

This article was downloaded by: [Kim Potowski]

On: 07 September 2011, At: 20:26

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



International Journal of Multilingualism

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmjm20>

Linguistic and cultural authenticity of 'Spanglish' greeting cards

Kim Potowski ^a

^a Hispanic & Italian Studies, The University of Illinois at Chicago, 1722 UH, mc-315, 601 S. Morgan St., Chicago, IL, 60622, USA

Available online: 07 Sep 2011

To cite this article: Kim Potowski (2011): Linguistic and cultural authenticity of 'Spanglish' greeting cards, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, DOI:10.1080/14790718.2011.606908

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.606908>



PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Linguistic and cultural authenticity of ‘Spanglish’ greeting cards

Kim Potowski*

*Hispanic & Italian Studies, The University of Illinois at Chicago, 1722 UH, mc-315,
601 S. Morgan St., Chicago, 60622 IL, USA*

(Received 27 August 2010; final version received 13 June 2011)

Past scholarly work has examined commercial greeting cards as an important cultural practice. The growing presence in the USA of bilingual greeting cards offers a site for understanding public uses of contact varieties of language. This paper analyses the reactions of 30 college educated US-raised bilingual Latinos to 17 intrasententially codeswitched Spanish–English greeting cards. Despite a few exceptions, there were correlations between the felicitousness of the codeswitches and their acceptability ratings. Hill’s concept of ‘mock Spanish’ helps explain participants’ reactions to the infelicitously codeswitched (IC) cards, although these cards are produced for (and presumably by) bilinguals rather than Anglos. The IC cards can be understood as a distortion of authentic bilingual practices in a failed attempt to reflect and/or shape Latino linguistic practices.

Keywords: codeswitching; Spanish; immigrant languages

Introduction

A good deal of social science literature indicates that greeting cards – their messages, occasions, design and exchange – constitute a rich area for the study of social interaction. According to Cacioppo and Andersen (1981), sending written expressions is a very old custom, but greeting cards became common in the USA among all socioeconomic classes when mail service became available to the masses in 1840 (p. 115). Stern’s (1988) history of the Hallmark Company states that J.C. Hall invented the greeting card to fill a market niche between the personal letter and the postcard, reasoning that people no longer had time to write long personal letters but that the postcard was too impersonal. Today, Americans receive an average of 20–30 greeting cards per year, totalling annual sales of approximately \$7.5 billion (Greeting Card Association, 2009). Within this lucrative industry, two companies control approximately 80% of the market. Hallmark Cards, Inc., is a privately held and family-owned business in Kansas City, Missouri, founded in 1910 and today owning 3300 dedicated retail stores in the USA. Hallmark cards can also be found in an additional 41,500 stores and in more than 30 languages in 100 countries around the world, with annual revenue of \$4.3 billion in 2008 (Hallmark, 2011). American Greetings began a few years before Hallmark, in 1906, and is currently based in Cleveland, Ohio. This publicly held company has many subsidiaries including Carlton Cards, Gibson and Papyrus, and posts annual revenues of \$1.7 billion.

*Email: kimpotow@uic.edu

Numerous theoretical approaches have been applied to the significance of greeting cards, including those hailing from the fields of sociology, popular culture and economics. To date, however, no one has focused exclusively on Spanish–English bilingual greeting cards produced for the bilingual Hispanic market, in particular those that employ intrasentential codeswitching (the combination of Spanish and English within the same sentence). The use of this particular communicative strategy in greeting cards is undoubtedly due to the large and growing Spanish-speaking population in the USA, which is younger overall than the rest of the population, and very commonly engages in intrasentential codeswitching. Several questions of interest include whether these cards combine Spanish and English in ways that occur in natural speech, how bilingual Latinos respond to these cards and what insights these cards can contribute to existing understandings of the greeting card as social interaction.

After briefly reviewing the literature on the social significance of greeting cards and the use of codeswitching in writing, I describe the research questions and the present study involving the reactions of 30 college-educated Latino bilinguals to 17 different intrasententially codeswitched cards.

The social significance of greeting cards

Given that greeting cards respond to consumer desires, they exhibit social significance on at least two levels. One is the experiences of card givers and receivers – that is, their exchange value. The other is the content and the sentiments expressed through the cards' text and design. I will briefly review some of the more interesting literature on the exchange value of greeting cards (a complete review of this topic is outside the scope of this paper) before turning to their content.

Jaffe (1999) makes several interesting observations about the role of greeting cards based on their status as part gift, part commodity. She notes that many cards are deictic in that they index the identities of the sender and the receiver. For example, by sending an Aunt Birthday card, I assert that I am your niece, you are my aunt and it is your birthday. She argues that the written sentiments may not even be the central meaning conveyed by greeting cards, but rather the voicing of identity is the important function that cards enact. Card senders can 'express socially authenticated identities and sentiments, as well as subtle and complex new messages about identities and relationships' (p. 115). Jaffe concludes that greeting cards can reiterate or perform existing statuses and relationships, or they can propose new relationships and identities in interaction, noting that 'The object of any kind of exchange is not neutral, but imbued with culturally constructed meanings' that people have ideas about and that guide their actions.

Jaffe (1999) also notes that another value of greeting cards is their illocutionary certainty. Generally speaking, in many situations, social risks can result from choosing the wrong words. Cards, however, leave little room for misunderstanding, in part because other people's words are often granted the authority of society at large. For example, public speakers are introduced (and their accomplishments and authority are enumerated) by someone other than themselves, and this distance suggests a degree of authority. Finally, Jaffe points out that although greeting card messages may be generic, selecting an appropriate card for someone requires knowledge of their attitudes, experiences and emotional life, such that the card is an 'object to which sender and receiver have a shared response' (p. 136). For example, many birthday

cards that are appropriate for a college friend are not suitable for one's grandmother. In this way, greeting cards 'cannot be defined as failed letters or meaningless assemblages of generic sentiments when we look at how they are used' (p. 138). I will return to these ideas of authority of language in the analysis of the corpus.

Also focusing on the exchange value of greeting cards, Johnson (1971) proposed socially motivated patterns in her personal Christmas card exchanges. Specifically, she found three different categories of exchange based on others' social status relative to hers. In the first category were family, friends and colleagues who she considered her equals on the social ladder. She sent them cards, and they reciprocated. In the second category were people she considered in a lower position on the social ladder; they sent her cards, but she had not reciprocated. The final category consisted of people above her on the social ladder with whom she hoped to establish connections, to whom she had sent cards but had not received one in return. She concluded that the middle class 'are the Christmas card senders par excellence' (1971, p. 28), noting that the upper class send cards based on reciprocity and business relationships, while the lower and working class tend to belong to close knit families and do not generally subscribe to an extended Christmas card practice.

Papson (1986) is critical of the social value of greeting cards, arguing that they do away with the depth of relationships by reducing interactions to meaningless entities. This link between corporations and the breakdown of interpersonal relationships, he argues, is due to the fact that individuals are handing over discourse to the 'logic of bureaucratic corporate capitalism' (p. 99). He further argues that the language of greeting cards is not used by real people, but is instead a conjuring 'produced and refined in corporate bureaucracies. It is the language of spectacle... it objectifies, rationalizes and fictionalizes relationships' (p. 100). By this account, greeting cards produced by large companies cannot be considered a true reflection of social expression; to the extent that this is true on a linguistic level will be central to the present analysis of codeswitched greeting cards. Similarly to Papson, in 1996 'Miss Manners' (syndicated columnist Judith Martin) admonished readers to put into their own handwriting the 'particular conditions that may arise in the lives of one's intimates' (1996, p. 65). Thus, there does not appear to be unanimous social consensus regarding the meaning and appropriateness of sending cards in the place of letters. A case in point are yearly 'collective letters' sent during winter holidays, which are appreciated by some and reviled by others.

