

Performing directives in Spanish:
The case of advice by Nicaraguan and Panamanian women
by
Ryan Platz

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2012 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Carmen García, Chair
Barbara Lafford
Álvaro Cerrón-Palomino

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2012

ABSTRACT

Although pragmatic analyses based on empirical data have been conducted throughout most of the Spanish-speaking world, Central America remains the most underrepresented region. This study examines the pragmatic strategies used by female Spanish speakers of Nicaragua and Panama in an advice-giving context. The data consists of eighteen role-plays recorded in Masaya, Nicaragua and Panama City, Panama in June and July of 2011. In the role-play situation, the interlocutor (fixed-role) requests advice from the participant, her best friend, regarding a serious issue in her marriage. The participant's advice-giving strategies are classified according to a categorization adapted from Blum-Kulka's request strategy taxonomy. This allows for a statistical analysis of how these strategies correspond to the three elements of Spencer Oatey's rapport management approach: behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional wants.

The results indicate strong similarities between participants from Nicaragua and Panama, both electing to respect all components of the association principle and to violate the equity principle, especially its autonomy control component. These results suggest that, at least in this advice-giving context between intimates, both Nicaraguan and Panamanian Spanish speakers prefer to impose their opinions and suggestions rather than respect the person's right to be treated fairly (i.e. equity principle) as well as to maintain a rapport-enhancing orientation rather than preserve their right to associate with others (i.e. association principle). The results of the pragmatic analysis show similarities with other research on directives in the Spanish-speaking world, including empirical studies in the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Venezuela and Spain. Specifically, these cultures are all associated with direct strategies and less mitigation, positive politeness,

conventional indirectness and high involvement.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this paper to Professor Carmen García. Her enlightening guidance, unparalleled experience and never-ending motivation have been an irreplaceable asset to my experience at ASU. This program wouldn't have been the same without her presence, nor would this thesis have been possible. ¡Mil gracias, Carmen!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data-collecting journey through Central America was a wonderful experience, as I must say that my love and respect for this beautiful, culturally diverse region grew with every interaction. I extend my thanks to the participants of this study and the hosts of the recording sites, especially the interlocutors, as their patience, cooperation and willingness helped make this all possible. I also appreciate the aid received during the transcription process provided by a few native speakers in ASU's Spanish department. Having realized early in this study that a thesis requires many types of support, I am incredibly thankful for my family, friends and loved ones who checked in with me, monitored my progress and offered encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Goal of the study	1
Statement of the problem	2
Purpose of the study	2
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Theoretical Framework	5
What is advice?	7
Directives in Spanish	8
Requests	9
Suggestions and Advice	18
Research Questions	21
3 METHODOLOGY	23
Subjects	23
Role play descriptions	24
Addressee subject pronoun expression	26
Data analysis	27
4 RESULTS & DISCUSSION	29
Strategies	29

CHAPTER

	Page
Behavioral Expectations	37
Face Sensitivities	43
Interactional Wants	46
Summary of Results	47
5 CONCLUSIONS	49
Differences and similarities with the Hispanic world.....	49
Limitations of the study	53
Future Research	54

REFERENCES

APPENDIX

A IRB Approval.....	58
B Instruments.....	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Behavioral Expectations	34
2. Face Sensitivities	39

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Goal of this study

The goal of this study is to analyze the strategies used by Spanish speakers of Panama and Nicaragua in a fixed advice-giving situation. The data will be compared to other empirical studies on Spanish speakers performing directives throughout the world, including Peru (García, 1993, 2002, 2005, 2009), Mexico (Curcó, 1998; Koike, 1998; Félix-Brasdefer, 2005), Uruguay (Márquez Reiter, 1997), Cuba (Ruzickova, 1998), Ecuador (Placencia 1998), Spain (Le Pair, 1996; Hernández Flores, 1999) and others. Due to the fact that this study only offers perspective on one gender, it will only provide a part of the empirical data that would be necessary to make justified comparisons; however, an insight into anything in Central American will prove useful for comparison to future data gathered. Beyond Félix-Brasdefer's (2009) study comparing request strategies in Mexican, Costa Rican and Dominican Spanish, there have been no pragmatic studies published on Central American Spanish speakers. Just as well, there exists a general lack of empirical studies on how Hispanics give advice, as most research on directives has consisted of requests and invitations. When placed within the pragmatic research on directives within the Hispanic world, the data from this study will offer perspective on the directive and advice-giving strategies used by Spanish speakers Nicaraguan and Panamanian societies.

Statement of the problem

Since initial colonization and language contact over five centuries ago, the natural linguistic evolution of Spanish in the new world has yielded much variation, including contrasting and congruent pragmatic systems. Social factors such as immigration, urbanization, nationalism, and now, inevitably, the media, have certainly contributed to this pragmatic variation within the Hispanic world. The participants from Panama and Nicaragua are speaker of the same language only a few hundred miles apart from each other, however the cultural and political histories of these people are completely different. The sociopragmatic variation between the two countries and the rest of the Hispanic world will be indicators of these varying societal circumstances. Consistent with García's (2008) conjecture that "interest in intralingual regional pragmatic variation (Placencia 1994, 1998; Márquez Reiter & Placencia, 2005) is on the rise" (p. 269), this study analyzes the differences between Nicaraguan and Panamanian pragmatic strategies in giving advice, providing empirical evidence to construct comparable hierarchies of social norms, levels of directness and preferred politeness strategies.

Purpose of this study

The purpose of this study is to perform a pragmatic analysis of the advice giving strategies used by Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants in a role play situation. The findings will be compared to the world of research on Hispanic pragmatics on performing directives. Although not exhaustive, the review of literature provided in the following section does convey the pragmatic variation

that exists throughout Spain and Latin America. This same variation most likely exists within Central America, as well, although until now empirical evidence of the sort does not exist. This study serves to fill the regional gap in the literature on pragmatic variation within two of the six Spanish-speaking nations in Central America. The empirical studies on directives throughout Latin America that were discussed in the literature review represent a majority of the most studied nations, namely Mexico, Spain, Peru, Argentina, Cuba, Uruguay, Venezuela and Ecuador.

As for Nicaragua and Panama, the political histories since *La conquista* and the different indigenous worlds must have developed complex systems of sociopragmatic communication strategies. The political evolutions of both countries in this study have been quite different since the exploration of the New World began and specifically in the 19th century. Nicaragua became part of the *República Federal de Centro América* during its creation in 1821, later becoming absolved by the *Imperio México* for almost two decades. Shortly after, Nicaragua created its own independent state in 1838, but its liberals from León and conservatives from Granada have continued in governmental feuds, possibly creating a more differentiated or at least skeptical society than in Panama. After winning independence from Spain in 1821, the Panamanians were officially a department of Bolívar's *República de Colombia*. The economy thrived from independence at the dawn of the 20th century with independence and, of course, the Panama Canal. It is the hope of this study that the advice strategies of the speakers in this study will show that these varying political and societal circumstances have developed different pragmatic norms. This will enable us to

be able to compare how Nicaraguans and Panamanians perform a directive with the rest of the Spanish-speaking world. The next section will discuss the definition of advice and directives, review empirical studies throughout the Hispanic world on performing directives, examines some of the differences found between Peninsular and Latin American pragmatics, and will discuss the contrasting use of *tú* and *vos* in Panama and Nicaragua.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Framework

This study uses Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach to analyze the participants' strategies used in giving advice. According to Spencer-Oatey, communication is successful (or not) in human interactions based on the behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional wants of the interlocutors. Behavioral expectations are social norms, the society's prescribed behavior of a particular communicative activity and setting, and are based on the relationship between the two interlocutors. Within these norms, Spencer-Oatey defines different domains, including: the illocutionary domain, which is concerned with the production of different speech acts; the discourse domain, dealing with the "content and structure of an interchange including topic choice, and the organization and sequencing of information" (p. 99); the participation domain, the analysis of discourse markers such as pauses, overlaps, interruptions and turn-taking, highlighting the "procedural aspects of an interchange" (p. 99); the stylistic domain, emphasizing the speakers' choice of tone, address forms and honorifics; the nonverbal domain, considering notions like gestures and eye contact.

These behavioral expectations are yielded from contextually dependent interactional principles, namely the equity principle (person's right to be treated fairly and not imposed upon) and the association principle (people's right to associate with others). Under the equity principle, three components are listed:

wcost-benefit, stating that people should not be exploited or disadvantaged; fairness-reciprocity, the principle that there should be a fair balance between these costs and benefits; autonomy-control, maintaining that people should not be unduly controlled or imposed upon (p. 100). The association principle also consists of three separate components: involvement, the principle that there should be an appropriate of involvement and types of involvement between people; empathy, sustaining that one should share one's concerns, feelings and interests with others; respect, the principle of being respectful and showing appropriate amounts of respects to others.

