language Portuguese: Immersion yes	-0.55	0.18	-2.97	.003**
R ²	0.04			

When looking at the percentages of PA use in both L1 groups, 31.1% of L1-French learners use *tú*, but only 17.3% of L1-European Portuguese learners do when learning the language in their home country. In both L1 groups, learners in immersion display a great increase in their use of *tú* and a decrease in their use of *usted* compared with their L1-counterparts who were studying Spanish in their home countries. However, their use of *tú* is still much lower than that of the native speakers, even after several months of immersion.

The model presented in Table 4 confirms the trends observed in Table 3. First, it reveals a significant main effect of L1, with L1-European Portuguese learners using *usted* significantly more often than L1-French learners. Second, a main effect of immersion was also found, showing that learners in an immersion context display a significantly greater use of *tú*. Finally, the interaction between language and immersion also reached significance. Concretely, the difference in the use of *tú* in the immersion group, as compared with the nonimmersion one, was significantly greater for L1-European Portuguese learners than for L1-French learners, pointing to a potentially greater effect of immersion on the former.

Because learners' responses (i.e., *tú*, *usted*, neither *tú* nor *usted*, *tú* and *usted*, no response) form a categorical variable, it was not possible to include more than two levels (i.e., *tú* vs. *usted*) in the dependent variable of the regression model. However, the evolution of mixed responses (i.e., when learners use both *tú* and *usted* in the same utterance) in the descriptive statistics presented in Table 3 also reveals interesting trends. Indeed, both L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners in an immersion context presented a greater proportion of mixed uses than their counterparts at home, which indicates that they may become more doubtful about their PA choices as they are exposed to native speakers of Castilian Spanish who use the T/V distinction in ways that differ from their L1.

When it comes to determining which situations trigger such doubts, an analysis of some illustrative DCT items reveals relevant patterns. For instance, both L1-French and L1-European Portuguese learners in immersion seem to hesitate between *tú* and *usted* when they do not know the age and sociocultural level of the hearer. For example, in Item 5, participants are asked to address an unknown man in the street. As evidenced in Table 5, for this item, 20% of French and 10.3% of Portuguese participants in

Table 5. Example of the use of address forms with an unknown interlocutor (Item 5)

	<i>Tú</i>	<i>Usted</i>	<i>Tú</i> and <i>usted</i>	Other
French nonimmersion	39.6%	47.9%	4.2%	8.4%
French immersion	42.9%	34.3%	20%	2.8%
Portuguese nonimmersion	21.7%	56.5%	6.5%	15.3%
Portuguese immersion	23.1%	56.4%	10.3%	10.2%
Spanish native speakers	48%	44%	4%	4%

immersion, as opposed to 4.2% of French and 6.5% of Portuguese in nonimmersion, use both *tú* and *usted* in the same statement.

In addition to this trend observed in learners of both L1s, L1-French speakers in immersion seem particularly unsure about their PA choices when they address a person whom they already know but whom they consider to have a lower sociocultural status. This hesitation does not seem to appear in the L1-European Portuguese data in either immersion or nonimmersion. Table 6 provides a comparison of two items from the DCT that have a common interlocutor: a salesclerk at the market. In Item 7, the salesclerk is a person the speaker would know, whereas in Item 1 they are not previously known by the speaker. An analysis of the responses to these two items reveals that L1-French participants use *usted* more often with a clerk they do not know, whereas they prefer using *tú* with a salesclerk with whom they share greater familiarity. In immersion, however, L1-French learners seem to feel more insecure in using a specific PA with the clerk they already know, as evidenced by a lower frequency of mixed responses at home (2.1%) than in immersion (17.1%).

In the case of European Portuguese speakers, they tend to hesitate more than the French and their doubts seem to be greater while in immersion than in nonimmersion, especially when addressing women whom they consider to have a high sociocultural status. The answers to Items 9 and 12, where they address a female doctor and a young female eye doctor, respectively, clearly illustrate these doubts with high-status women, as evidenced in Table 7. However, when addressing a man with a higher status,

Table 6. 1 by L1-French learners and native speakers

	<i>Tú</i>	<i>Usted</i>	<i>Tú and usted</i>	Other
Item 7: known salesclerk (L1-French immersion)	51.4%	31.4%	17.1%	0.1%
Item 7: known salesclerk (L1-French nonimmersion)	47.9%	45.8%	2.1%	4.2%
Item 7: known salesclerk (Spanish native speakers)	84%	12%	–	4%
Item 1: unknown salesclerk (L1-French immersion)	34.3%	54.3%	–	11.4%
Item 1: unknown salesclerk (L1-French nonimmersion)	22.9%	62.5%	–	14.6%
Item 1: unknown salesclerk (Spanish native speakers)	72%	28%	–	–

Table 7. Responses to Items 9, 12, and 3 by L1-Portuguese learners and native speakers

	<i>Tú</i>	<i>Usted</i>	<i>Tú and usted</i>	Other
Item 9: female doctor (L1-European Portuguese immersion)	5.1%	66.7%	17.9%	10.3%
Item 9: female doctor (L1-European Portuguese nonimmersion)	4.3%	87%	2.2%	6.5%
Item 9: female doctor (Spanish native speakers)	48%	44%	–	8%
Item 12: young eye doctor (woman) (L1-European Portuguese immersion)	23.1%	33.3%	15.4%	28.2%
Item 12: young eye doctor (woman) (L1-European Portuguese nonimmersion)	21.7%	58.7%	4.3%	15.2%
Item 12: young eye doctor (woman) (Spanish native speakers)	88%	–	–	12%
Item 3: young HR officer (man) (L1-European Portuguese immersion)	23.1%	48.7%	10.3%	17.9%
Item 3: young HR officer (man) (L1-European Portuguese nonimmersion)	8.7%	80.4%	2.2%	8.7%
Item 3: young HR officer (man) (Spanish native speakers)	52%	20%	8%	20%