Another interesting aspect of greeting cards is the estimate that 80% of US greeting card purchasers are women (Greeting Card Association, 2009), thus constituting part of the 'kinship work' that women are expected to carry out in modern societies¹ – that is, the maintenance of ritual celebrations and communication across different households, which if not enacted lead many women to feel guilty (Di Leonardo, 1987). Schrift (1994) notes that, ironically, although women purchase and send the majority of studio cards, the images of women in greeting cards portray women in male-defined patriarchal corporate terms (p. 112).

In addition to the value obtained from the exchange of greeting cards, their visual and textual content is imbued with meaning. Given that they are a business driven by profit like any other, greeting card companies seek to produce cards that consumers want to buy; in this way, their content both reflects and reinforces societal norms. As Cacioppo and Andersen (1981) put it, 'The choices that individuals make when purchasing greeting cards influence what designs and sentiments are subsequently available. This suggests that the nature of the available greeting cards can be used as an

archival data source to gauge social attitudes and interpersonal communicative processes' (1981, p. 115). Murphy (1995) agrees that greeting cards are good indicators of popular beliefs, reminding us that Hallmark (and probably all greeting card producers) conducts extensive market research on desirable formats and messages.

From these perspectives, greeting cards can teach us a lot about what mainstream society values and expects. Murphy (1994), for example, showed the gendered nature of greeting cards in her finding that 75% of the 28 cards in the Valentine's Day category contained front pages with gender targeted images. Also, activities such as sports were shown only 13% of the time in cards designed for girls. In a similar vein, Willer (2001, p. 22) analysed 300 'welcome baby' greeting cards, arguing that the greeting card industry 'reflects (or perhaps infects) society's perceptions of what girl babies are and what boy babies are and what they do depending on their gender'. Thus, greeting cards may not only reflect, but also shape, social expectations. In a more ambiguous finding, Cacioppo and Andersen (1981) analysed design and message content of 48 birthday cards for daughters and sons, showing that popular birthday cards for sons had more masculine designs, but also contained more feminine or androgynous sentiments than those for daughters. Regarding the normalisation of excessive alcohol consumption, Finn (1980) found 129 studio greeting cards containing alcohol-related subject matter that suggested drunkenness is a humorous, enjoyable and harmless result of celebrations, which he argued may legitimise and reinforce tolerance towards alcohol abuse.

Although Jaffe (1999) posits that 'American culture increasingly advocates the therapeutic power of voicing and sharing personal trauma of all kinds' (p. 125), the messages contained in greeting cards are usually constrained to mainstream occasions; she notes the negative public reactions to Hallmark's line of condolence cards for families of suicides and its line of cancer cards.² Cards for quinceañeras (a celebration when a Catholic Latina girl turns 15 years old) and bar/bat mitzvahs (when a Jewish person turns 13) are available today but were likely not commercially produced 50 years ago,³ which brings us to a discussion of 'minority' card lines.

'Minority' greeting cards

Surprisingly absent from research on greeting card content and exchange value is a focus on non-mainstream greeting cards. By this I refer to the so-called 'minority' card lines including Mahogany cards marketed toward African-Americans, the Tree of Life brand of Jewish cards and the Spanish language greeting cards from Hallmark and American Greetings. *Mahogany*, the greeting card line for African-Americans, began in 1987 with 16 cards. Its success led to its inclusion as an official line with year-round offerings in 1991. It features over 1000 cards for occasions including birthdays, thinking of you, get well and anniversaries (no data are available on Mahogany's yearly earnings). A cursory glance at these cards reveals images of phenotypically African-American individuals and colours and patterns often associated with African nations. Hallmark founded the *Tree of Life* line in 1995, although they had been creating Jewish cards since the 1940s (Hallmark, 2011). To create this line of 375 cards, Hallmark carried out focus groups to gather requests and suggestions from Jewish consumers which led to the inclusion of more humour, a better usage of 'relevant Hebrew phrases', and photography, artwork and writing 'for and by Jewish people' (Hallmark, 2011). Silberman-Federman (1995), the only study to date of minority greeting cards, examined a corpus of 56 Hanukkah cards from

several different companies. Grounded in theories on the sociology of humour, she concluded that these cards generally were representative of Jewish humour and Jewish tradition, but yet were ‘a microcosm of the American Jewish experience’ (p. 228) because such cards do not exist in Israel or in Russia.

Hallmark began offering Spanish cards in the mid-1980s, and in 1991 introduced a line called *Primor*. They launched *Hallmark en Español* in 1999 and renamed the brand *Sinceramente* in 2003 (Hallmark, 2011), stating that this line is based ‘en la expresión, el color y el calor del corazón latino’ (Hallmark, 2011). Today, they offer more than 2500 cards in the *Sinceramente* brand – more than *Mahogany* and *Tree of Life* combined – and their website states that the brands were created for the Spanish-speaking consumer not only in the USA but also in Puerto Rico, Mexico and the rest of Latin America, representing a growing marketing strategy worldwide of multilingualism in order to reach a larger market. There are more than 300 *Sinceramente* Christmas cards (Hallmark, 2011) and 312 Mother’s Day cards, which are entirely in Spanish and translated to English on the back. Nine of these Mother’s Day cards include sound chips, including songs like ‘Amor de Madre’ by Aventura and ‘Cielito Lindo’ by José Feliciano. There are also 12 Administrative Professionals Day cards in Spanish with English translations on the back and 40 graduation cards.

Greeting cards aimed at Spanish-speaking consumers include both monolingual and (much fewer) bilingual options. Monolingual cards appear entirely in Spanish, while bilingual cards either have the main text entirely in Spanish and include a translation on the back, or engage in codeswitching in the main text of the greeting card. In their 1996 press release, Hallmark stated that they had ‘over 350’ bilingual cards. The present study examines only codeswitched cards which were created for Hispanic consumers; they are found in the Spanish card section, separated from mainstream English cards. In order to situate them within a wider phenomenon of codeswitched print, I turn now to research on the use of codeswitching in writing.

Codeswitching in writing

Written codeswitching has been studied in a variety of genres including short stories and novels, emails and blogs and at least one popular magazine. In one portion of her analysis of 30 short stories and novels produced in the USA containing Spanish–English codeswitching, Callahan (2004) compared the structure and functions of the written codeswitches in the texts to those typically found in oral speech. She argues that although there is ‘some parity between oral and written codeswitching in regard to discourse function’ (p. 79), there are necessarily differences between spoken and written codeswitching in fiction texts, in part due to the need to accommodate readers who are not bilingual and might require translation.⁴ Although she does not investigate the subject further, Callahan adds that greeting card language tends to be poetic, rhymed and sentimental, and thus it may not be feasible to apply the same rules that tend to govern oral speech.