The rapport-management approach defines respectability face and identity face as distinct. The concept of respectability face pertains to the prestige and honor that a person or social group maintains within the community, reflecting different characteristics such as social status indicators, personal reputation, relational attributes and biographical variables. Identity face, represented in Spencer-Oatey's model by one's performance/skills, bodily features and control, possessions and belonging, and social behavior, is based on Goffman's (1967) notion of face, or the "positive social values that [people] associate with their various self-aspects." Due to the nature of the current study's role play situation, i.e. advice-giving between close friends, only the relational wants are relevant when analyzing the pragmatic strategies used by the participants.

A third and final component of this rapport-management approach is defined as interactional wants, which can either be transactional or relational. Relational goals aim at the management of an effective relationship, while

transactional wants are task oriented, although its success might depend on the management of a relational goal, yielding a certain level of interconnectedness.

After organizing the strategies within each of these three components, their statistical distributions will be analyzed in order to yield a conclusion on how both Nicaraguans and Panamanians give advice.

What is advice?

When defining advice as a speech act, the purpose of its use as a directive is to influence the intentional behavior of the hearer in such a way that the latter carries out the action specified by the proposition (Haverkate, 2002, p. 7-8). This action's result (or agreement thereof) fits into Searle's (1976) taxonomy of speech as *world to words*, whereas the directive speaker attempts to get the hearer to modify the world in accordance with the words uttered. Based on empirical data and varying methodologies, the pragmatic studies of the Hispanic world analyze directives, assertives, commissives and expressives. García (2009) notes there still exists a need for more research among Hispanists in both empirical and theoretical work. The current study analyzes empirical data and places Nicaraguans and Panamanians within the continuum of pragmatic research in the Hispanic world.

Bravo (1996) uses the concepts of *autonomy* and *affiliation* to compare the differences among interactions in a cross-cultural study between Swedish and Spanish businessmen. The latter is the equivalent of *confianza* in the Hispanic world. Fitch (1994) found that more *confianza* resulted in privileges and advice-

giving rites, compiling an ethnographic study of advice giving strategies in Colombia. Hernández-Flores (1999) describes this concept by maintaining that it appears

" because the interactants have a close relationship that allows them to speak openly; in other words, *confianza* provides an open and friendly background for expressing personal ideas, in this case, for expressing advice" (p. 42).

The current study's role plays requires that the two participants be best friends and have a close relationship, creating a context that would yield much *confianza* and a comfortable situation in which to express advice or make a suggestion. The next section reviews the empirical research on pragmatic strategies used to perform different directives throughout the Spanish-speaking world, takes a look at differences in second person singular pronoun usage between Nicaragua and Panama, and compares the strategies used when performing directives in Peninsular and Latin American Spanish.

Directives in Spanish

In terms of language evolution, the diverse social hierarchies and histories of the different Latin American countries have produced heterogeneous sets of pragmatic norms. When advising, suggesting, inviting, offering, and requesting, i.e. performing a directive, the listener's interpretation and illocutionary force of

the utterance is very culture dependent. The current study uses Spencer Oatey's (2005) rapport management model for analysis. In order to place the strategies of the participants from Nicaragua and Panama correctly among the other studies, a review of the pragmatic studies throughout the Hispanic world is necessary. The next section will review the literature on performing a directive in Spanish, including research on requests, suggestions and advice.

Requests

García (1993) examined request strategies in Peru, using Brown & Levison's (1987) theory of solidarity and deference politeness to study how participants make requests for a service as well as respond to them. The strategies used were categorized into head acts and supportive moves based on Blum-Kulka's (1989) model. In making the request, both genders preferred deferential strategies rather than solidarity strategies, although the men (83%) preferred them slightly less than the women (90%). However, in responding to requests, the male participants completely reversed their strategies, split between solidarity (52%) and deferential (48%) in the same context. The female participants reversed preferences and increased their use of solidarity strategies (92%), perhaps feeling the need to be more amicable and protect their positive face. García's research indicates that Peruvians prefer deference over camaraderie in requesting, but when responding to requests, they prefer to establish camaraderie with the interlocutor.

Investigating Mexican Spanish speakers studying abroad at a public university in the United States, Félix-Brasdefer (2005) examined the head acts and supporting moves while performing a request. All participants were part of ten role plays, five of which were designed for the experiment and the other five distracters. These situations were classified according to the three politeness systems described by Scollon and Scollon (2001): hierarchical (+Power, +Distance), deferential (-Power, +Distance), and solidarity (-Power, -Distance). When requesting in a +Power or +Distance context, the ten participants tended to use conventionally indirect strategies; however, they preferred directness while making a request to an interlocutor of -Distance. The author links these results with Blum-Kulka's (1987) notion that there exists a connection between conventional indirectness and politeness. Reflecting on the tendencies of his participants' strategies, Félix-Brasdefer (2005) confirms that

“(...) at least for the current study, conventionally indirect requests increased levels of deferential politeness and were used to express respect of distance between the interlocutors.” (p. 76)

García (2002) found differences between Venezuelan men and women while making a request using Brown & Levinson's (1987) theoretical framework. While the women used more supporting moves than head acts, making their requests less abrupt and overbearing, the men used many different head acts. This created a more forceful request, which could be interpreted as taking a stronger

position than the women. The men decidedly preferred solidarity politeness over deferential, whereas the women only slightly preferred deferential politeness, exemplifying their respect as well their camaraderie.

When looking at all head acts and supporting moves combined, the women's strategies were more deferential and/or mitigating (72%) than the men's (50%). All potential face threats were to the negative face, as both genders used the same percentage of strategies to threaten the interlocutor's face and their own. This indicates that the men were at the same time deferential and overbearing, which could have threatened the face of the interlocutor.

Using the same categorization of speech acts as García, Ruzickova (1998) analyzed 124 naturally occurring requests recorded in Havana, Cuba. The author defines these service encounters as "request interactions in which customers are requesting a product, service, or information from servers such as employees in a bus station, post office library, or a pizza stand" (p. 215). This corpus of spontaneous data was marked by conventionally indirect strategies (50.8% of the total strategies), namely suggestive formulas and query preparators. Ruzickova categorizes the nature of these strategies as consistent with Spaniards, Argentineans and Uruguayans, although the Cubans are the least inclined to make use of a conventionally indirect strategy when compared to speakers of Spain (79.8%), Uruguay (68%) and Argentina (60%). The Cuban men were slightly more indirect than the women, as female strategy selection was unpredictable; however, the females were less restricted and not as concerned with being polite.

Ruzickova's (1998) findings confirm that not all cultures value negative face more than positive, adding Cubans to the list of "friendly back slapping cultures", along with Spaniards, Mexicans, Venezuelans, and Uruguayans. The author explains that Cubans do not maintain social distance nor are they concerned about appearing rude or offending by being too familiar. They do not feel the need to minimize face loss because they don't see this risk as particularly high. Based on this data, it's more important in the Cuban culture to maintain positive face and preserve positive self-image than to impede on other's actions or freedoms.

Márquez Reiter (1997) investigated the differences and similarities between British English and Uruguayan Spanish speakers when making a request. The data was collected via discourse completion tests based on Blum-Kulka et al's (1989) Cross Cultural Speech Act Realisation Project (CCSARP). While comparing the two cultures' request-making strategies, there was a clear preference by the Uruguayans for negative politeness, while the English speakers preferred positive politeness. In both languages, interrogatives were the most used strategy in requesting, slightly more frequent in British English than Uruguayan Spanish (86% vs. 68%). There was also a difference in the use of imperatives, as Uruguayans made more use of them (29%) than the British (10%).

The author addresses the use of modal verbs in both Spanish in English, noting that the general use of modals could indicate tentativeness and even lack of commitment. The frequent use of modal verbs in English provides a *detachment device* for its speakers, or a means for them to "distance themselves from the

requestive act by means of the form's inherent pragmatic ambiguity" (p. 163). These different constructions in English using modal verbs (i.e. the conditional) while making a request are equivalent to the present indicative of Spanish; however, both interrogative-negatives and conditionals are used in their respective languages for the same reason: to reduce the risk of losing face. The author uses Hall's (1976) distinction of high-context and low-context cultures, designating Uruguay as high-context culture in which "the expression of feelings is emphasized" (p. 165). British culture is categorized as low-context, in which stored information is less stable. This distinction is crucial in terms of intercultural communication, as the expectations of a person raised in a high-context culture are normally much higher than those raised in a low-context culture (Hall, 1976).

Focusing on pragmatic variation with Spanish, Félix-Brasdefer (2009) conducted an analysis and comparison of Dominican, Mexican and Costa Rican request strategies. Data was collected *in situ* from the 54 male university participants via role plays, with each situation reflecting symmetric situations of power yet different degrees of distance. The author categorized the participants' head acts as direct, conventionally indirect or non-conventionally indirect, but also analyzed the different internal modifiers used called *downgraders*, including syntactic, lexical and a preliminary analysis of prosodic downgraders. The data from all speakers resulted in seven different strategies for making a request, as the imperative and query-preparator were the most common. However, after requesting initially, all three groups showed an affinity towards impositives in

their post-initial requests, primarily accomplished with imperatives. In fact, Félix-Brasdefer found this to be consistent throughout his data, in general, writing “direct forms were conditioned by the situation and by the sequential environment of the interaction, namely the initial request vs. the post-initial requests (insistence-request sequence)” (p. 503).