European Portuguese speakers tend to use *usted* more often and do not hesitate as much, except if the man in question is younger (e.g., Item 3). Indeed, in addressing a young male human resources officer, L1-European Portuguese learners used both *tú* and *usted* in the same utterance 10.3% of the time when in immersion and only 2.2% of the time while learning Spanish at home.

Overall, it seems that great mismatches between L2-learners' and L1-speakers' uses result in more doubt for learners who are in immersion. In most of these items, native speakers show a clear preference for the T form and learners in nonimmersion greatly favor the V form. Thus, it is not surprising that learners who are exposed to this completely opposite set of T/V uses in Spain may need some time to adjust and hesitate between their L1 tendency of using V and the newly discovered Spanish preference for T in certain specific situations.

Variables influencing the use of tú in different groups

To further explore the variables that influence PA choices in the different groups of learners who participated in this study, the next sections present a series of five logistic regression models for each one of the groups (i.e., L1-Spanish speakers, L1-French immersion, L1-French nonimmersion, L1-European Portuguese immersion, L1-European Portuguese nonimmersion). It was impossible to include all groups in a single model due to lack of power, which explains the multitude of models.

All models include the same set of predictors:

- Age of the interlocutor (young, old, unspecified)
- Sociocultural level of the interlocutor (high, low, unspecified)
- Gender of the interlocutor (male vs. female)
- Formality of the situation (formal vs. informal)
- Familiarity with the interlocutor (known vs. unknown person)

In all five of the models, the dependent variable is the proportion of uses of *tú*, as it is the default PA in Spanish but not in European Portuguese and French. The goal is thus to observe whether the uses of *tú*, which were significantly greater for learners in immersion contexts, are also better adjusted to variables known to be decisive in L1-Spanish. Concretely, what variables are they taking into account when deciding to use *tú* while in immersion? How do these variables differ from the ones used to make T/V decisions by students who are not in a linguistic immersion context?

Variables influencing the uses of tú in L1 speakers of Spanish

In the case of the L1 speakers of Spanish, as evidenced in Table 8, all predictors reached significance, with increased uses of *tú* being associated with the younger age of the interlocutor, the fact that the interlocutor is a woman, that the situation is informal, and that the interlocutor is a known person. When it comes to the effect of the sociocultural level of the interlocutor, speakers tend to increase their use of *tú* when they know the person they are addressing has a lower sociocultural level and decrease their use of *tú* when they do not have that information. Using the model's parameter estimates as unstandardized effect sizes, age is the most influential variable in deciding to use *tú*, followed by familiarity and sociocultural level (only the unspecified-low pair) and finally by formality and gender. This confirms the previously mentioned finding in the literature that the age of the interlocutor is the main

Table 8. Parameter estimates and derived values from the logistic regression models *tú* ~ gender ~ age ~ formality ~ sociocultural level ~ familiarity of the Spanish native speakers

	Spanish native speakers			
	Estimate	SE	z	p
(Intercept)	0.46	0.32	1.43	.15
Gender: male	-0.72	0.24	-3.06	.002**
Age: old-young	-2.86	0.56	-5.15	<.001***
Age: unspecified-old	1.78	0.55	3.25	.001**
Age: unspecified-young	-1.08	0.41	-2.64	.008*
Formality: formal	-1.033	0.45	-2.29	.02*
Sociocultural level: high-low	-0.51	0.42	-1.19	.23
Sociocultural level: unspecified-high	-0.73	0.43	-1.7	.09
Sociocultural level: unspecified-low	-1.24	0.30	-4.10	<.001***
Familiarity: known	1.23	0.59	2.09	.04*
R ² theoretical	.39			
R ² delta	.35			

predictor of T/V decisions in Castilian Spanish and that the effects of formality and gender are generally less conclusive.

Variables influencing the uses of *tú* in L1-French L2-Spanish learners

As can be observed in Table 9, no predictor reaches significance in L1-French learners in a nonimmersion context even though age, formality, and sociocultural level present marginally significant results. Concretely, L1-French learners in France tend to use *tú* more often with younger people, in informal contexts, and with people who they identify as having a lower sociocultural level. In learners who are in an immersion context in Spain, the effect of the interlocutor’s sociocultural level reaches statistical significance, as they use *tú* more often, not only when the person is known to have a lower sociocultural level, but also when they are unsure about the person’s sociocultural

Table 9. Parameter estimates and derived values from the logistic regression models *tú* ~ gender ~ age ~ formality ~ sociocultural level ~ familiarity (model on the left: French + nonimmersion; model on the right: French + immersion)