However, Montes-Alcalá (2005), studying 122 personal email messages written by 10 bilingual individuals, argues that bilingual writing is, in fact, a mirror image of bilingual speech, including motivations such as direct and indirect quotations, emphasising, clarifying and elaborating, making parenthetical comments, idiomatic expressions, lexical need and stylistic changes.

Mahootian (2005) analysed a subset of 56 out of a total of 435 tokens of codeswitching in two 1999 issues of *Latina*, a US women’s lifestyle magazine. She

found that 77% of the switches were ‘of the emotive, ethnically bonding type’, 15% were functional categories or non-emotive lexical items and 8% were idiomatic. She reminds us that unlike oral codeswitching, which is often unconscious, language choice is made consciously in printed media, where copy is written, proofread and approved by a number of people. If language-mixed texts are found in institutionalised publications such as magazines, she argues, it is ‘a reflection of a community norm which has found acceptance’ (p. 365). Thus, the author argues that the ‘intentional use of mixed-code discourse in a conventionalized medium [*Latina* magazine], juxtaposed with L1-only and L2-only discourse, signals acceptance of the L1-L2 mix’ (p. 364). This in turn signals an identity as a bilingual, which is ‘connected to, yet distinct from, the identity of speakers in their monolingual contexts’ (p. 362). The author does not cite any infelicitous or unnatural-sounding codeswitches, nor did I see any in her examples, which distinguishes Mahootian’s findings from my codeswitched greeting card corpus. It is interesting to note that every article in *Latina* appears in two versions: English or English–Spanish and Spanish. The English–Spanish versions are predominately in English, with Spanish nouns, conjunctions and prepositional phrases rendered in italics; and the Spanish versions are abbreviated versions of the English versions, both of which suggest that the majority of the readers are English dominant.

Two additional, non-academic examples of written codeswitching are informative. Bill Santiago, a New York raised bilingual Puerto Rican comedian, wrote a book entirely in codeswitched language about codeswitched language or, as he titled it, *Pardon my Spanglish* (2008). The numerous examples cited throughout the book are entirely authentic-sounding codeswitches, even if his running commentary is occasionally forced (as in ‘Déjenme show you why’). Santiago’s thesis is that ‘Spanglish’ is ‘very pro-Spanish. I wage it as an act of *resistencia* against the assimilate-or-else mentality. We are *lo que hablamos*. Indeed, what we speak formats our reality, *mientras a la misma vez* providing the means to articulate it’. The term ‘Spanglish’, it must be noted, while used rather freely by non-linguists, is rejected by others as obscuring various language contact phenomenon and, more importantly, giving bilinguals the erroneous idea that what they speak is not in fact Spanish, but something else that requires a different name.⁵

The second example, on the other hand, is rife with language that no one would actually produce. Stavans (2010), a self-proclaimed defender of ‘Spanglish’, created a supposedly Spanglish version of Don Quijote that begins: ‘In un placete de La Mancha of which nombre no quiero remembrearme, vivía, not so long ago, uno de esos gentlemen who always tienen una lanza in the rack, una buckler antigua, a skinny caballo y un grayhound para el chase’. Lipski (2004) calls this text a ‘grotesque creation [that] not only contains numerous syntactic violations of code-switching, but also phonotactically unlikely combinations in either language [...] and phonetic imitation of popular or uneducated Spanish [...] [which] reinforce the notion that only uneducated people speak spanglish’. I fully agree with Zentella (2007) that with ‘friends’ like Stavans, Spanglish does not need any enemies.

A theoretically relevant perspective on inauthentic or ‘gringo Spanglish’ is Hill’s (1993, 1998) concept of ‘mock Spanish’, the use by English speakers of lexical items and fixed expressions of Spanish-language origin, supposedly for humour value; in other words, an appropriation of Spanish language resources in a limited way for limited purposes by English speakers. Examples include ‘Hasta la vista, baby’ and ‘No problemo’ which, like most mock Spanish usages, contain morphological and

syntactical errors. When Whites⁶ use phrases like ‘mucho trouble-o’ or ‘el cheap-o’, according to Hill, they are ‘elevating Whiteness’ in two ways: by signalling that they are cosmopolitan and funny – creating a desirable White public persona – and by indirectly indexing racist images of Spanish speakers. According to Hill, these racist stereotypes are indeed perceived as such by Spanish-speakers. Mendoza-Denton (2008), too, cites evidence that her participants were aware of Anglo-Americans making fun of Spanish, showing sensitivity to ‘quite subtle linguistic variants... as well as the explicit links between the use of those out-of-place elements and the intention to offend’, noting that ‘speakers do indeed orient to these microphenomena in their fashioning of linguistic and cultural stances’ (p. 293).

A main distinction between Spanish-speaking bilinguals vs. Anglophone monolinguals drawn on by the concept of mock Spanish involves keeping order at linguistic borders. According to this heuristic, bilinguals feel strong pressure to police their linguistic borders so that their Spanish does not contaminate polite public space and create ‘disorder’. They are also often highly self-conscious about Spanish phonology influencing their English. Anglophones, on the other hand, ‘permit themselves a considerable amount of disorder’ in public discourse (1998, p. 481), and the oral and written Spanish they use publicly is often syntactically, morphologically and phonologically cringe-inducing. I will return to this concept in the conclusions when considering the fact that codeswitched greeting cards are made neither for nor by Anglophones, yet the language they contain is clearly akin to mock Spanish.

Lipski (2004) shares Hill’s view, referring to:

... the torrent of gibberish that is tolerated as gentlemen’s approximation to Spanish. In a society that has become increasingly intolerant of racial and ethnic slurs and offensive discourse disguised as ‘just plain fun,’ the continued acceptance of pseudo-Spanish is a stark reminder of the challenges that remain.

Schwartz (2008) uses the term ‘gringo Spanish’ to describe such uses, arguing that they constitute acts of ‘the reproduction of privilege, racism and social order in White public spaces’ (p. 224), while *Gringoism* is his term for ‘a larger framework in which Mock Spanish finds its place’ (2011, p. 656). He argues that many Anglophones have begun to co-opt the term ‘gringo’ as a re-appropriation of pejorative language in order to promote ‘solidarity among those not only identifying as monolingual Anglos, but more importantly, those taking mutual comfort and pride in their inability to speak Spanish’ (p. 230). Schwartz proposes that several commercially available Spanish books, including *Spanish for Gringos*⁷ claims about how easy it is to ‘pick up’ Spanish⁷ and another title that assists in communicating with domestic help, emerge from a ‘need for Anglos to actively reclaim positions of power and elevate Whiteness as symbolic of linguistic and cultural order’ (p. 230). I will return to these concepts in the greeting card analysis, but it is important to keep in mind that the codeswitched cards I examine are not intended for monolingual Anglophone consumers.

Differently from Hill (1998), Lipski (2004) and Schwartz (2008), the comedian Bill Santiago (2008) in his chapter titled ‘Spanglish a lo Gringo’ humorously accepts and even promotes ‘gringo Spanglish’:

Spanish and pseudo-Spanish words and phrases pour constantly from the mouths of monolinguals in this country who don’t really know Spanish per se. In fact, gringos

enjoy a certain advantage as Spanglish speakers over Latinos. Nobody expects them to get Spanish right, so they can be a lot less inhibited about experimenting. Whereas if a Latino screws up the Spanish, ¡ay qué vergüenza! You feel you're going to get disowned by your family or banned from watching *Sábado Gigante* [...]