The strategies used by Mexicans and Costa Ricans were similar to what García (1993) found in Peru, as there was a preference for deferential politeness in symmetric situations. The Dominicans’ strategies pertained more to those found in Venezuela (García, 2002) and Spaniards (Le Pair, 1996), showing more involvement and a preference for camaraderie. All three groups preferred the conditional/imperfect and downtoners as downgraders, conveying deference and politeness in conventionally indirect requests. By using more lexical and syntactic downgraders, the Costa Ricans (and to a lesser extent, the Mexicans) performed more tentative and deferential requests. The Costa Ricans also performed more requests per interaction in general (6.83) than both the Mexicans (5.17) and the Dominicans (4.28). Félix-Brasdefer (2009) uses Scollon and Scollon’s (2001) notion of *independence* and *involvement* face to distinguish between the three cultures. The Dominican participants used many direct strategies and didn’t use many internal modifiers (*involvement face*), while the Mexicans and Costa Ricans made frequent use of various internal modifiers and used strategies that maintained at least some degree of independence (*independent face*).

Comparing the different strategies and levels of directness and formality used within Spanish and Ecuadorian societies, Placencia (1998) studied requests

made through a telephone service. The two cultures reflect different levels of directness when answering the phone and when identifying themselves. As the speakers from Ecuador tended to be less direct in both their requests and responses, the Spaniards utilized a larger variety of strategies and a more direct approach. The results indicate that, in requesting that the hearer either waits or self-identifies himself, speakers from Spain were more likely to use the imperative and not soften the impositions, as it was not seen to be threatening to the hearer. The participants from Ecuador used mitigating strategies during the interactions, such as the diminutive (*-ito*), and the tag-question *¿no?* and *por favor*. Placencia (1998) concluded that the notion of what defines an imposition in these two groups of speakers is very different. While the Ecuadorians preferred mitigation, a marked hierarchy system, to not be impeded and to use more deferential strategies, the Spaniards behaved more openly regarding their personal information. The author concluded that these behaviors are most likely a reflection of what would happen in similar contexts because this society is familiar with these norms; however, perhaps with a more serious request, the participants might have felt the need to be more direct, as the same verb forms and strategies are still used and available in both cultures.

In Buenos Aires, García (2005) analyzed the request strategies of 10 male and 10 female Argentinians using Blum-Kulka et al's (1989) head act/supporting move categorization and Brown and Levinson's (1987) theoretical framework. The participants took part in a role play with a fixed interlocutor, with their task being to request that their neighbor give English lessons to their child. García

explains that, while making the request, the Argentinians didn't utilize a large number of strategies in general, with the majority being supporting moves (71%) rather than head acts (29%). Upon responding to the request, there was a fair amount of negotiation in which the participants discussed the specifics of the lessons (date, time, cost, etc...) and the language teaching abilities of the neighbor (experience, methodology, credentials, etc...), i.e. if the neighbor could fulfill the request in the future. Throughout this negotiation, as well as during the request, the Argentinians preferred strategies of solidarity politeness and exclusively mitigators as supporting moves. The males were more stern in their requests than the females, as the females preferred to find an equilibrium between respect and deference. The author explains that the most significant gender difference was that the women used more strategies of agreement and approval during the actual request than the negotiation, whereas the men behaved the opposite in these two phases of the interaction. Despite these differences, the male and female participants both preferred strategies that would threaten their own face rather than the interlocutor's. These results indicate that, while making a request, Argentinians have a preference to protect the positive face of both the interlocutor and themselves.

The conventionally indirect request strategies used by Spanish speakers of Uruguay and Spain were compared by Márquez Reiter (2003). Participants took part in six non-descriptive, open role play situations of everyday social settings. The results indicated that the Uruguayans preferred much more external modification than the Spaniards, with their primary function being to downgrade.

The Uruguayans also expressed a higher level of tentativeness, although this could be explained by the higher level of formality in their cultures' different formulaic expressions. These longer and more formal expressions, along with a wider range of precursors and combinations the like, distinguish the Uruguayan participants from the Spanish and summarizes the main differences in requesting between these two cultures. The author writes that this study provides more evidence against the notion that Spaniards are more abrupt and intrusive, supporting the "negative correlation found between social distance or familiarity and indirectness" (p. 176).

Le Pair (1996) examined the cross-cultural differences in making a request between third year non-native speakers (NNS) of Spanish (i.e. native Dutch speakers) and native speakers from Spain. The participants consisted of 20-25 year old university language students in Spain and the Netherlands, the majority being female (75%). Data collection was conducted through a discourse completion test based on Blum-Kulka et al's (1989) CCSARP. Participants were asked to provide a response to twelve different contexts, as each reflected different levels of power, distance and situational setting. The results showed Spaniards as more direct, preferring imperatives, obligation statements and want statements much more than the NNS. The Dutch participants made use of many of the conventionalized strategies used by the native speakers, suggesting that "conventional indirectness is a kind of strategy that is shared by both cultures" (p. 668). Examining the nature of the NNS's conventionally direct strategies, Le Pair concludes that the NNS put much more effort in not sounding offensive, as they

chose safer and less face-threatening communication strategies. The results also indicated that Spaniards tended to use more face-saving strategies in situations of +Distance. This data was to be compared to the author's future study of native Dutch speakers in these same contexts, where Le Pair will continue this study and compare NS and NNS of Spanish and Dutch.

Suggestions and Advice

Suggestions and advice are some of the least studied speech acts in the world of Hispanic pragmatics, although there do exist a few empirical analyses. Bordería-García (2006) compared the advice giving strategies of Spaniards and Americans through a perception questionnaire and role plays. The questionnaire on different advice giving strategies did not produce a significant difference in preference, but clear distinction in directness was made between the two cultures during discourse. The 30 Spanish speakers had a strong preference for direct advice when orally participating in the role plays. This result was in contrary to the Americans' choice to be non-conventionally indirect. The Spaniards preferred to be non-conventionally indirect after already giving the advice, in either a direct or conventionally indirect manner.

Hernández-Flores (1999) analyzed Spaniards giving advice in a colloquial setting. The conversations that were analyzed revealed two examples in which advice is indeed a non face-threatening speech act, where "the first example serves to flatter; in the second one, to help" (p. 47), questioning Brown & Levinson's (1987) idea that advice necessarily threatens the hearer's face.

Although this study was more critical and theoretical in nature, it only includes two conversations in its analysis. The author conveys that in the colloquial setting, Spaniards welcome and encourage advice from others participating in the discourse. Participation in the conversation and maintaining the well-being of other speakers can create more solidarity. The results indicated that within Spanish culture there is decidedly a different focus on the relationship between the individual and her/his group.

In terms of morphology and syntax, suggestions can take many different forms and may appear identical to advice. Koike (1998) proposes that suggestions are potentially face-threatening, as the speaker is impeding the interlocutor upon expressing an idea that they believe better than others. A suggestion can be defined as an opinion combined with a directive, as Koike's (1998) study reveals in the analysis of pragmatic behavior of participants in Mexico. The data used was based on interactions of a Mexican professor offering suggestions to an assistant, yielding many different ways to suggest and offer advice. The professor used diminutives, markers of doubt, mitigating strategies, intonation and the conditional. Although personal references instead of generic references (“lo que yo hago” vs. “lo que se hace”, *what I do* vs. *what is done*) were used, there was a tendency to depersonalize the suggestion strategy with the impersonal pronoun *se* (“se puede hacer un repaso”, *a review can be done*).

The author found that by carefully making suggestions accompanied by praise and enthusiasm, the professor could encourage the assistant to better their situation by identifying their own errors. These suggestions were by no means

interpreted as a threat to the hearer's face, contradicting the view of Brown and Levinson (1987) that all directives are inherently face-threatening due to the imposition it places on the hearer.

Upon discovering how Spaniards might use advice to express self-identity and enrich the conversation, Hernández-Flores (1999) proposes a neutral categorization of face using Bravo's (1996) concepts of *affiliation* and *autonomy*, as well as including *self-affirmation* and *confianza*. In her research of Spanish colloquial interactions, Hernández-Flores writes that

“acts such as offering (directive) and complimenting (expressive) have good social consideration; [...] On the other hand, being disapproved of, a potential threat to positive face, occurs often in Spanish colloquial conversations. Disapproval becomes evident through the high controversy that may arise in discussions; yet, controversy is appreciated because it shows engagement with the conversation” (p. 39)

While analyzing the strategies of over 100 university students from Mexico City and Barcelona, Curcó (1998) used Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) model to analyze the effects of the imperative, diminutives, and negation, finding that Mexicans prefer to protect their own positive face more than Spaniards. Research has indicated that, of all Hispanic cultures, Spaniards have a preference for conventionalized indirectness, sometimes being perceived as very direct and rude by non-Peninsular speakers (Recuero, 2005). When giving advice,

making a request or performing any directive, this conventionalized indirectness can be interpreted as abrupt. In fact, the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer is subject to the hearer's interpretation, and this could lead to different types of communication failure, i.e. advice is interpreted as a command.