	French + nonimmersion				French + immersion			
	Estimate	SE	z	p	Estimate	SE	z	p
(Intercept)	-0.66	0.2	-3.33	<.001***	-0.35	0.23	-1.56	.12
Gender: male	0.003	0.17	0.02	.98	-0.13	0.19	-0.69	.49
Age: old-young	-0.49	0.26	-1.87	.06	-0.56	0.31	-1.82	.07
Age: unspecified-old	-0.05	0.34	-0.15	.88	-0.05	0.39	-0.13	.90
Age: unspecified-young	-0.54	0.31	-1.75	.08	-0.61	0.36	-1.7	.09
Formality: formal	-0.54	0.3	-1.78	.08	-0.48	0.35	-1.35	.18
Sociocultural level: high-low	-0.57	0.3	-1.92	.06	-0.74	0.35	-2.11	.04*
Sociocultural level: unspecified-high	0.5	0.31	1.62	.11	1.06	0.36	2.93	.003**
Sociocultural level: unspecified-low	-0.07	0.21	-0.34	.73	0.32	0.24	1.36	.17
Familiarity: known	0.25	0.34	0.75	.45	0.25	0.39	0.63	.53
R ² theoretical		.09				.13		
R ² delta		.07				.10		

Table 10. Parameter estimates and derived values from the logistic regression models *tú* ~ gender ~ age ~ formality ~ sociocultural level ~ familiarity (model on the left: Portuguese + nonimmersion; model on the right: Portuguese + immersion)

	Portuguese + nonimmersion				Portuguese + immersion			
	Estimate	SE	z	p	Estimate	SE	z	p
(Intercept)	-0.87	0.29	-2.91	.004**	-0.71	0.24	-2.88	.004**
Gender: male	-0.13	0.22	-0.6	.55	0.38	0.21	1.85	.06
Age: old-young	-0.36	0.34	-1.08	.28	-0.63	0.31	-2.06	.04*
Age: unspecified-old	-1.06	0.66	-1.59	.11	-0.72	0.48	-1.51	.13
Age: unspecified-young	-1.42	0.61	-2.31	.02*	-1.35	0.46	-2.95	.003**
Formality: formal	-1.33	0.51	-2.61	.009**	-0.21	0.47	-0.46	.65
Sociocultural level: high-low	-1.85	0.56	-3.27	.001**	-2.38	0.55	-4.35	<.001***
Sociocultural level: unspecified-high	1.39	0.58	2.42	.02*	1.61	0.57	2.85	<.001***
Sociocultural level: unspecified-low	-0.45	0.24	-1.84	.07	-0.77	0.24	-3.27	<.001***
Familiarity: known	-0.94	0.63	-1.49	.14	-0.63	0.47	-1.33	.18
R ² theoretical			.29				.23	
R ² delta			.17				.17	

level. Age, however, does not reach significance in any of the two groups of L1-French speakers. Finally, it needs to be noted that the R^2 values of these models are relatively low, with the immersion model being the one that explains the most variance, at approximately 10%. This indicates that there are probably more variables that are influencing L1-French learners' decision making when they choose to use *tú*.

Variables influencing the uses of tú in L1-European Portuguese L2-Spanish learners

As evidenced in Table 10 above, L1-European Portuguese learners of L2-Spanish who are in a nonimmersion context tend to associate the use of *tú* with informal situations and with the lower sociocultural level of the interlocutor. Speakers also take into account the age of the person they are addressing and they pay attention to the level of formality required by the specific situation at hand. In the case of L1-Portuguese learners in the immersion group, age and sociocultural level remain significant predictors of the use of *tú*, with younger people with a lower sociocultural status being addressed more often with *tú*. Alternatively, formality, a variable that reached significance but was not as relevant as age in the native speakers' model, is not a significant predictor in the immersion model. Both in the immersion and the nonimmersion models, the R^2 is around .20, indicating a medium effect size.

Discussion

Some linguistic varieties, like Castilian Spanish, are known to focus on proximity and solidarity, using positive politeness forms, whereas others, like French, focus on negative politeness forms, seeking to ensure some distance between the speaker and the hearer in order to show respect (Briz, 2007; Haverkate, 2004; Sampedro Mella, 2019). Therefore, even though Castilian Spanish, French, and European Portuguese all present a T/V distinction, the distribution and use of such forms greatly varies, with the T form representing the default in Castilian Spanish (Carrasco Santana, 2002; Hickey &

Vázquez Orta, 1990; Sampedro Mella, 2016, 2022) and V forms being favored in most situations by speakers of French (Hughson, 2003; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 2005; Maingueneau, 1994) and European Portuguese (Cook, 1997; Guillerme & Lara Bermejo, 2015; Hammermüller, 1993). In sum, although Spanish speakers generally default to *tú*, French speakers most often use *vous*, and Portuguese display a broader array of respect forms with the use of nominal forms, such as *o senhor/a senhora*, thus presenting the greatest attention to politeness and distance of the three groups.

These differences between the L1s were reflected in participants' frequency of use of T/V forms in Spanish when they were learning Spanish in their home countries, revealing instances of pragmatic transfer (Kasper, 1992). Specifically, L1-European Portuguese learners used *usted* significantly more often than L1-French speakers. In both L1 groups, however, learners in immersion used *usted* less often than those in nonimmersion and chose to use *tú* in more situations, which better conforms to the T/V frequencies in the L1-Spanish group. Interestingly, the immersive context of living in Spain not only played a role in developing more native-like frequencies of use of *tú* and *usted* but also seemed to sow doubt for some learners when deciding which PA to use in certain contexts. For example, L1-French participants in immersion presented significantly more mixed uses of *tú* and *usted* when addressing a salesclerk they knew than did L1-French learners in France. This may be due to the fact that, in France, they would systematically use *vous* in the context of a service encounter, whereas Spaniards would consistently use *tú*, presenting a great mismatch between L1 and L2 pragmatic practices. Overall, our data suggest that, when discrepancies between the forms preferred in the L1 and the L2 in a given situation are notable, learners experience greater insecurity in PA choice in that situation when they are immersed in the L2 context. Such doubts seem to reflect a normal step in the process of adopting, and adapting to, new pragmatic uses that do not correspond to the L1.