His 'Top ten tips for speaking Spanglish like a Gringo' include 'Never miss a chance to mispronounce a Spanish word so badly that it's no longer recognizable to a Spanish-speaking person' and 'When all else fails, throw in an "¡Ay caramba!"' (p. 92). The examples of Gringo Spanglish he cites (and those that he occasionally uses himself, such as 'I hope que you enjoyed el booko'), however, are not identified as uses that a true bilingual codeswitcher would never actually produce. It is difficult to determine whether Santiago truly welcomes such attempts at Spanish use by Anglo monolinguals as a legitimate part of his 'pro-Spanglish' campaign, or whether he simply sought to appeal to (or at least not alienate) a wider Anglo monolingual readership.

Multilingualism in advertising has received a fair amount of research attention and is also relevant here because, like greeting cards, it is a form of print language created for commercial purposes. In particular, print advertisements and billboards in German, Portuguese, French, Dutch and Spanish (Einbeck, 2004; Friedrich, 2002; Gerritsen et al., 2007; Kelly-Holmes, 2005; Piller, 2001) have demonstrated a clear effort by marketers to utilise multiple languages to express modernity, sophistication or superiority, specifically through their use of English. In television commercials, too, Lee (2006) found an explicit link between English use and the idea of modernity, liberalism and youth among young, bilingual Korean–English speakers. Some researchers have noted that language mixing in advertising can lead to the creation of an 'artificial' language different from either original language. Einbeck (2004) looked at the mixing of English into and with German print advertisements, arguing that English had been absorbed into the German and resulting in a language altogether different from either separately. For example, an advertisement for a restaurant in the Austrian Alps reads 'Letty's Route 66^s – Die Bar – Der Treff – Das Steakhouse' (Einbeck, 2004, p. 50). I will return to this idea of artificial language in my analysis of codeswitched Spanish–English greeting cards.

Finally, shifting to the focus of the present study on greeting cards, there has been one study of the use of English lexical items in Chinese greeting cards available on mainland China in the late 1990s. In a fascinating study of a corpus of 109 greeting cards, Erbaugh (2000) found that 68% had some use of English (according to the author, the rate has increased since then) which 'functions largely as an alphabetic symbol of modernity' (p. 189). English also serves to both 'legitimize the fluid foreign holidays' and allow senders to be more romantic – given that 'the Chinese words for "I love you" (*wo ai ni*) stills sound foreign, blunt, and improper' (p. 189), the English 'I love you' is often used. The cards contained rather bizarre combinations of text and images, such as Chinese 'Happy Birthday' printed above an English 'Merry Christmas' or mixed collages of Santa and a baby elephant in diapers. The author posits that cards allow individuals to express lateral connections and affections, which is seen as a welcome change in overwhelmingly vertical Chinese social hierarchy. She also notes that, as in the West, greeting cards are especially attractive to women, who are increasingly literate and have their own incomes. She concludes that although multiple styles compete almost everywhere in modern written Chinese,

these greeting cards were 'eclectic in the extreme' (p. 184) and documents how greeting cards 'have become thoroughly integrated into Chinese political and personal life' (p. 200).

Based on the literature just reviewed on greeting cards, on codeswitching in written form, and on 'Spanglish'/mock Spanish, codeswitched greeting cards provide an interesting arena for analysis. Do bilingual Latinos see Spanish-English codeswitched cards favourably, as an enactment of bilingual identity (Mahootian, 2005), thus granting linguistic authority to the card makers (Jaffe, 1999)? Conversely, to what degree is the language of codeswitched greeting cards considered 'not used by real people' (Papson, 1986), an artificial language (Einbeck, 2004), Mock Spanish (Hill, 1998) or Gringoism (Schwartz, 2008)?

Methodology

The current study examined bilinguals' reactions to 17 codeswitched greeting cards. A total of 30 college students or college graduates were interviewed in Chicago, IL, or Tucson, AZ.⁹ These different cities were chosen to explore whether participants' reactions would vary by location. Chicago is the third largest Spanish-speaking city in the USA, with 28% of its three million residents being Census-identified as Hispanic and hailing from many different groups including Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and Salvadoran. Tucson, a smaller urban area at slightly over one million people, was selected for its physical proximity to the border with Mexico and more homogenous Mexican-origin population.

Participants were sought between the ages of 18 and 40 years, either born in the USA or brought here before the age of 5 years, and self-identified as both (1) Hispanic/Latino, as well as (2) bilingual in Spanish and English. The ages of our participants ranged from 19 to 32 years, with the gender variation mirroring that of greeting card consumers generally: 23% male and 77% female. The majority (24/30) of participants were of Mexican origin, while others were Argentinean, Ecuadorian, Guatemalan, Panamanian, Colombian and Puerto Rican. All interviews were conducted in English and lasted approximately one hour. Eleven participants completed interviews in small focus groups consisting of two individuals (one of the partners ended up not fitting our criteria stated above) and 15 completed individual interviews. There was also one focus group of four individuals. The interview format was varied to ascertain whether different formats would generate more active responses from the participants, but participation did not vary significantly across formats. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

After a series of introductory demographic questions about age, place of birth, age at which they began learning English and Spanish, and a self-assessment of language proficiency, participants were asked about their greeting card purchasing habits: Did they buy greeting cards? What percentage of them were in English and what percentage in Spanish? Who did they buy them for and why? In which language and why? Had they ever given or received a codeswitched greeting card? Then, they were asked to read and discuss a corpus of codeswitched greeting cards, described below.

Greeting card corpus and ratings of codeswitching

Participants were asked to look at a corpus of 17 codeswitched greeting cards. The complete texts appear in Appendix 1, which also lists the abbreviations used henceforth to refer to each card, such as 'Pedi', 'Wonderful Navidad' and 'Chihuahua'. I collected the cards over a few years in different stores across the country, mostly in Chicago. Not included in this study were cards with a monolingual Spanish text followed by an English translation on the back; each card had to contain intrasentential codeswitching, meaning that the codeswitch occurred within a single sentence. Nor were any electronic (email) greeting cards included, in part because none were found with intrasentential codeswitches, but more importantly, to keep the medium of the card constant (i.e. paper cards only).

I rated each card as either felicitously codeswitched (FC) or infelicitously codeswitched (IC). Felicitous codeswitching is that which does not violate constraints on (more accurately, *tendencies of*) codeswitching.¹⁰ An example of a felicitous codeswitch from this corpus is 'Pero me dijo forget it'. Infelicitous codeswitching violates grammatical tendencies of codeswitching, such as the example 'Los birthdays are like mocos. The more you have, the más difficult respirar'. This is considered infelicitous because codeswitching usually does not occur between a determiner and an adverb, and because the syntax of English is violated with 'difficult respirar'. The terms 'felicitous' and 'infelicitous' reflect more accurately than the terms 'correct/incorrect' the fact that intrasentential codeswitching conforms to tendencies, not strict rules, and that every constraint on codeswitching proposed to date has been met with counterexamples (Thomason, 2001).