Perhaps this is the reason that the communication strategies of Spaniards have been the subject of many cross-cultural comparisons, including Uruguay (Márquez Reiter, 2002), Ecuador (Placencia, 1998), and Mexico (Curcó, 1998), as well as non-Spanish speaking societies like the United Kingdom (Vázquez Orta, 1995) and Scandinavia (Fant, 1989). Spaniards are grouped with Mediterranean and Middle Eastern cultures (Recuero, 2005), generally using less mitigations, markers of tentativeness and show less tolerance for indirectness. Latin American Spanish is not homogeneous by any means, but some of these general differences distinguish its varieties from its European counterparts.

Research Questions

This study hopes to shed light on some of the lesser-studied cultures within the Spanish-speaking world, as Félix-Brasdefer (2009) notes in his cross-cultural comparison that “several national languages in Spanish remain to be investigated (e.g. Paraguay, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama)” (p. 506). Previous studies on directives in different Hispanic cultures have resulted in many heterogeneous systems of politeness and social norms, and this diversity should certainly be found in Nicaraguan and Panamanian societies. The research questions for this study are as follows:

1. Will Panamanian and Nicaraguan female Spanish speakers differ in their request-making strategies?
2. With what other Hispanic cultures do the directive strategies of the female Nicaraguans and Panamanians have the most similarities?
3. Comparatively, where will the participants from both two cultures fit into the Hispanic pragmatic continuum?

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses some background information on the recording sites and participants of the study and the role-play descriptions given to the participants before recording. The differences between the use of *tú* and *vos* in Nicaragua and Panama reviewed, followed by a brief discussion of the analytical methods that will be used to compare the current study's data with other empirical studies.

Participants

The recordings that provided the data for this study were conducted in the summer of 2011 at various sites. A total of eighteen conversations, nine recordings from each country, provided the data for this study's analysis. The female participants were primarily recruited on a volunteer basis, although a few were found through social networking and "snowballing" through friends. In order to participate, the recruits had to have lived the majority of their lives in the local area and speak Spanish as their primary language. The participants were read the intentions of the study as well as the researcher's expectations.

The Nicaraguan role plays took place in Masaya, a town of 150,000 inhabitants and the third most populous in the country. All Nicaraguan participants were born in either Masaya or the capital, Managua, except for one participant who was born in Juigalpa, a town of 70,000 people situated 140 km east of Managua. The ages of the 11 females that participated from Nicaragua

ranged from 20-35 years old. All but one of the participants from Nicaragua attended some sort of training after high school. Their professions were quite diverse, including a teacher at the university, two receptionists, several lawyers, a real estate agent and two accountants.

In Panama, the participants were recorded in the *Casco Antiguo* district of Panama City and on the campus of the *Universidad de Panamá*. The 19 participants from Panama had an age range of 18-31. The majority of the Panamanian participants were students at the University and all but two had previously attended school after their secondary education. One participant was a journalist, another was a receptionist as well as a bartender, and the other two worked at a hotel. Although there was no sociolinguistic element to this study, the groups from Nicaragua and Panama differ in their participants' professions; however, the general educational level amongst them is quite level, providing enough homogeneity to be able to compare their advice-giving strategies. Upon agreeing to participate, the participants were administered an information sheet for them to provide general demographic information about themselves. The role-plays were recorded in isolated settings where the participants could focus on their situation. Before recording, the researcher clarified the participant's role one last time before leaving the room so that the role-play could proceed.

Role-play descriptions

Recruits for this study were instructed that they would be participating in a role-play as the best friend of another person. In Nicaragua, there was only one

interlocutor for all recording situations because all recording took place on one day at the same site; in Panama, three different interlocutors were used, as the recordings occurred on separate days in different parts of the city. The interlocutor and participant were chosen and given a card with the corresponding role description:

Interlocutor: Ud. sospecha que su esposo de 4 años la está engañando. Ud. recibe llamadas de teléfono sospechosas, él nunca regresa a casa temprano después del trabajo, y además cuando regresa, huele a un perfume que Ud. no usa. Para complicar esta situación, Ud. acaba de descubrir que está embarazada, pero todavía no le ha dicho nada a su esposo. Ud. no quiere destrozarse su matrimonio porque quiere mucho a su esposo y también por el bebé, pero no sabe cómo abordar la situación. Su mejor amiga sabe del embarazo y es la única con la que Ud. puede hablar de todo esto. Ud. la ve y le habla.

Participant: Su mejor amiga está embarazada y Ud. es la única que sabe. Ud. se encuentra con ella y ella le habla de una difícil situación por la que está atravesando. Respóndale.

The participants were left to complete the role-play in an area where there would be less distractions and they could focus on their different roles. As can be seen from the two role descriptions, the situation would require that one of

them give the other advice on a serious issue. The interlocutor that requested the advice was a fixed role, as only the advice giving strategies of the participant were analyzed.

Addressee subject pronoun expression

Throughout its development, Latin American Spanish has been subject to a competition between *tú* and *vos* for the second person singular non-deferential pronoun. Penny (1991) attributes the pronoun distinctions to the two different types of cultural relationships that the New World nations maintained with the Spanish crown from the Golden Age to the eighteenth century:

“Mexico, Peru and Bolivia came to prefer *tú*, as did the Caribbean islands and most of Venezuela; it can now be added that in those areas most culturally ‘distant’ from Spain (e.g. Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, the Central American states) *vos* came to dominate” (p. 125)

As for the Spanish of Nicaragua, Lipski (1994) writes that only *vos* (conjugated *decí, hablás, tenés, etc...*) and *usted* exist as second person pronouns; use of *tú* has practically disappeared among all social classes (p. 313). In other countries, including Colombia, Ecuador, and Costa Rica, *tú* and *vos* coexist in a “complex sociolinguistic relationship” (Penny, 1991, p. 125). The Nicaraguan participants of this study exclusively used *vos*, while only one of the Panamanian participants addressed the interlocutor as *vos*. Most of the verbal forms and

explicit subject expressions in Panama were *tú*, consistent with the norm in that society.

Panama exhibits much variation and represents a transitional region in terms of pronoun expression. Rural Panamanians have been known to address even family and close friends as *usted*, where most residents of Panama City use the standard *tú/usted* distinction (Lipski, 1994, p. 322). In the Azuero peninsula and near the bordering region with Costa Rica, some speakers still maintain a *vos/usted* distinction; however, the conjugations correspond to *vosotros* conjugations and the *vos* conjugations (*hablá(s)*, *coméi(s)*, *etc...*) in Costa Rica, Chile, and parts of Colombia (p. 321). As a result of the different pronoun norms established in Nicaragua and Panama, pragmatic analysis and comparison of *tú* and *vos* usage is challenging. One society varies greatly between the three pronouns and the other has developed into a fixed *vos/usted* system. Since all participants in Nicaragua used exclusively *vos* and all except one in Panama used *tú*, there is no need for pragmatic analysis of the subject pronouns, as practically no variation was recorded.

Data Analysis

The audio recordings were transcribed and the advice-giving strategies were adapted from Blum-Kulka et al.'s (1989) request strategies. This was the base for the categorization of the strategies because requests, also considered a directive, are by far the most studied directive in Hispanic pragmatics. Previous research that has used Spencer Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach (e.g.

García, 2009) was consulted in order to correctly organize the advice-giving strategies. The participants' strategies will be categorized based on their upholding or violation of each of the three elements of rapport management, i.e. Behavioral Expectations, Face Sensitivities, and Interactional Wants. This will in turn be analyzed using the proportions and difference in proportions tests. These tests will yield Z values that pertain to particular (e.g. 95%, 99%) significance levels and will be crucial in the assumptions we make that allow for pragmatic comparison.

Chapter 4

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

In this section, the participants' advice-giving strategies are exemplified and analyzed according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. Most strategies were used by both groups, although six of the 25 strategies were explicitly used by only either Nicaraguan or Panamanian participants.

Strategies

The female participants from both Nicaragua and Panama used many different strategies while giving advice. In this section, examples of these request strategies are provided along with a brief description of each. The interlocutor is represented by the letter *I* and the participant is represented by a number and a letter, e.g. P7 denotes participant 7 from Panama.

1. Suggestory Statement - Participants from both countries made use of the verb *deber* but in the conditional form, altering the illocutionary force from an obligation (i.e. *debes de...*) to a suggestion (i.e. *deberías de...*).

N3: Bueno, para mí, lo fundamental es la comunicación. **Deberías de platicar con él**, a ver si de verdad te está engañando, si pretende seguir con eso.

2. Obligation Statement – Both Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants attempted to obligate the interlocutor to follow their advice with verbs like *deber* in the present tense and *tener que*.

I: Y si me está engañando?

N4: Pues... vos no vas a pasar sufriendo, tampoco. **Tenés que pensar también en vos y en tu bebé.**

1: Pues voy a hablar con él.