It is important to note that mixed uses of *tú* and *usted* in the same utterance also appeared in the responses of the L1-Spanish group, which is not surprising because similar cases have been documented in Spain (Sampedro Mella, 2016, 2022), in Argentina with the pronouns *vos* and *usted* (Rigatuso, 2014), and in Colombia (Denbaum, 2021) or Costa Rica (Quesada Pacheco, 2010) with *tú*, *vos*, and *usted*. In the literature, such mixed uses by L1-speakers are known as *polymorphism* (Denbaum, 2021), *alternancia* [alternation] (Sampedro Mella, 2022), *cambio momentáneo* [momentary change] (Rigatuso, 2014), or *danza pronominal* [pronominal dance] (Quesada Pacheco, 2010). When multiple variables need to be taken into account at once and each may lead to competing and sometimes contradictory options, speakers, native or not, may proceed to mix both PAs. In the case of L2-learners, the influence of the L1 and the resulting pragmatic transfer add another level of complexity to the already intricate decision-making process of choosing context-appropriate forms of address. Therefore, although some mixed T/V uses can be considered as linguistic mistakes, as was found in previous studies (Marsily, 2022), most T/V hesitations, especially in immersion, seem to be an indication of learners' realization of the complexity of the PA system (including cases of polymorphism) and, consequently, a positive step in their development of L1-Spanish patterns.

When it comes to the variables that better predicted the use of *tú* in the different groups of participants, it is notable that none of them seemed to play a predominant role in the nonimmersion L1-French group. Although formality, age, and sociocultural level were marginally significant in that model, no variable actually reached significance. In the case of the L1-French learners who had been living in Spain for a few months, the sociocultural level of the interlocutor became the decisive factor for

choosing *tú* over *usted*, most often addressing people who were identified as having a lower sociocultural status with *tú*. However, the age of the interlocutor, which was the most predictive variable in the L1-Spanish group, was not a significant predictor either in immersion or in nonimmersion for L1-French learners.

It is noteworthy that the overall R^2 in both the immersion and nonimmersion L1-French models was low, indicating very small effect sizes. This suggests that other variables that were not included in the model may underlie French speakers' decisions about which PA to use (e.g., hierarchy, physical context, etc.). It may also be that, even in immersion, learners did not have opportunities to interact with people in all age groups or in situations that were highly formal, thus lacking enough exposure to certain situations that were presented in the DCT (Quan, 2019). As Kinginger and Farrell (2004) proposed, PA choices depend on adequate socialization, and Quan (2019) clearly showed how the simple act of being abroad is not enough to ensure such socialization, as it greatly depends on the motivation, emotions, and goals of the learners. Therefore, if learners' social life in immersion does not include enough opportunities to notice differences between L1 and L2 address patterns, L1-transfer will continue to play a great role and they may not adopt L2-uses as readily. Finally, the DCT used in this study does not offer items for all possible combinations of variables, as it would result in a long test that very few participants would agree to complete. It is possible that the inclusion of additional items could have brought light onto specific combinations of predictors that could reach significance together but not in isolation.

In the case of the L1-European Portuguese learners of L2-Spanish, the models showed larger effect sizes, pointing to a better fit of the variables at hand for these learners. Age and sociocultural level were significant predictors of the use of *tú* both in immersion and nonimmersion. However, the level of formality of the situations described in the DCT played a distinct role in deciding to use *tú* for participants who were in a nonimmersion context, but not for those who were living in Spain. This pattern shows that not only did L1-Portuguese learners in immersion better align with L1-Spanish speakers in that they started using *tú* more often than in nonimmersion; they also started rejecting PA selection criteria that were transferred from their L1 but not as relevant in their daily interactions in Spanish. Indeed, formality was one of the least predictive (though significant) variables in the L1 model. These data seem to indicate that, in the case of the L1-Portuguese group, pragmatic transfer was reduced when learners were immersed in a Spanish-speaking environment, in terms of both frequency of T/V use, as Granvik (2005) also pointed out, and of the variables taken into consideration when making decisions about PA choice.

In sum, the difference between being in immersion or not was overall more observable in the pragmatic choices of L1-Portuguese learners than in L1-French learners. This may be due to several factors. First, when it comes to frequencies of use of *tú* and *usted*, the choices of L1-French learners tended to deviate less from those of the L1-Spanish speakers. They did use *usted* more often than L1 speakers but less than L1-Portuguese learners. In this context, L1-French learners had less room for improvement and may have had a harder time noticing the difference between their own T/V uses and those of L1-Spanish speakers while in immersion. Alternatively, L1-Portuguese learners in nonimmersion were already making use of predictors of PA use that were similar to those of L1 speakers (i.e., age, sociocultural status, closeness). Even if they used *usted* as the default option in many cases, the specific variables that they took into account when deciding when to use *tú* differed less from the L1 speakers than L1-French learners, for whom none of the predictors reached significance in the nonimmersion group.