According to the Greeting Card Association (2009), greeting card purchases nationwide are split evenly between everyday purchases such as birthday cards and seasonal purchases like Christmas and other holiday cards. There were 10 cards in the everyday category, only two of which were not birthday cards. The seven seasonal cards were all Christmas cards with the exception of one Halloween card. In addition, all codeswitched cards located were for happy occasions. This is not surprising; one would not expect a religious card to a grandmother or a sympathy card to contain codeswitched language because codeswitching is almost always an informal mode of communication. Accordingly, in a 2006 press release, Hallmark stated that certain occasions were not conducive to bilingual cards, and which 'often contain casual, lighthearted sentiments and...are usually aimed at younger recipients and friend-to-friend sending' Jozefiak (2006). In fact, the heavy cardstock dividers that identify card types, such as 'Birthday, Mother' and 'Get well', were revealing. In most stores, Spanish language cards have orange dividers with labels like 'Cumpleaños-madre' or 'Navidad-abuela', but the codeswitched cards in this corpus had one of three labels on their dividers: 'Spanish-bilingual', 'Spanish-humorous' or 'Spanglish'. This equation of bilingual, humorous and 'Spanglish' underscores the 2006 Hallmark press release about the informal, lighthearted nature of these cards.

A breakdown of the 17 cards according to type of intrasentential codeswitching (felicitous vs. infelicitous) as well as whether it was an everyday or a seasonal card appears in Table 1. Twelve of the cards (70%) contained felicitous codeswitches, and five (30%) contained codeswitches deemed infelicitous. Having learned from Jaffe (1999) that there is a manual for aspiring greeting card verse writers (Hohman & Long, 1981) and from Erbaugh (2000) that she had interviewed greeting card

Table 1. Greeting card corpus.

	'Everyday' content	Seasonal content	Total
Felicitously codeswitched	6	6	12
Infelicitously codeswitched	3	2	5
Total	9	8	17

executives, I hoped to understand the process behind the creation of these greeting cards – particularly such blatantly infelicitous switches like ‘Sólo hay un little problema’ or ‘Ten mucho fun’ – by interviewing executives at the two card companies. Unfortunately, my attempts were not successful.

Participants were asked to look at each of the 17 cards one by one. First, they were asked whether they would buy it and why or why not, and for whom. Then they were asked whether the language of the card sounded ‘authentic’ to them. That is, participants were asked to think of how closely the language resembled their own speech or the speech of people they know, and if there was any language they would change or, conversely, that they felt was particularly authentic. I hypothesised that the 12 FC cards would be more readily bought and rated more authentic-sounding than the 5 IC cards, but as will be shown ahead, this hypothesis was not entirely borne out. Participants were also asked how they felt about the illustrations and the card sentiment generally.

Findings

Neither gender nor location (Chicago vs. Tucson) was strongly correlated to overall responses, so all responses will be reported in the aggregate. Only 4 of the 30 participants stated that they did not regularly buy greeting cards. The 26 people that did regularly purchase cards bought anywhere from 5 to 25 cards per year, and of these, 19 people stated they always bought cards in English, either because they rarely found Spanish greeting cards they liked or because they gave cards to people who did not speak Spanish. In other words, 73% of the participants never bought greeting cards in Spanish. Of the seven participants that did purchase cards in Spanish, the recipients were older, Spanish-dominant family members such as grandparents, parents or aunts and uncles. No participant reported having ever purchased a bilingual greeting card, and only two people thought they had once received a bilingual card, though neither was certain that the language was codeswitched as opposed to a translation. Clearly neither Spanish nor bilingual greeting cards currently on the market were figuring prominently in the greeting card experiences of these 30 individuals.

The next sections discuss how authentic-sounding the participants deemed the corpus of codeswitched greeting cards, before exploring whether they would purchase them or not – a decision that was not based solely on linguistic authenticity.

Perceptions of linguistic authenticity

Appendix 1 displays the reactions of the participants to the codeswitching in the 17 cards. On average, the FC cards were rated as authentic-sounding by 20 (or 67%, two thirds) of the participants, while the IC cards were deemed authentic-sounding

on average by 11 (37%) of the participants. This difference suggests a degree of validity of my ratings of codeswitching felicitousness. Six of the 12 FC cards received authentic ratings by two thirds or more of the participants; the remaining six were deemed authentic-sounding by between one third and two thirds of the participants. Although four of the five IC cards, as hypothesised, were rated as 'authentic' by one third or fewer of the participants, the IC card with the highest rating ('Pedí') actually received 'authentic' ratings by a few more people than did the lowest rated FC card ('Merry Navidad'), indicating that felicitousness of codeswitching and considerations of linguistic authenticity do not map neatly on to one another. The card with the lowest authenticity rating of the entire corpus (the IC card 'Mocos') was rated as authentic by only 23% (7) of the participants.

Participants rather consistently indicated that the language was more authentic and easier to read and understand when the codeswitch occurred a phrasal level rather than individual words, which may explain the relatively low authenticity ratings for 'Merry Navidad' which, in spite of containing felicitous switches, consists of mostly English text with single Spanish words like 'alegría' and 'tesoro'. In the 'Pedí' card, participants noted that the use of the words 'God' or 'money' in an otherwise all-Spanish sentence was inauthentic. Comments about authenticity were additionally linked to consistent rhyming patterns, such that the five cards with rhymes ('Love', 'Delicioso', 'Sick', 'Te quiero' and 'Maravilloso') all received high authenticity ratings. Participants also indicated they found the cards easier to read with the aid of clear visual separations between English and Spanish in the form of line breaks.

However, what one woman called a 'segregation' of Spanish produced negative reactions among some participants. Several cards featured Spanish words or phrases that were either bolded, italicised or put into quotation marks. For example, one woman said the quotations in the card 'Feliz Navidad' were confusing, as if the narrator of the card were quoting someone else while directing speech at the recipient. Another said that the use of quotations made her feel as if someone 'was trying to show how cool they were by knowing a few words in Spanish, but were at the same time making fun of me to my face'. Several participants made air quotes with their fingers as they read the text of these cards, one claiming somewhat annoyed, 'I don't know why this is quoted'.

Regarding 'Mocos', which received the lowest ratings for authentic language (23%), participants said the Spanish was 'just thrown in there' in order to produce a codeswitched card; one woman claimed it read 'as if it had been written by a man sitting behind his desk Googling Spanish phrases' to include. Regarding 'Tan Nice', another stated, 'I'm irritated with "un little problema"'. That's how people talk when they're making fun of Spanish', which I return to later as support of Hill's (1998) analysis of mock Spanish. Most participants noted that they would never say 'los birthdays', and that 'The more you have;/the más difficult respirar!' was difficult to read, immediately correcting it to read, 'The more you have;/lo más difícil [para] respirar'. Reacting to 'Feliz Navidad', every single participant mentioned 'mucha' ('may your happiness be mucha') as sounding 'wrong' or 'weird'.

Some language uses were affiliated with a particular dialect. This reaction occurred most frequently with the card 'Pedí', which prompted three participants to mention Mexican-American comedians George Lopez or Paul Rodriguez: 'This sounds like George Lopez to me. I see him when I read it'. Another woman stated, 'I'm not Chicana, so I don't speak this way'. Several participants also mentioned an

aversion to the use of the word ‘chica’ in ‘Tan Nice’, which was associated with a ‘valley girl’ or ‘West Coast’ language. Thus for some cards, participants had a sense that notions of linguistic authenticity were related to dialect differences.