3. Opinion Statement – With verbs like *creer* and *pensar*, many participants chose to express opinions about the situation in order to actually solicit or facilitate giving the advice.

P15: **Pienso que la mejor manera de esto es hablarlo con tu esposo**, de la situación, de que ha sentido que te está engañando, y hacer no más un vínculo familiar entre ambos.

I: Ay amiga, sabes de todo.

4. Impersonal Statement - Rather than refer directly to the interlocutor, some participants chose to use impersonal statements when providing advice.

P13: Unos tienen mejor suerte que otros, y es así. Pero la vida continúa, **hay que seguir hallando para adelante.**

I: Ay, gracias niña. Es una situación, pero... Voy a tener que enfrentar y seguir adelante.

5. Requesting Confirmation - Although more so in Nicaragua than Panama, participants requested confirmation on previously stated information in order to clarify information and aid their decision in what type of advice to give.

I: Pero yo no puedo comprobar que me está engañando, o sea, yo pienso.

N5: **Entonces tu mayor preocupación es que, no es porque estás embarazada, sino porque te está engañando.**

I: Sí.

6. Expressing Optimism - A few participants found it necessary to cheer up their friend in this unfortunate situation, expressing a general optimism about the future and its possibilities.

I: Vos crees?

N2: Cuando se dé cuenta que está embarazada, **tal vez cambie su actitud al engañando.**

I: A ver, hablo con él hoy. Sí,

7. Statement of Fact – Establishing general facts that pertain to the situation was important to a few of the participants. This helped them justify their advice and could have been used to make the interlocutor realize certain information that she had not already considered.

I: Entonces no sé qué voy a hacer porque no le he dicho que estoy embarazada. ¿Qué pensás?

N6: Pues yo creo que depende mucho como una mujer. **Tiene el derecho tomar las decisiones que, de lo que sea.**

8. Participation Shift – Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants put themselves in the situation themselves, using the imperfect subjunctive and conditional with statements such as “*si fuera yo...*”, exemplifying themselves in the same context.

I: Y tú sabes que no puedo contarle a nadie porque no tengo confianza, y la única que tengo eres tú. Qué puedo hacer en este caso?

P5: Tienes que pensarlo también por el bebé. Bueno, **yo te hablaría por mí. Si fuera yo, yo creo que yo le dejaría.**

9. Imperative – Verbs in the imperative form were very common, as many of the participants even used imperatives in consecutive turns.

P2: Si tú quieres este chiquillo, **apártate** de ese cueco.

I: Exacto.

P2: **Apártate** de ese idiota y **sigue** tu vida de tu hijo.

10. Requesting Information – Clarification was important for the participants to provide good advice for their friend. Many participants requested information to enlighten their decision making in this process.

I: Pues, qué pensás?

N11: **Y cuántos meses de embarazo tenés?**

I: Dos.

N11: Ah haaa....

11. Offering Comfort/Support – When the interlocutor described the situation to the participants, many felt the gravity of the situation and expressed comfort and offered support to their friend.

I: Muchas gracias amiga, te quiero. Voy a tratar de hacerla con la ayuda de Dios.

P9: **Sí, siempre estoy aquí para ayudarte.**

12. Signaling Comprehension – A few participants signaled comprehension as the interlocutor described the situation, demonstrating their involvement and that they cared about what the interlocutor was saying.

I: Todo va a ser así.

P13: **Sí entiendo.**

I: Mejor que no afecte al bebé. Qué decisión tomarías?

13. Accusing 3rd party – Upon hearing the details of the situation, some participants blamed the interlocutor's husband for the situation and based their advice on this accusation.

I: Pero si compruebo que me engaña, qué crees que debo hacer?

N4: Pues esperáte, porque si él lo hizo la primera vez, **se equivocó** y sabe y va a ser el único padre para tu hijo para, para crecer.

14. Grounder – Both Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants used reasons and explanations to justify the advice they were about to give.

I: Es que yo le pregunto y él no quiere hablar, él es pasivo. No sé qué hacer. Ayúdame.

P11: **Tú sabes que yo soy tu mejor amiga.** Pero lo que te puedo decir es que hables con él.

15. Moralizing – Subjects from both countries employed “general moral maxims” (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989, p. 288) to establish the expected social behavior in this particular situation.

N10: Bueno yo creo que mejor le digás, porque si, **si es cierto que está saliendo con otra persona, definitivamente con esa noticia se tiene que decidir.**

I: Sí, pues qué pensás? Que lo deje?

16. Accusing Interlocutor – A few participants actually directly blamed the interlocutor while giving advice, expressing the possibility that the husband had no choice because the interlocutor was not satisfying enough.

N5: O sea, que **no le estás complementando a él**, pues que él ha tenido que encontrar alguien más. Ya, o sea, **lo que estás haciendo en tu matrimonio que definitivamente él tenía que buscar a alguien más**, y como **no le estás dando**. No solo en la parte sexual sino en la comunicación, y todo lo demás, pues.

17. Expressing Empathy – Many participants expressed empathy and a mutual understanding towards the interlocutor's difficult situation.

P13: Pero bueno, esto es como te digo, no? **No va a ser fácil**, obviamente desde cuatro años has estado con él, pero es como te digo, **no es fácil llevar una situación así**, no es porque no puedes llevarlo.

18. Expressing Concern – One participant expressed concern indirectly with questions regarding the future status of the interlocutor's marriage.

N10: Primero decírselo, y después comprobar si hace cosas, si realmente está saliendo con alguien más. **Qué va a pasar con Uds? Qué va a pasar con el matrimonio?**

I: Pues sí, tengo que hablar con él. Gracias por el consejo.

19. Expressing Pessimism – One participant expressed an inevitable and pessimistic outlook on the future reactions of the interlocutor's husband if she were to tell him she was pregnant.

I: Y ahora tengo el problema de que creo que me está engañando porque llega tarde del trabajo, este, siempre tiene llamadas extrañas, no sé con quién hablar, entonces no sé qué hacer.

N8: Sería bueno que le digas tal vez, **pero con esa noticia ya sabés que va a cambiar todo con él.**

I: Sí.

20. Preparator – Some participants prepared the interlocutor before soliciting advice.

N6: Tenés derecho, ah, tomar las decisiones que, de lo que sea. **Como tu mejor amiga**, me gustaría que valorara, a pesar de lo que tu esposo está haciendo, si él te esté engañando o no, valorara el hecho de que tenés un hijo creciendo dentro de vos.

21. Well-wishing – One participant wished well on the interlocutor by expressing hope that God help her in the future.

N5: Así que yo pienso que tenía, no sé, te aconsejaría que lo pondrías en manos de Dios. Y **que Dios le dé sabiduría, te ayude**, porque sinceramente es una, una situación difícil.

22. Expressing Sympathy – One instance of expressing sympathy was recorded.

I: Estoy esperando un hijo y no quiero dejar mi matrimonio. Qué hago? Igualmente me engañó.

P17: **Ay amiga, lo siento**. De verdad es una difícil situación.

23. Want Statement – Between the two countries, only a single instance of a want statement appeared in the data.

P1: Si tienes una familia rota, no es bueno, y **quieres que tu hijo tenga padre**, pero no uno que está engañándote.

I: Pues bueno, gracias por todo. Voy a hablar con él de la situación.

In the next section, these strategies will be analyzed using Spencer Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. This analysis will show how the participants' behavioral expectations, face sensitivities and interactional goals are reflected through the strategies they used when giving advice.

Behavioral Expectations

The participants' advice-giving strategies were categorized as either violating or respecting the three components of both the equity and association principles, according to Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. Both Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants preferred to respect rather than violate the involvement, empathy and respect components of the association principles. In this advice-giving context, an empathetic approach towards a serious situation with your best friend makes sense, as sharing one's feelings and concerns with others is only natural according to the rapport management (p. 100). The *Preparator* and *Expressing Pessimism* strategies were only used by the Nicaraguan participants, while *Well-wishing* and *Expressing Sympathy* pertained only to the participants from Panama. *Expressing Disagreement* was the only strategy used that violated the association principle, and both groups used this strategy twice. Respect for the association principle reflects both groups' concern regarding the maintenance of their relationship with the interlocutor. Demonstrating respect for a best friend in this serious situation wasn't as

important as staying involved and showing empathy to the participants, as the balance between the empathy and involvement components was more important than the respect component. In choosing strategies that adhere to the involvement and empathy components, the participants encouraged the interlocutor to share her feelings and concerns while controlling their amount of involvement in the conversation.

The equity principle was violated by all participants, as not a single strategy respected any of the three components of this principle. The *Imperative*, *Obligation Statement*, *Opinion Statement* and *Suggestory Statement* were all used to violate the autonomy- control component of the equity principle. This challenge to autonomy- control shows that the participants were more concerned with the interlocutor understanding their advice than being considered imposing or violating of the interlocutor’s will. The strategies that respected and violated both the equity and association principles are organized into Table 1 below.