Conclusion

This study analyzed the uses of the Spanish address pronouns, *tú* and *usted*, by learners whose L1s display similar pronominal distinctions—namely, French and European Portuguese. Although both languages have various forms of address to indicate a greater or lesser distancing, as is the case in Spanish, the specific variables that determine which pronoun fits better in a particular context vary between languages. First, both French and European Portuguese exhibit an overall preference for their respective V forms, whereas in Spanish the T form is the default. Additionally, speakers of European Portuguese tend to use information about the formality of the situation as a central criterion to determine which address form to use. Spanish speakers, alternatively, tend to guide their decision by the age of the interlocutor as well as their perceived sociocultural level. This study indicates that learners of both L1s not only increase their use of *tú* during a study abroad experience but also start adopting more native-like criteria in deciding which PA to use, displaying less instances of pragmatic transfer when in immersion.

These findings demonstrate that (1) PA choices are challenging even for learners' whose L1s also have a T/V distinction and (2) immersive experiences result in more native-like uses. Such data have implications not only for future research, which should dive deeper into the development of pragmatic competence by learners of L1s other than English, but also for L2-Spanish teaching. Indeed, the evidence of pragmatic transfer found in the nonimmersion groups and the difficulty experienced by students as they adapt to new T/V uses in their L2 seem to confirm the need for an in-depth pedagogical treatment of the distinction between *tú* and *usted*. A more systematic approach that explicitly explains the decision process behind T/V choices by L1-speakers of Spanish may be a first step in the right direction. Furthermore, analyzing recorded interactions between speakers and trying to understand why each interlocutor used the pronouns they used in this situation would also allow for interesting discussions about politeness standards in different cultures. This approach, though, would need to be adapted to the community of Spanish speakers that learners may most probably interact with, as T/V uses present a great deal of variation across the Spanish-speaking world.

Despite the contributions of the present study, some limitations need to be acknowledged. First, the items included in the DCT were designed based on the most influential predictors found in previous literature, but it is probable that more factors are important in PA decisions, such as the personality and pleasantness of the interlocutor, or the physical context (e.g., being at the office or at the cafe with your boss or coworkers), for example. Additionally, due to time constraints, the DCT does not include items that cover all possible interactions of the multiple variables, which limits our understanding of how these factors influence each other in different communicative situations. Finally, it might also be relevant to replicate this study's findings by looking at speech corpora, which would provide more naturalistic data. In sum, this study is a first step in the direction of going beyond the focus on L1-English students when it comes to learning the distinction between *tú* and *usted* in L2-Spanish, but more sources of data will be necessary to provide a full picture of this learning process in various L1 groups.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Paloma Fernández Mira for her work on the statistical models in this article and to acknowledge the help provided by students and faculty during data collection at the Universidade de Lisboa, Universidad de Salamanca, and Université Sorbonne Nouvelle. This study was funded through a grant from the Xunta de Galicia (Spain) received by María Sampedro Mella and titled "Use of general and learner corpora for the research and teaching of discourse in Spanish as a foreign language" [grant code: ED481D-2022-016].

References

- Agüado Candanedo, D. (1981). Análisis sociolingüístico del uso de *tú/usted* en los estudiantes universitarios de Bilbao. *Letras de Deusto*, 21, 165–186.
- Alba de Diego, V., & Sánchez Lobato, A. (1980). Tratamiento y juventud en la lengua hablada. Aspectos sociolingüísticos. *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, 21, 95–130.
- Aldina Marques, M. (2010). Formas de tratamento e construção da relação interpessoal em Contos da Montanha de Miguel de Torga. *Revista Galega de Filoloxía*, 11, 61–78. <http://hdl.handle.net/2183/8389>
- Alonso, D. (1968). La muerte del usted. In D. Alonso (Ed.), *Del Siglo de oro a este siglo de siglas* (pp. 264–467). Gredos.
- Araújo Carreira, M. H. (2003). Les formes allocutives en portugais Européen: Évolution, valeurs et fonctionnements discursifs. In *Colloque Pronoms de 2e personne et formes d'adresse dans les langues d'Europe*. Instituto Cervantes de Paris. https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/coloquio_paris/ponencias/pdf/cvc_araujo.pdf
- Bataller, R. (2010). Making a request for a service in Spanish: Pragmatic development in the study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, 160–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01065.x>
- Bataller, R. (2013). Role-plays vs. natural data: Asking for a drink at a cafeteria in peninsular Spanish. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura*, 18, 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala>
- Biderman, M. T. (2001). O Português Brasileiro e o Português Europeu: Identidade e contrastes. *Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 79, 963–975. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2001.4556>
- Blas Arroyo, J. L. (1998). Una variable sociopragmática: La alternancia *tú/usted*. In J. L. Blas Arroyo (Ed.), *Las comunidades de habla bilingües. Temas de sociolingüística española* (pp. 167–189). Libros Pórtico.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns. *Applied Linguistics*, 5, 196–213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196>
- Borrego, J., Gómez Asencio, J., & Pérez Bowie, J. J. (1978). Sobre el *tú* y el *usted*. *Studia Philologica Salamanticensia*, 2, 53–67.
- Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848113>
- Briz, A. (2007). Para un análisis semántico, pragmático y sociopragmático de la cortesía atenuadora en España y América. *Lingüística española actual*, 29, 5–40.
- Brown, P., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 253–276). Wiley.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bustin-Lekeu, F. (1973). Tutoiement et vouvoiement chez les lycéens français. *The French Review*, 46, 773–782.
- Carrasco Santana, A. (2002). *Los tratamientos en el español*. Ediciones Colegio de España.
- Cintra, L. F. (1986). *Sobre as formas de tratamento na língua portuguesa*. Livros Horizonte. (Original work published 1972).
- Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language learning*, 31, 113–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1981.tb01375>
- Cohen, E., & Shively, R. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 189–212.
- Cook, M. (1997). Uma teoria de interpretação das formas de tratamento na língua Portuguesa. *Hispania*, 80, 451–464.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Companion volume*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Coveney, A. (2010). Vouvoiement and tutoiement: Sociolinguistic reflections. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 20, 127–150. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269509990366>
- Cyluk, A. (2013). Discourse completion task: Its validity and reliability in research projects on speech acts. *Anglica. An International Journal of English Studies*, 22, 101–112.
- De Jonge, B., & Nieuwenhuijsen, D. (2006). Formación del paradigma pronominal de las formas de tratamiento. In C. Company (Coord.), *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española* (pp. 1593–1672). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Denbaum, N. (2021). *Polymorphism of second person singular forms of address in Medellín, Colombia: Usage and language attitudes* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Indiana University.