Finally, several issues of linguistic authenticity mentioned by participants were not related to codeswitching. The Puerto Rican participants adamantly insisted that no one calls a quinceañera a ‘quince’. Another said she did not like the word ‘fantástico’ on the ‘Dora’ card, which was too formal a word for the young child audience of the card. For the ‘Sick’ card, a few participants indicated that ‘Feeling sick is not “No te sientes bien”, it’s “Estás enfermo?” Or “¿Te sientes mal?”’. A few other cards also prompted corrections or suggestions for improvements on particular words.

Willingness to purchase codeswitched cards: design¹¹ and cultural authenticity

In general, cards with higher linguistic authenticity ratings also received higher ratings for willingness to purchase. However, on average, 43% of the participants rejected FC cards as potential purchases, and two of these cards were considered acceptable to purchase by only one third or fewer of the participants. Why were FC cards, on average deemed authentic-sounding 67% of the time, rejected at a fairly high average rate of 43%? Regarding the IC cards, an average of 70% of the participants rejected them as potential purchases. Why were these cards – all of which I had hypothesised would be thoroughly rejected – deemed *acceptable* to purchase by between 26% and 43% of the participants?

Callahan (2004) signalled the difficulty in responding to printed language with the same rules that govern oral speech. An individual may recognise a codeswitch as perfectly authentic-sounding, yet reject seeing it in print. The opposite may also be true: someone can feel that certain language would *not* be heard in everyday speech, yet find it acceptable as greeting card text, perhaps deferring to the perceived authority of the written words in the cards (Jaffe, 1999).

However, it seems that design and cultural authenticity often trump ratings of linguistic authenticity. Although the colour used in the design of the cards played an important role in their ratings – to the detriment of ‘Merry Navidad’, which was deemed was too bland (one participant stated, ‘We’re Hispanic. We like a lot of colors’.) – a much more significant factor was cultural authenticity. For example, three cards (including ‘Quince Felicidad’) were deemed linguistically authentic by approximately 70% of the participants, yet only half stated that they would buy those cards. Suggestions for a more suitable ‘Quince Felicidad’ design included a girl with a tiara and a formal dress, which according to participants better represented a quinceañera. Many felt that whoever had written the card could not possibly be a part of Hispanic/Latino culture; one woman said that the card was something a ‘white person’ would give for a quinceañera.

In fact, several images on these cards were criticised for drawings of people who appeared to be something other than ‘Latino’ and for images that were ‘Americanized’ or contained cartoon animals. The young girl pictured on the front of the ‘Tan Nice’ card, for example, was referred to as a ‘white Barbie with a tan’, and another participant criticized the ‘skinny’ legs on the illustration by stating, ‘We’re Mexican, we’re thick’. ‘Merry Navidad’ was said to be so far from a traditional feeling of Navidad that one participant claimed his mother would slap him if he ever gave her a card like that. One participant picked up ‘Mocos’ (with an Anglo-looking

boy about 10 years of age on the cover), shook his head, and put it down. When prompted to explain his reaction, he shrugged his shoulders and stated, 'I'm used to seeing images that are whitened'.

Another card that was very commonly criticised for being culturally inappropriate was the 'Amistad' Christmas card: 'This is alien to how I see my culture'; 'Hot chocolate does not say Christmas'; 'This is a white American drawing with strong cultural ties... Americans have this obsessive need for thank you cards'; 'This is a super American Christmas card'; and 'Americans are corny'. 'Te quiero', which featured a cartoon drawing of a very dapper male lion, bothered participants in both image and content, particularly that the lion 'suggested a Latin lover'. One person stated that the word 'caballero' was sarcastic, although others said it had very positive connotations. The 'Delicioso' card, which mentions how wine ages, prompted one Mexican-origin participant to note, 'We drink tequila or beer, not wine'. In the 'Pedí' card, several people did not like the idea of 'God' in English or that it appeared at all: 'This is an important word that should be kept in Spanish', 'I don't like the idea of God speaking', and 'This should say "le pedí a someone else", not God'.

One card strongly offended the majority of participants with what they claimed was an ethnic slur. 'Chihuahua' has on its cover a Chihuahua dog wearing a tassel-embellished sombrero with the text 'Ay, Chihuahua'. Many participants responded, 'Who *says* that?' and bemoaned the association between Chihuahuas and sombreros with Mexicans, infamously promoted by Taco Bell commercials (Schwartz, 2011 offers a discussion of the Chihuahua as gringo object). One young woman stated about the bright red and yellow on the cover, 'Something about the colors makes me feel like they're making fun of me'. One Mexican participant stated that only 'an American' would buy this card, 'not a Spanish speaker'.¹² The Chihuahua card is also IC with 'Ten mucho fun', and although one third of the participants rated this as authentic language, the card received the lowest purchase rating of the entire corpus (20%).

Finally, price played a minor role in a card's desirability as a potential purchase. This was noted by Papson, who pointed out that greeting card exchange value in the form of price 'becomes a sign value mediating the relationship signified by the exchange' (1986, p. 101). Many participants flipped to the back of the card to take note of the manufacturer and the price, and particular disdain was shown to the cards 'Sonríe' and 'Merry Navidad' because participants deemed the quality to be 'dollar store' and expected the price to be lower.

Conclusions: carnival mirrors and rejection of 'disorder'

The prediction that FC cards would be perceived as more linguistically authentic and more desirable to purchase than IC cards was generally borne out in this study. The fact that linguistic authenticity and purchasing desirability did not always coincide, however, can be understood through respondents' comments about the perceived degree of cultural authenticity of the card's message and images, which were critical factors – in some cases, more than language – in the card's desirability.

Despite some of the cards receiving relatively high ratings on both linguistic and cultural measures, almost every one of them was criticised by some participants – members of the audience targeted as consumers of bilingual greeting cards. In the analytical framework of Mahootian (2005), the majority of participants did not see these codeswitched cards as an enactment of bilingual identity. Quite on the contrary,

participants' sensations that they were being made fun of by the language in these cards very clearly invokes Hill's (1993, 1998) work on mock Spanish and Schwartz's (2008) *Gringoism*, but with an interesting twist. The mock/gringo Spanish discussed by Hill and Schwartz is found in mainstream cards designed for and by monolingual Anglophones, containing language that Spanish speakers would not use (e.g. 'Numero two-o' or 'Grassy Ass'). Codeswitched cards like those analysed in the present study are created for consumption by bilingual Latinos only; they are found in the Spanish card section, separated from mainstream English cards, and thus not in 'White public space' (Hill, 1998, p. 484). Moreover, a monolingual Anglophone would not know enough Spanish to produce these cards – as difficult as it may be to believe that a native bilingual codeswitcher produced the texts for the IC cards.

The fact that 70% of the participants stated they would not buy the IC cards in this corpus constitutes a rejection of the 'disorder' (Hill, 1998) the cards represent. Participants expressed knowledge of the concept of mock Spanish and sensed a kind of leakage of this practice into some of these cards, leading me to conclude that the IC cards in this corpus do in fact constitute mock Spanish. What is unclear is *why* there are infelicitous codeswitches in commercially published greeting cards marketed to Latinos and *who* participated in creating them. Do these uses represent simple carelessness on the part of greeting card manufacturers, unwilling to invest in focus groups and US-raised bilingual card writers who know how US Latino bilinguals really speak? If so, could such carelessness be considered a form of racism, a la Hill (1998)? Or are these companies guilty of hoping that bilingual Latinos will actually find such inauthentic uses humorous – that they will begin to accept and produce mock Spanish, granting linguistic authority to the card makers (Jaffe, 1999)? And might bilinguals in fact do so, due to linguistic insecurities or other reasons?