Table 1 **Behavioral Expectations: Association and Equity principles**

A. Respecting Association Principle (RAP)					
		<u>Nicaragua</u>		<u>Panama</u>	
1. Involvement Component		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
a	Requesting Information	7	7	8	8
b	Requesting Confirmation	6	6	2	2
c	Signaling Comprehension	1	1	2	2
d	Statement of Fact	5	5	4	5
<i>Subtotal</i>		19	19	16	16
2. Empathy Component					
a	Expressing Concern	2	2	0	0
b	Well-wishing	0	0	1	1
c	Offering Comfort/Support	3	3	5	5
d	Expressing Empathy	4	4	8	8
e	Expressing Pessimism	1	1	0	0
f	Expressing Sympathy	0	0	1	1

g	Expressing Optimism	3	3	3	3
	<i>Subtotal</i>	13	13	18	18
	3. Respect Component				
a	Grounder	6	6	5	5
b	Preparator	2	2	0	0
	<i>Subtotal</i>	8	8	5	5
	Total Strategies RAP	40	39	39	38
	B. Violating Association Principle (VAP)				
	1. Involvement Component				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	2. Empathy Component				
a	Expressing Disagreement	2	2	2	2
	<i>Subtotal</i>	2	2	2	2
	3. Respect Component				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	Total Strategies VAP	2	2	2	2
	C. Respecting Equity Principle (REP)				
	1. Cost-Benefit				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	2. Fairness-Reciprocity				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	3. Autonomy Control				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	Total Strategies REP	0	0	0	0
	D. Violating Equity Principle (VEP)				
	1. Cost-Benefit				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	2. Fairness-Reciprocity				
	<i>Subtotal</i>	0	0	0	0
	3. Autonomy Control				
a	Imperative	8	8	16	16
b	Obligation Statement	9	9	11	11
c	Suggestory Statement	12	12	10	10
d	Want Statement	0	0	1	1
e	Opinion Statement	12	12	13	13
f	Participation Shift	4	4	3	3
g	Impersonal Statement	4	4	1	1
h	Moralizing	4	4	4	4
i	Accusing 3rd Party	3	3	1	1
j	Accusing Interlocutor	4	4	1	1

<i>Subtotal</i>	60	59	61	60
Total Strategies VEP	60	59	61	60
<u>Total of all strategies RAP, VAP, REP & VEP:</u>	102	100	102	100

A total of 102 strategies were used by each of the two groups, although the distributions of these strategies vary. As for the behavioral expectations, the biggest difference between the Nicaraguans and Panamanians was within the empathy component of the association principle (N: 13% vs. P: 18%), although a proportions test shows that this difference was not statistically significant. For both groups, the choice to respect the association principle, rather than violate it or use a strategy that pertains to the equity principle, was statistically significant at the 95% level (Nicaragua: $Z=2.2$; Panama: $Z=2.4$). The group from Panama both explicitly expressed empathy and offered comfort/support more than the group from Nicaragua. This slight difference in strategies that respect the empathy component reflects that both groups have the same communicative goal, i.e. expressing to the interlocutor that they understand and have compassion for them during this difficult situation, but choose to achieve this goal at different levels of explicitness.

The other two components of the association principle were also respected, as the Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants chose to uphold the involvement component (N: 19% vs. P: 16%) and respect component (N: 8% vs. P: 5%) slightly more. In Nicaragua, both the empathy and respect components were statistically significant at the 95% level ($Z=2.2$ and $Z=2.5$, respectively) while respecting the association principle, while in Panama this was the case with

only the respect component ($Z=4.6$). Both groups requested information with the same frequency (N: 7% vs. P: 8%), yet the Nicaraguans were more likely to request confirmation (N: 6% vs. P: 2%). The difference between these two strategies lies in the knowledge that the participant is seeking, being either new information in hopes of enlightening the participant's familiarity with the situation (*Respecting Information*) or confirming facts and details that were already previously mentioned in order to provide clarity regarding the situation and assure the participant's involvement with the interlocutor (*Requesting Confirmation*). In general, the association principle was well respected by both groups, as only 2% of each group's strategies violated the empathy component. Reviewing Spencer-Oatey's (2005) definition of the association principle and its three components, one expects that, in a serious advice-giving situation with a best friend, participants would exploit their right to associate with the interlocutor. More specifically, maintaining the correct amount of involvement, encouraging others to share concerns and feelings, and showing respect are all crucial elements when advising or suggesting, as proven here with the data from Nicaragua and Panama.

When considering the equity principle, there was also a striking resemblance in strategies between both groups. The choice to violate the equity principle was statistically significant at the 95% level among the participants from Panama ($Z=2.0$), although this was not found to be statistically significant in Nicaragua. Neither group of participants respected any of the three components of the equity principle, as each group chose to violate only the autonomy-control

component. Within autonomy-control, four of the strategies, *Suggestory Statement*, *Obligation statement*, *Opinion Statement* and *Imperative*, made up a majority of the component's data (N: 40% vs. P: 49%), with the *Imperative* strategy yielding the biggest difference between the two groups (N: 8% vs. P: 16%). This preference of the Panamanians exemplifies their will to present advice as more of an obligation rather than a mere recommendation. The Nicaraguan participants were slightly prone to use more indirect strategies, including *Suggestory Statement* (N: 12% vs. P: 10%) and *Impersonal Statement* (N: 4% vs. P: 1%), suggesting again that both groups' goal was the same with respect to the component (i.e. maintaining that people should not be controlled or imposed upon). Although there was no statistical significance in the use of indirect strategies (or any of the strategies) within the autonomy control component, the difference between the groups was how this goal of not imposing was achieved. The group from Nicaragua also preferred to place the blame of the situation on another, either accusing the 3rd party or the interlocutor herself (N: 7% vs. P: 2%). In this particular context, the blamed 3rd party was necessarily the husband who is suspected of cheating. Although blaming others is considered a violation of the person's right to being treated fairly and not be imposed upon, the Nicaraguan interlocutor never complained or became offended by either type of accusation. This suggests that finding a culprit is important to Nicaraguans when giving advice, perhaps as a means to justify or legitimize their suggestions.

Face Sensitivities

Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants chose to both enhance and challenge the identity face of the interlocutor. Face-enhancing strategies such as *Expressing Optimism, Expressing Empathy, Expressing Sympathy, Moralizing, Expressing Concern* and *Well-wishing* reflected a desire to maintain the close friendship between the interlocutor and participant, i.e. identity face-enhancing. Although many strategies challenged the interlocutor's identity face, including *Accusing Interlocutor, Obligation Statement, Expressing Disagreement* and *Obligation Statement*, there was no intention on the part of the participants to undermine the public image or social perception of the their best friend, as these strategies were mainly used to convey their own awareness and ability to help in such a context. Table 2 indicates the distribution of these strategies as they pertain to the identity face sensitivities.

Table 2 **Face Sensitivities: Identity Face**
A. Enhancing Interlocutor's Identity Face (EIIF)

	<u>Nicaragua</u>		<u>Panama</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
a Requesting Information	7	7	8	8
b Requesting Confirmation	6	6	2	2
c Expressing Optimism	3	3	3	3
d Signaling Comprehension	1	1	2	2
e Accusing 3rd Party	3	3	1	1
f Expressing Concern	2	2	0	0
g Well-wishing	0	0	1	1
h Offering Comfort/Support	3	3	5	5
i Expressing Empathy	4	4	8	8
j Expressing Sympathy	0	0	1	1
k Grounder	6	6	5	5
l Moralizing	4	4	4	4
m Statement of Fact	5	5	4	4
n Preparator	2	2	0	0
Total Strategies EIIF	46	45	44	43

B. Challenging Interlocutor's Identity Face (CIIF)

a	Expressing Disagreement	2	2	2	2
b	Imperative	8	8	16	16
c	Obligation Statement	9	9	11	11
d	Opinion Statement	12	23	13	13
e	Suggestory Statement	12	23	10	10
f	Want Statement	0	0	1	1
g	Participant Shift	4	4	3	3
h	Impersonal Statement	4	4	1	1
i	Expressing Pessimism	1	1	0	0
j	Accusing Interlocutor	4	4	1	1
	<i>Total Strategies CIIF</i>	56	55	58	57
	<u>Total of all Strategies EIIF & CIIF</u>	102	100	102	100

As with behavioral expectations, the groups' strategies were quite similar and evenly distributed, both in enhancing (N: 46% vs. P: 44%) and challenging (N: 56% vs. P: 58%) the interlocutor's identity face. The proportions test yields no statistical significance in the preference of either enhancing or challenging the interlocutor's identity face. However, the weight of both groups' combined data used in the difference in proportions test does find statistically significant differences, even with this balance of strategies in both groups. When analyzing all combined strategies from both groups, there was a statistically significant preference to challenge the interlocutor's face rather than enhance it at 95% ($Z=2.4$). Considering each group of participants separated this preference was found to be statistically significant among the Panamanian participants at 95% ($Z=2.0$), but not among the Nicaraguans. The very nature of an identity face-threatening strategy and the concept of giving advice coincide, as both challenge the interlocutor's social behavior and impose future actions on the interlocutor.