- DiBartolomeo, M., Elias, V., & Jung, D. (2019). Investigating the effects of pragmatic instruction: A comparison of L2 Spanish compliments and apologies during short term study-abroad. *Letrônica, 12*, Article e33989. <https://doi.org/10.15448/1984-4301.2019.4.33989>
- Duarte, I. M. (2010). Formas de tratamento: Item gramatical no ensino do Português Língua Materna. In Brito A. M., (Org.). *Gramática: história, teorias, aplicações* (pp. 133–146). Universidade do Porto.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2007). Natural speech vs. elicited data. A comparison of natural and role play requests in Mexican Spanish. *Spanish in Context, 4*, 159–185.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C., & Hasler-Barker, M. (2015). Complimenting in Spanish in a short-term study abroad context. *System, 48*, 45–71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.006>
- Fontanella de Weinberg, B. (1999). Sistemas pronominales de tratamiento usados en el mundo hispánico. In I. Bosque & V. Demonte (Dirs.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (pp. 1401–1425). Espasa Calpe.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Ni tu ni vous*: Principes et paradoxes dans l'emploi des pronoms d'allocation en français contemporain. *Journal of French Language Studies, 1*, 139–155. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269500000958>
- González Lloret, M. (2008). “No me llames de usted, trátame de tú”: L2 address behavior development through synchronous computer-mediated communication [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Granvik, A. (2005). Formas de tratamiento e interferencia. Estudio sobre el uso de las formas de tratamiento españolas por parte de portugueses nativos residentes en Madrid. *Revista de Filología Románica, 24*, 221–250. <https://doi.org/10.5209/RFRM>
- Guigo, D. (1991). Les termes d'adresse dans un bureau parisien. *L'homme, 119*, 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.3406/hom.1991.369402>
- Guilherme, A., & Lara Bermejo, V. (2015). Quão cortês é você? O pronome de tratamento *você* em Português Europeu. *Labor Histórico, 12*, 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.24206/lh.v1i2.4801>
- Hammermüller, G. (1993). *Die Anrede im Portugiesischen. Eine sociolinguistische Untersuchung zu Anredekonventionem des gegenwärtigen europäischen Portugiesisch*. Nov Nver Verlag.
- Haverkate, H. (2004). *La cortesía verbal. Estudio pragmalingüístico*. Gredos.
- Havu, E. (2005). Noms et pronoms d'adresse en Français et en Finnois—comparaison des deux systèmes. *Modèles linguistiques, 52*, 83–97.
- Havu, E. (2006). *Quand les Français tutoient-ils?* [Paper presentation]. Actes du XVIe Congrès des Romanistes Scandinaves, Copenhague 25–27 août 2005. Copenhague et Roskilde. <https://researchportal.helsinki.fi/en/publications/quand-les-fran%C3%A7ais-tutoient-ils>
- Hernández, T. A. (2018). L2 Spanish apologies development during short-term study abroad. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 8*, 599–620. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2018.8.3.4>
- Hernández, T. A., & Boero, P. (2018). Explicit intervention for Spanish pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: An examination of learner request production and cognition. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*, 389–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2018.1459278>
- Hickey, L., & Vázquez Orta, I. (1990). El empleo de *tú* y *usted* en el discurso publipropagandístico. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada, 6*, 73–82.
- Hughson, J. (2003). *Tu et Vous*: Étude sociolinguistique dans la banlieue parisienne. In *Colloque Pronoms de 2e personne et formes d'adresse dans les langues d'Europe*. Instituto Cervantes de Paris. http://cvc.cervantes.es/obref/coloquio_paris/ponencias/pdf/cvc_hughson.pdf
- Isosävi, J. (2010). *Les formes d'adresse dans un corpus de films français et leur traduction en finnois* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of Helsinki.
- Ivanovska, B., Kusevska, M., Daskalovska, N. & Ulanska, T. (2016). On the reliability of discourse completion tests in measuring pragmatic competence in foreign language learners. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 25*, 437–443. <https://gssr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/5039>
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8*, 203–231.
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 215–247.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1992). *Les interactions verbales*. Colin.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (2005). *Politeness in France: How to buy bread politely*. In L. Hickey & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 29–44). Multilingual Matters.