Hill acknowledged that, when she showed greeting cards with uses like 'Moochos Smoochos' to bilinguals, some found them funny. In the present study as well, at least a handful of participants said they would buy even the cards with low linguistic authenticity ratings. However, overall, participants refused to grant linguistic authority to the card makers (Jaffe, 1999). Recalling Papson's (1986) analysis that greeting card language is 'not used by real people' or is a kind of artificial language (Einbeck, 2004), the IC (and some FC) cards in this corpus were indeed seen as linguistically artificial by many participants. Papson (1986) additionally hypothesised a link between corporations and the breakdown of interpersonal relationships because individuals are increasingly handing over discourse to the 'logic of bureaucratic corporate capitalism' (p. 99). The present findings suggest that Latinos are in fact not handing over codeswitched discourse to greeting card companies because they rejected many of the companies' products in theory, and more importantly, did not actually buy the products in practice.

Another angle on this, inspired by Jaffe's (1999) proposal that card senders can 'express socially authenticated identities and sentiments, as well as subtle and complex new messages about identities and relationships' (p. 115), we might ask ourselves what relationships the selection of a codeswitched card indexes. However, none of our participants had given nor (as far as they could recall) received a codeswitched greeting card. And although 87% of the participants regularly bought greeting cards, 73% of the regular card purchasers had never bought cards in monolingual Spanish, either. These findings, significant in themselves, suggest that young bilingual Latinos *are* exchanging greeting cards to carry out social functions, but they do this work almost entirely in English.

What of the cards' images – the Chihuahua, the Anglo boy, the 'Barbie with a tan' and the hot chocolate? Participants were very certain about cultural inauthenticity, from the need for a card to depict a quinceañera dress to rejecting 'white people's' referents such as wine and hot chocolate. Relevant here is Callahan's (2004) proposal that three conditions are necessary for authentic codeswitching in fiction: (1) a setting in which Spanish is naturally used, (2) characters who are fluent in Spanish and (3) thematic content with which Latinos can identify. However, the thematic content of many of the greeting cards in this corpus was deemed irrelevant to Latinos' lives, which often also coincided with infelicitous codeswitching. Furthermore, recall the participant who stated that Americans have an 'obsessive need' to send thank you cards; others stated that food or a celebration were preferable to receiving a greeting card, which were deemed by some as 'useless'. Greeting cards are not nearly as widely available or exchanged in Mexico (either in large cities or smaller towns) as they are in the US. Thus, if these mostly Mexican participants and their families and friends do end up acculturating to mainstream US greeting card practices, it makes sense for them to do so in English.

The content of greeting cards both reflects and reinforces societal norms. Eckardt (1981, p. 57) posited that greeting cards 'lock our society in a hall of mirrors' in which it is not clear whether reality or greeting card images create the other. As Cacioppo and Andersen (1981) put it, 'The choices that individuals make when purchasing greeting cards influence what designs and sentiments are subsequently available. This suggests that the nature of the available greeting cards can be used as an archival data source to gauge social attitudes and interpersonal communicative processes'. This appears *not* to be the case for codeswitched greeting cards among our participants because they had never purchased any. In addition, in Eckardt's (1981) terms, the IC cards in this corpus represent not regular mirrors, but carnival mirrors that grotesquely distort instead of reflect a linguistic phenomenon. I suspect that the creators of the cards in this corpus were Anglophone monolinguals, operating within *Gringoism* (Schwartz, 2008) but receiving assistance of some kind from bilinguals to produce the codeswitched text. Access to card companies' sales figures would reveal whether codeswitched greeting cards gain in popularity as the bilingual population grows,¹³ but more culturally and linguistically authentic cards would appear to be necessary in order for this to happen.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Jane Hill and to Adam Schwartz for their insightful comments, as well as to the two anonymous reviewers.

Notes

1. As an example, among my friends, it is common for women to regularly buy and send cards to our husband's family members as well as our own.
2. Commercially available greeting cards are obviously not available for all occasions; I once joked to a friend who had "made santo" within the santería religion that I could not find an appropriate Hallmark card to send her.
3. I was unable to locate data on this.
4. Some authors clearly envision a bilingual audience and do not offer translations, which may result in a greater similarity between their written texts and spoken codeswitching.
5. For a debate between Ana Celia Zentella and Ricardo Otheguy about this topic, see <http://potowski.org/debate-spanglish>.

6. Hill notes that African-Americans also use mock Spanish (1998, p. 486), so the term “Anglophone” is more accurate than “White”.
7. However, it is frequently a selling point for language books that *their* method makes language learning “easy”. There may be books about “picking up” French or Chinese as well.
8. “Route 66” is a reference to the historical US interstate highway, typically signifying excitement and adventure.
9. Many thanks to L. Monique Tippins for conducting the interviews and analysing findings.
10. For more on grammatical constraints on/tendencies of codeswitching, see Poplack (1985) and Thomason (2001).
11. Due to copyright restrictions, the card designs cannot be reproduced here.
12. It merits repeating that this card, like all in the corpus, is sold in the Spanish language card section, not with the mainstream cards.
13. In the meantime, these cards do continue to be produced and sold; I have acquired eight additional intrasententially codeswitched cards since this project was completed.

References

- Cacioppo, J., & Andersen, B. (1981). Greeting cards as data on social processes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 2(2), 115–119.
- Callahan, L. (2004). *Spanish/English codeswitching in a written corpus*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Di Leonardo, M. (1987). The female world of cards and holidays: Women, families and the work of kinship. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12(3), 440–453.
- Eckardt, W. (1981, December 14). Mirroring American taste. *Time*, 118.
- Einbeck, K. (2004). Mixed messages: English in German advertising. *Journal of Language for International Business*, 15, 41–61.
- Erbaugh, M. (2000). Greeting cards in China: Mixed language of connections and affections. In D. Davis (Ed.), *The consumer revolution in urban China* (pp. 171–200). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Finn, P. (1980). Attitudes toward drinking conveyed in studio greeting cards. *American Journal of Public Health*, 70, 826–829.
- Friedrich, P. (2002). English in advertising and brand naming: Sociolinguistic considerations and the case of Brazil. *English Today*, 18(3), 21–28.
- Gerritsen, M., Nickerson, C., Van Hoof, A., Van Meurs, F., Nederstigt, U., Starren, M., & Crijns, R. (2007). English in product advertisements in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes*, 26(3), 291–315.
- Greeting Card Association. (2009). *General facts*. Retrieved from http://www.greetingcard.org/thegreetingcard_facts.html
- Hallmark. (2011). About Hallmark. Retrieved from <http://corporate.hallmark.com/Company>
- Hill, J. (1998). Language, race, and White public space. *American Anthropologist*, 100(3), 680–689. Reprinted in *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*, Alessandro Duranti, ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hill, J. (1993). Is it really “No Problemo”? Junk Spanish and Anglo Racism. SALSA I: annual symposium about language and Society-Austin No. 1, Austin TX. 33(1–12).
- Hohman, E., & Long, N. (1981). *The greeting card handbook*. New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Jaffe, A. (1999). Packaged sentiments: The social meanings of greeting cards. *Journal of Material Culture*, 4(2), 115–141.
- Johnson, S.K. (1971). Sociology of Christmas cards. *Trans-Action*, 8(3), 27–29.
- Jozefiak, G. (2006). Looking for a Spanish sympathy cards? Try Hallmark’s Sinceramente range. Retrieved from <http://greetingcardguide.com/24/spanish-sympathy-card-try-hallmark%E2%80%99s-sinceramente-range/>.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. (2005). *Advertising as multilingual communication*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lee, J.S. (2006). Linguistic constructions of modernity: English mixing in Korean television commercials. *Language in Society*, 35(1), 59–91.