The distribution of the identity face strategies in both groups of participants demonstrates the need to establish harmony between face-enhancing and face-challenging strategies, as every participant of both group's used at least one of each.

As identity face sensitivities are constantly negotiated and therefore vulnerable throughout an interaction, they are inherently context dependent. As stated previously, Spencer Oatey's (2005) notion of respectability face was not included in the analysis because this context is not threatening to the public image of either the participant or the interlocutor. In this particular advice-giving context, challenging the interlocutor's identity face by soliciting advice was encouraged and, in a few of the interactions, explicitly requested by the interlocutor. This explains the slight preference for challenging rather than enhancing the interlocutor's identity face. When considering only the face-challenging strategies of the Panamanian participants, the majority consisted of *Imperative*, *Obligation Statement*, *Opinion Statement*, and *Suggestory Statement* (86%), while these four strategies made up significantly less of the total in Nicaragua (73%). When enhancing the interlocutor's identity face, neither country's participants were prone to a particular strategy. Within this category, the most common strategies in Nicaragua included *Requesting Confirmation* (15%) and *Grounders* (13%), while in Panama the most common strategies' percentages weren't much higher (*Requesting Information* and *Expressing Empathy* both were 18%). Therefore, not only was there a balance between enhancing and challenging the interlocutor's identity face, but also a somewhat

sporadic usage of many different strategies within these two categories. When requesting advice from a best friend in this particular context, the interlocutor should not perceive an identity face threat through the challenge of her identity face; similarly, it would be difficult to perceive an enhancement. The lack of preference to either enhance or challenge the identity face demonstrates that the interlocutor's perception of the participant's behavior towards her identity face is far less relevant than the importance of the relational goals of the conversation.

Interactional Wants

The interactional goals of the participants in this particular context necessarily pertain to the relational rather than transactional needs of Spencer-Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. In an advice-giving situation between close friends, maintaining and enhancing the relationship between the participant and interlocutor are more relevant than the completion of the task, as reflected through the data. Although not analyzed in the present study, the interlocutor is inherently more transactional than the participant, providing information and probing for a solution to her dilemma. These transactional wants of the interlocutor were met by the participants, as there was a general respect for the involvement and empathy components of the association principle.

Just as Spencer Oatey (2005) describes the relationship between transactional and relational wants, the achievement of both Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants' transactional wants (*Requesting Information, Requesting Confirmation, Statement of Fact*) depended heavily on the successful

management of relational goals. By respecting the involvement, empathy and respect components of the association principle, participants were able to maintain and enhance their friendship with the interlocutor, facilitating the manner in which the transaction's goal, i.e. giving advice, was achieved. By violating the autonomy control component of the equity principle, the participants demonstrated the belief that their advice was more important than treating the interlocutor fairly and imposing on the interlocutor's will. Both Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants attempted to take control of the interlocutor by imposing their own opinions, wills, and suggestions when soliciting advice, further supporting the use of transactional rather than relational wants in this particular context, successfully enhancing the relational goals of the interaction.

Summary of Results

The participants' results were analyzed through Spencer Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach, specifically looking at the behavioral expectation, face sensitivities and interactional wants. There were slight differences between participants from Nicaragua and Panama in each of these categories, although not many. Regarding behavioral expectations, there was a clear attempt by all participants to maintain a rapport-enhancing orientation. All strategies except two pertaining to the association principle respected it, including the involvement, empathy and respect components. The manner in which these components were respected varied between the two countries, as the Panamanians used more strategies that respected the empathy component and the Nicaraguans were more

concerned with respecting the involvement component. The equity principle was violated by all participants, mainly through expressing opinions, suggesting, and imposing future actions on the interlocutor with their advice strategies.

Nicaraguan participants were more prone to accuse either the interlocutor herself or the husband, while Panamanian participants chose to use imperatives and obligation statements geared towards the interlocutor.

Regarding face sensitivities, both countries' participants struck a balance between enhancing and challenging the interlocutor's identity face. Most of the Panamanian participants' identity face challenging strategies consisted of only four strategies (*Imperative, Obligation Statement, Opinion Statement* and *Suggestory Statement*), while the Nicaraguans had a much more dispersed set of strategies. Neither group showed a preference for a particular strategy when enhancing the interlocutor's identity face, as both groups used 12 different advice-giving strategies to realize only 44 and 46 face enhancing strategies. There were a few strategies that pertained only to one of the groups: *Expressing concern, Preparator* and *Expressing Pessimism* were only found in Nicaragua, while *Well-wishing, Expressing Sympathy* and *Want Statement* were only recorded in Panama. While the interactional wants of the interlocutor were clearly transactional, those of the participants were clearly relational. The nature of this advice-giving context paired with the close relationship of the two speakers promoted the enhancement of this context's relational goals through the maintenance of their relationship rather than the completion of a task.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study analyzed the advice-giving strategies of Spanish speakers from both Nicaragua and Panama using Spencer Oatey's (2005) rapport management approach. This section will address some general conclusions of how Nicaraguans and Panamanians give advice, as well as how their pragmatic tendencies when performing a directive compare with the rest of the Hispanic world, although many of the previous empirical studies on different Spanish-speaking varieties use different methodologies. In general, this section serves to provide answers to the research questions of the Chapter 2.

Differences and similarities with the Hispanic world

When comparing the strategies used by participants of this study to those of other empirical studies on directives, one finds many similarities and differences throughout the Hispanosphere. For example, in Félix-Brasdefer's (2009) intra-lingual analysis of Mexican, Costa Rican and Dominican Spanish, the author concludes that Dominicans prefer camaraderie, are more direct than both Costa Ricans and Mexicans, and do not use many modifiers when requesting. Although all three cultures preferred deference politeness, the preference for involvement shown by the Dominicans and the directness with which they perform request strategies is similar to that of Nicaraguans and Panamanians. This also pertains to García's (2002) findings in Venezuela when performing a request. Women only slightly preferred deference politeness,

although there was no clear choice, and showed respect along with camaraderie. Ruzickova's (1998) conclusions that Cubans don't feel the need to minimize face or maintain social distance parallels the tendencies of this study's findings in Nicaragua and Panama. When requesting, Cubans were found to be consistent with Spaniards in using conventionally indirect strategies, although to a lesser extent, placing them with other "friendly back slapping cultures" such as in Spain, Mexico, Venezuela and Uruguay. Although the Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants' strategies were inconsistent with those found in México (Félix-Brasdefer, 2009) and Uruguay (Márquez Reiter, 2003), this statement holds true for conclusions made in Venezuela (García, 2002) and several studies in Spain.

Cross-cultural studies on Peninsular Spanish suggest similarities with Nicaraguan and Panamanian advice-giving strategies. Based on Placencia's (1998) comparative study of Ecuadorian and Spaniards performing a request through a telephone service, the Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants of this study are more similar to the Spaniards, preferring imperatives without a lot of mitigation rather than the mitigated, less direct strategies used in Ecuador. Placencia (1998) notes that this behavior would probably be similar in a situation where the distance between the interlocutor and participant was less. On the other hand, when compared to Peninsular speakers in the same context, the tentativeness and formality found in Uruguayan request strategies by Márquez Reiter (2003) do not coincide with the current study's data. In this study, the strategies used in Nicaragua and Panama are again more similar to Spaniards than the Latin American counterpart. Le Pair's (1996) comparison of Dutch non-native

speakers of Spanish and Spaniards found that the Spanish preferred imperatives and obligation statements, much less preoccupied by protecting their own positive face or being perceived as rude than the L2 speakers. The most common and fourth most common advice-giving strategy in Nicaragua and Panama were imperatives and obligation statements. Hernández Flores' (1999) comments on Spanish colloquial conversation also connect the current study's data to Peninsular speakers, as involvement and association are particularly important and encouraged in Spain when soliciting and giving advice. It is also permitted to threaten the hearer's positive face, something Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants manifested through constant violation of the equity principle.

The preference for deference over solidarity when requesting (García, 1993), as well as respecting the interlocutor's identity face when expressing sympathy (García, 2009), place Peruvians at the opposite end of the continuum from Nicaraguans and Panamanians. In Mexico, Koike's (1998) study on suggestions reveals a preference for diminutives, mitigation and markers of doubt when a superior offers suggestions to an inferior. Although this social distance between speakers is different than that of the current study, the tendencies do not share common ground with the data from Nicaragua and Panama. Félix-Brasdefer's (2005) study of Mexican Spanish speakers performing requests shows a preference for conventionally indirect strategies. As the distance between the participant and interlocutor decreases, the likelihood of conventional indirectness increases. This may be the case in Nicaragua and Panama, although there are no empirical studies on pragmatics situations of +Distance with which to compare.

García (2005) found that Argentines prefer to protect the positive face of both the interlocutor and participant when requesting. They also did not make use of many different strategies and were prone to discuss the specifics of the request quite frequently. The Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants didn't violate the respect component of the association principle, but they were more concerned with the involvement and empathy components. They also made use of many strategies while giving advice, differing greatly from what García (2005) found in Argentinean directives.