- Kinginger, C., & Farrell, K. (2004). Assessing development of meta-pragmatic awareness in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 19–42. <https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v10i1.131>
- Lennertz Marcotulio, L. (2014). Formas de tratamento no português arcaico: Contribuições do teatro português quinhentista. *Confluência: Revista do Instituto da Língua Portuguesa*, 46, 157–200.
- Maingueneau, D. (1994). *L'énonciation en linguistique Française*. Hachette.
- Marsily, A. (2022). *La petición en español peninsular. Producción y percepción de la cortesía verbal en las estrategias de petición de hablantes nativos y francófonos de Bélgica* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Université Catholique de Louvain.
- Mas Álvarez, I. (2014). Formas de tratamiento y enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera. *RedELE*, 26, 85–101. <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/dam/jcr:f6a3c5fe-c300-4a6e-9491-8c3ca3602d52/2014-redele-26-06inmaculada-mas-lvarez-pdf.pdf>
- Mas Álvarez, I. (2021). Las formas de tratamiento en español: visión panorámica y sinóptica. In P. García Girao (Ed.), *Redefinir la enseñanza-aprendizaje del español* (pp. 191–208). Octaedro.
- Molina Martos, I. (2002). Evolución de las fórmulas de tratamiento en la juventud madrileña a lo largo del siglo XX: Un estudio en tiempo real. In F. Rodríguez González (Coord.), *El lenguaje de los jóvenes* (pp. 97–121). Ariel.
- Morris, K. J. (2017). *Learning by doing: The affordances of task-based pragmatics instruction for beginning L2 Spanish learners studying abroad* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of California, Davis.
- Navarro Gala, R. (2000). Una propuesta teórico-práctica para la enseñanza de las formas de tratamiento de segunda persona en las clases de ELE. In M. A. Martín Zorraquino & C. Díez Pelegrín (Eds.), *Actas del XI Congreso Internacional de ASELE. ¿Qué español enseñar?* (pp. 551–558). Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Nurani, L. M. (2009). Methodological issues in pragmatic research: Is DCT a reliable data collection instrument? *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, 17, 667–678.
- Paiva Raposo, E., Bacelar do Nascimento, M. F., Coelho da Mota, M. A., Segura, L., Mendes, A., & Andrade, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Gramática do Português* (Vol. 3). Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Quan, T. (2019). Competing identities, shifting investments, and L2 speaking during study abroad. *L2 Journal*, 11, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L20038633>
- Quesada Pacheco, M. A. (2010). Formas de tratamiento en Costa Rica y su evolución (1561–2000). In M. Hummel, B. Kluge, & M. E. Vázquez (Eds.), *Formas y fórmulas de tratamiento en el mundo hispánico* (pp. 647–699). El Colegio de México/Karl Franzens Universität.
- RAE & ASALE (2011). *Nueva gramática básica de la lengua española*. Espasa Libros.
- Ramos-González, N., & Rico-Martín, A. (2014). Análisis de la expresión de la cortesía en RTVE-Internacional para la enseñanza del español-lengua extranjera. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada*, 52, 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-48832014000100005>
- Rigatso, E. (2014). Cuestiones de variación lingüística en un sistema de tratamientos del español de la Argentina. El español bonaerense 2: Cambios momentáneos de tratamiento pronominal y esquemas innovadores. *Boletín de la Academia Argentina de Letras*, 79, 309–366.
- Sampedro Mella, M. (2016). *Las formas de tratamiento del español centro-norte peninsular actual: Estudio sociolingüístico*. Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Sampedro Mella, M. (2019). Variación en la cortesía en la expresión de la petición en el Español Castellano y el Portugués Europeo. *Textos en proceso. Revista de Lengua y Lingüística del Español*, 5, 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.17710/tep.2019.5.1.4sampedromella>
- Sampedro Mella, M. (2021). DCT vs. corpus orales: Reflexiones metodológicas sobre el estudio de los actos de habla. *Pragmalingüística*, 29, 337–395. <https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2021.i29.19>
- Sampedro Mella, M. (2022). «Usted podía dejar la lancha donde te diera la gana». Sobre la alternancia de las formas de tratamiento en el español centro-norte peninsular. *Oralia*, 25, 135–162. <https://doi.org/10.25115/oralia.v25i1.8391>
- Sampedro Mella, M., & Sánchez Gutiérrez, C. (2019). Formas de tratamiento y enseñanza de español lengua extranjera: Una propuesta de mejora. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada*, 13, 182–200. <https://doi.org/10.26378/rnlael1327331>
- Sanromán, B. (2006). *Las formas de tratamiento del Español peninsular actual. Los estudiantes de poblaciones gallegas*. XVI Congreso de Romanistas Escandinavos. Roskilde Universitet. <http://www.ruc.dk/cuid/publikationer/publikationer/XVI-SRK-Pub/SMO/SMO05-Sanroman>