In summary, although studies on advice in Spanish are scarce and pragmatic data on Central American Spanish is practically non-existent, some general conclusions regarding the general pragmatic tendencies of Nicaraguans and Panamanians can be made. Just as well, the limited data provided in this study did not yield any significant difference in advice-giving strategies between participants from both countries, an unanticipated result that might be countered in the future with more empirical data. From what was concluded, the directive strategies used by Panamanian and Nicaraguan participants do coincide with those used by other Central American Spanish speakers in Costa Rica and Mexico. Conversely, the positive face enhancing strategies found in Argentina (García, 2005) and preference for deferential strategies in Peru (García, 1993) are quite different from the current study's findings. The intercultural studies of Uruguayan (Márquez Reiter, 2003) and Ecuadorians (Placencia, 1998) with Spaniards both suggested more similarities with Spain. The positive politeness and conventional indirectness found in Cuba (Ruzickova, 1998) and Venezuela (García, 2002)

correspond to the current study's data, as well. In general, the directive strategies used in Panama and Nicaragua were most similar to the results found in Spain, Venezuela, Cuba and the Dominican Republic. The studies of directives in these cultures reflect many of the same values: the use of imperatives, more direct strategies, conventional indirectness, preference for less mitigation and high involvement, lack of tentativeness and disregard for enhancing the equity principle (or positive face).

Limitations of the study

There were several limitations to the current study. When considering the sample size, making generalizations about Nicaraguan and Panamanian cultures and linguistic tendencies is difficult. Just as well, Masaya and Panama City should not be considered representative of the populations in Nicaragua and Panama. All participants were female, also not representative of the populations; with male participants, perhaps the two countries' data would have been more contrastive. Considering the two different recording situations, having a different interlocutor in Panama and the same interlocutor in Nicaragua might have affected the consistency of the responses solicited from participants. Ideally, another role play would have been employed along with the study's role play, distracting participants from which role play was to be analyzed by the researchers. Unfortunately, this was not possible due to time constraints, the difficulties in obtaining empirical data, and recruiting participants.

Future Research

As mentioned previously, there is a lack of studies on advice strategies in Spanish-speaking countries. Comparing the current study's advice-giving strategies to previous studies' results on requesting strategies is valid, yet comparing the same speech act would without a doubt be more ideal. Just as well, without empirical data from Central American countries, understanding the communication strategies of Nicaraguan and Panamanian participants is more difficult. In order to offer a more ample perspective and demonstrate the heterogeneity of the Hispanosphere, more studies on this region, as well as other countries that have yet to be studied (e.g. Puerto Rico), are necessary. The ideal studies on directives would be intra-lingual and comparative in nature, controlling for distance, power and weight of imposition. Additionally, it would be interesting to complement the empirical data of pragmatic studies with questionnaires that ask speakers from different countries about the appropriateness or acceptability of certain strategies. The historical development of the region, immigration and displacement, language contact and other socio-cultural factors are crucial elements in the development of any society's communicative tendencies. By incorporating these perspectives, perhaps we can begin to understand why pragmatic and social norms have evolved so asymmetrically throughout the Spanish-speaking world, and possibly where these norms are going in the future.

REFERENCES

- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. New Jersey: Alblex.
- Bravo, Diana (1996) *La risa en el regateo: Estudio sobre el estilo comunicativo de negociadores españoles y suecos*. Stockholm: Edsbruk Akademi, Stockholm University.
- Bordería-García, A. M. (2006). *The acquisition of pragmatics in Spanish as a foreign language: Interpreting and giving advice*. Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International: The Humanities and Social Sciences. University of Iowa.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Curcó, C. (1998). “¿No me harías un favorcito? Reflexiones en torno a la expresión de la cortesía verbal en el español de México y el español peninsular”. In H. Haverkate, G. Mulder & C. F. Maldonado (Eds.), *La pragmática lingüística del español: Recientes desarrollos* (pp. 129-171). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Mexican Requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistic Symposium* (pp. 66-78). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2009). Pragmatic variation across Spanish(es): Requesting in Mexican, Costa Rican, and Dominican Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(4), 473-515.
- Fant, L. (1989). Cultural mismatch in conversation: Spanish and Scandinavian communicative behaviour in negotiation settings. *Hermes*, 3, 247-263.
- Fitch, K. L. (1994). A cross-cultural study of directives and some implications for compliance-gaining research. *Communication Monographs*, 61(3), 185-209.
- García, C. (1993). Making a request and responding to it: a case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 127-152.
- García, C. (2002). La expresión de camaraderie y solidaridad: Cómo los venezolanos solicitan un servicio y responden a la solicitud de un servicio. In M.E. Placencia & D. Bravo (Eds.) *Actos de habla y cortesía en español*. Munich: Lincom.
- García, C. (2005) ‘Y bueno pienso que vos podrías dárselo’: estrategias de cortesía utilizadas por participantes argentinos en la solicitud de un servicio profesional. *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Lingüístics*, Vol XII, 153-174.

- García, C. (2008). Different realizations of solidarity politeness: Comparing Argentinean and Venezuelan invitations. In K. Schneider & A. Barron (Eds.) *Variational Pragmatics: a focus on regional varieties in pluricentric languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- García, C. (2009). 'Cuenta conmigo': The expression of sympathy by Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 408-425.
- García, C. (2009). The Performance of a rapport-challenging act (blaming) by Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5, 217-241.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Doubleday.
- Haverkate, H. (2002). *The syntax, semantics and pragmatics of Spanish mood*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Hernández-Flores, N. (1999). Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversatio: The case of advice. *Pragmatics*, 9(1), 37-49.
- Lipski, J. (1994). *El español de América*. Madrid: Catedrá.
- Koike, D. (1998). La sugerencia en español: una perspectiva comparativa. In H. Haverkate, G. Mulder & C. F. Maldonado (Eds.) *La pragmática lingüística del español: Recientes desarrollos* (pp. 211-235). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (1997). Politeness Phenomena in British English and Uruguayan Spanish: The case of requests. *Miscelánea*, 18, 159-167.
- Márquez Reiter, R. (2003). Pragmatic variation in Spanish: External request modifications in Peninsular and Uruguayan Spanish. In R. Núñez-Cedeño, R. López & R. Cameron (Eds.) *A Romance Perspective on Language Knowledge and Use* (pp. 167-180). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Márquez Reiter, R. & Placencia, M. E. (2005). *Spanish Pragmatics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Penny, R. (1991). *A History of the Spanish language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Placencia, M. E. (1998). Pragmatic variation: Ecuadorian Spanish vs. Peninsular Spanish. *SAL*, 2(1), 71-106.

Placencia, M. E. & García, C. (Eds.) 2007. *Research on Politeness in the Spanish-speaking World*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Recuero, S. I. (2005). Politeness Studies on Peninsular Spanish. In M. Placencia & C. Garcia (Eds.) *Research on Politeness in the Spanish-speaking World* (pp. 21-35). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ruzickova, E. (1998). *Face, face-threatening acts and politeness in Cuban Spanish*. Dissertation from University of Pittsburgh. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Searle, J. (1976). The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-24.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. (2001). *Intercultural Communication* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face or perceptions of rapport: Unpacking their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1), 95-119.

Vázquez Orta, I. (1995). A Contrastive Study of Politeness Phenomena in England and Spain. *Applied and Interdisciplinary Papers* No. 267. Duisburg: LAUD.

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL



Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

To: Carmen Garcia Fernandez
LL

fo **From:** Mark Roosa, Chair *SM*
Soc Beh IRB

Date: 05/06/2011

Committee Action: Exemption Granted

IRB Action Date: 05/06/2011

IRB Protocol #: 1104006359

Study Title: Pragmatic Speech Styles of Central America

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(2).

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS

Role-play situation

Interlocutor: Ud. sospecha que su esposo de 4 años la está engañando. Ud. recibe llamadas de teléfono sospechosas, él nunca regresa a casa temprano después del trabajo, y además cuando regresa, huele a un perfume que Ud. no usa. Para complicar esta situación, Ud. acaba de descubrir que está embarazada, pero todavía no le ha dicho nada a su esposo. Ud. no quiere destrozar su matrimonio porque quiere mucho a su esposo y también por el bebé, pero no sabe cómo abordar la situación. Su mejor amiga sabe del embarazo y es la única con la que Ud. puede hablar de todo esto. Ud. la ve y **le habla (Ud. inicia la conversación)**.

Participante: Su mejor amiga está embarazada y Ud. es la única que sabe. Ud. se encuentra con ella y ella le habla de una difícil situación por la que está atravesando. **Respóndale**.

Participant background information form:

Información de participante

Edad: _____

Educación – (Ponga un X en los que Ud. ha terminado):

Colegio _____

Licenciatura _____

Maestría _____

PhD. _____

Otro: _____ Especifique, por favor: _____

Más información:

Trabajo:

Lugar de nacimiento:

Años que lleva viviendo en esta ciudad:

(Para el investigador) Código de participante: _____