- Schwenter, S. A. (1993). Diferenciación dialectal por medio de pronombres: Una comparación del uso de *tú* y *usted* en España y México. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 41, 127–149. <https://doi.org/10.24201/nrfh.v41i1.926>
- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1818–1835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.030>
- Silva, A. S. (2020). *Manual of standardization in the romance languages*. De Gruyter.
- Soler-Espiaba, D. (1996). Lengua y cultura españolas en el extranjero. In S. Montesa & P. Gomis (Eds.), *Tendencias actuales en la enseñanza del Español como lengua extranjera. Actas del V Congreso Internacional de ASELE* (pp. 199–208). Universidad de Málaga.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 91–112.
- Thomé-Williams, A. C. (2004). Sociolinguistic aspects of forms of address in Portugal and Brasil: *Tu* or *Você*. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13, 85–99. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.493.3811&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- van Compernelle, R. A., Gomez-Laich, M. P., & Weber, A. (2016). Teaching L2 Spanish sociopragmatics through concepts: A classroom-based study. *Modern Language Journal*, 100, 341–361. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12318>
- Villarreal, D. (2014). Connecting production to judgments: T/V address forms and the L2 identities of intermediate Spanish learners. *Journal of pragmatics*, 66, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.02.005>

Appendix 1

Demographic questions:

- Edad [age]:
- Sexo [gender]:
- Nacionalidad [Nationality]
- Lengua(s) materna(s) [L1(s)]:
- Titulación que está cursando [University major]:
- Tiempo de estudio de español [Period of time studying Spanish]:
- Tiempo residiendo en España [Period of time living in Spain]:
- ¿Has residido en algún otro país en el que se hable español? [Have you ever lived in another Spanish-speaking country?]

ITEMS OF THE DCT

1. Vas a comprar manzanas al mercado, pero no las encuentras. Pregúntale a la vendedora si tiene más en el almacén. [You go to the market to buy apples, but cannot find them. Ask the salesclerk if she has more in store.]
2. Has faltado al trabajo porque estás enfermo. Pídele al médico que te ha atendido en el hospital que te firme un justificante. [You have missed work because you are sick. Ask the doctor who examined you at the hospital to sign a doctor's note.]
3. Vas a dejar tu CV a una empresa y te atiende el responsable de recursos humanos, que es más joven que tú. Pídele una tarjeta de visita. [You go to the offices of a company to apply for a job, and give your CV to a Human Resources officer who is younger than you. Ask him for a business card.]
4. Encuentras a tu vecina, una mujer mayor, cargada con bolsas y decides ofrecerle tu ayuda. ¿Qué le dices? [You run into your neighbor, an elderly woman, carrying grocery bags and you decide to offer your help. What do you tell her?]
5. Encuentras un móvil en la calle y crees que pertenece a un hombre que anda por la zona. Pregúntale si el teléfono es de él. [You find a cellphone in the street and think that it belongs to a man who you have seen walking around. Ask him if the cellphone is his own.]
6. Estás en el ayuntamiento y te atiende una señora funcionaria. Te has equivocado en la fecha de tu impreso, ¿cómo le pides que la corrija? [You are in the town hall, being attended by a civil servant who is an older woman. You have inadvertently written a wrong date on a form. How would you ask her to correct it?]

7. Estás en la frutería donde siempre compras. Pídele a la vendedora que te recomiende algo para comprar. [You are at your usual fruit store. Ask the salesclerk to recommend you something to buy.]
8. El señor mayor con el que siempre hablas en el autobús ha dejado su cartera olvidada en el asiento y se la has guardado, ¿qué le dices cuando se la devuelves? [The elderly man with whom you always talk in the bus has left his wallet on his seat when he left the bus and you have kept the wallet. What would you tell him when you give it back to him?]
9. Acudes a urgencias por una lesión en un pie. Pídele a la médica que te recete unos calmantes, porque tienes mucho dolor. [You go to the emergency room due to a foot injury. Ask the [female] doctor to prescribe you some painkillers, as you are in a lot of pain.]
10. Has puesto un dato incorrecto haciendo un ingreso. ¿Cómo le pides a Pérez, empleado del banco a punto de jubilarse, que lo rehaga con la información correcta? [You have made a mistake when making a deposit at the bank. How would you ask Pérez, a bank clerk who is about to retire, to repeat the procedure with the correct information?]
11. Pregúntale al camarero si puede servirte el plato que quieres sin pimiento, porque eres alérgico. [Ask the [male] waiter if they can alter your dish by not including peppers, because you are allergic to them.]
12. Acudes a la óptica a comprarte gafas nuevas y la especialista que te atiende, más joven que tú, te muestra varios modelos, pero ninguno te convence. Pídele más opciones. [You go to the optician to buy new glasses and the clerk, who is a woman and is younger than you, shows you some models. You are not convinced by any of the ones she shows you. Ask her for more options.]
13. A la mujer que va andando delante de ti se le acaba de caer la bufanda y tú se la has recogido, ¿qué le dices al entregársela? [The woman who walks ahead of you in the street has just dropped her scarf and you have picked it up. What would you say when you give it back to her?]
14. Pregúntale al señor de la tienda donde siempre compras si tiene más cuadernos, porque ninguno te gusta. [Ask the salesclerk from your usual shop if he has different notebooks in store, because you do not like any of the ones you have seen in the shop.]
15. Pregúntale a la chica que limpia el portal de tu edificio si puede fregar delante de tu puerta, porque está bastante sucio. [Ask your building's cleaning lady to mop the floor in front of your door, because it is quite dirty.]
16. ¿Cómo le pides a tu farmacéutico de siempre, un señor mayor, que te recomiende algún medicamento para la gripe? [How would you ask your usual pharmacist, an elderly man, to recommend you some medicine for the flu.]