- Lipski, J. (2004). *Is "Spanglish" the third language of the South? Truth and fantasy about U.S. Spanish*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from <http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/j/m/jml34/spanglish.pdf>
- Mahootian, S. (2005). Linguistic change and social meaning: Codeswitching in the media. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9(3 & 4), 361–375.
- Martin, J. (1996). *Miss Manners' basic training: Communication*. New York: Crown Publications.
- Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008). *Homegirls*. London: Blackwell.
- Montes-Alcalá, C. (2005). ¡Mándame un email! Cambio e códigos español-inglés online. In L. Ortiz López & M. Lacorte (Eds.), *Contactos y contextos lingüísticos: El español en los Estados Unidos y en contacto con otras lenguas* (pp. 173–186). Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Murphy, B.O. (1994). Greeting cards & gender messages. *Women and Language*, 17(1), 25.
- Papson, S. (1986). From symbolic exchange to bureaucratic discourse: The Hallmark greeting card. *Theory Culture & Society*, 3(2), 99.
- Piller, I. (2001). Identity constructions in multilingual advertising. *Language in Society*, 30(2), 153–186.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581–618.
- Santiago, B. (2008). *Pardon my spanglish: One man's guide to speaking the habla: ¡porque because!* Philadelphia, PA; Enfield: Quirk; Publishers Group UK [distributor].
- Schrift, M. (1994). Icons of femininity in studio cards: Women, communication and identity. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 28(1), 111–122.
- Schwartz, A. (2008). Their language, our Spanish: Introducing public discourses of 'Gringoism' as racializing linguistic and cultural reappropriation. *Spanish in Context*, 5(2), 224–245.
- Silberman-Federman, N.J. (1995). Jewish humor, self-hatred, or anti-Semitism – the sociology of Hanukkah cards in America. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 28(4), 211–229.
- Stavans, I. (2010). *Don Quixote de La Mancha*, Miguel de Cervantes. First Parte, Chapter Uno Traducido al Spanglish por Ilán Stavans. Retrieved from http://www.cuaderoscervantes.com/art_40_quixote.html
- Stern, E. (1988). *The very best from Hallmark*. New York: Harry Abrams.
- Thomason, S. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Georgetown University Press.
- Willer, L.R. (2001). Warning: Welcome to your world baby, gender message enclosed: An analysis of gender messages in birth congratulation cards. *Women and Language: WL*, 24, 16–23.
- Zentella, A.C. (2007). *With friends like these, who needs enemies: The Spanglish Bandwagon*. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Costa Mesa, CA.

Appendix 1. Greeting card texts

Feliciciously codeswitched (12 cards)

Abbreviation	Occasion	Front	Inside	<i>(n = 30)</i>	
				Authentic	Purchase
Wonderful Navidad	Christmas	Wishing you a Wonderful Navidad...	... bright with sonrisas and filled with sorpresas./Feliz Navidad con Cariño	25	26
Love	Love	I love you!/Te quiero mucho, ¿sabes?/And every day I love you more!	But this card/is too chiquita/¿Para contener todo mi amor!	24	22
Delicioso	Birthday	A mi esposo delicioso/La manzana grows for many months before it can be eaten.../...and the peach has to hang por mucho tiempo just for it to sweeten.	Cuando el queso has been aged, they say it's at its best.../...and el vino sits for many years to pass a flavor test./ Everything takes time to be the best that it can be... And with every cumpleaños, you're más sabroso para mí./Feliz Cumpleaños, Mi Amor	23	22
Sick	Get well	Feeling sick? ¿No te sientes bien?/Tienes que descansar and then...	Watch un poco de televisión.../Drink your té con miel y limón.../Habla on the telephone.../ Before you know it,/ y de repente.../ you'll be feeling/ ¡excelente!	22	16
Quince Felicidad	Quinceañera	May your Quince find you sparkling with felicidad./May you be surrounded by cariño y amistad.	May your dreams come true/and fill your heart with alegría./This and more is wished for you/because it is tu día./¡Felicidades!	22	15
Te Quiero	Birthday	Front: Do you know why/Yo te quiero?	You're strong and sweet.../...and so sincero.../You are todo un caballero!/ Happy Birthday/con mucho amor/	21	15

Appendix 1 (*Continued*)

Abbreviation	Occasion	Front	Inside	<i>(n = 30)</i>	
				Authentic	Purchase
Maravillosa	Birthday	Para mi esposa maravillosa/ Sometimes I lose mi ropa . . . /A veces mi cabeza . . . /También I lose my way.	I'd like to lose mi panza, ¿Pero cómo? -/¡Yo no sé! Sometimes I lose mi ánimo . . . / Sometimes mi calma, too!/Pero hay algo que/I'll never lose . . . / . . . And that's mi amor for you!/Feliz cumpleaños, mi amor	19	17
Sonríe	Christmas	Hey, Sonríe!	Llegó la hora/de tener/una/Merry/Christmas!	19	12
Dora	Birthday	Happy Birthday!/ ¡Feliz Cumpleaños!	Hope your day is fantástico!	17	19
Jalowin	Halloween	¡¡Jalowin!!!	¿Jaló quién a who? Be careful no te vayan a jalar a ti! Feliz Halloween	17	17
Feliz Navidad	Christmas	Hope you have a merry Christmas, 'Feliz Navidad' to you.	May your happiness/be 'mucha'/and continue all year, too!/'Feliz Navidad' to you./and 'Próspero Año', too./¡Que disfrutes felicidad/all the season through!	16	10
Merry Navidad	Christmas	Merry Navidad	Here's a warm wish that your celebrations/be filled with alegría y cariño/and all the gifts of the spirit/ that only Navidad can bring	13	9
Average number of participants				20 (67%)	17 (57%)

Appendix 1 (*Continued*)

Infelicitously codeswitched (5 cards)

Abbreviation	Occasion	Front	Inside	<i>(n = 30)</i>	
				Authentic	Purchase
Pedí	Birthday	Le pedí a God/que me diera mucho money/¡para comprarte/un big regalo!	Pero me dijo:/'Forget it!'/Diviértete, Anyway!/(and Happy Birthday)	16	13
Tan Nice	Christmas	Eres tan nice, tan super, y tan special/ que Santa va a bring you/todo lo que mereces.	Sólo hay/un little problema . . . /No sabe como poner/todo el mall/en su sleigh!/ Merry Christmas,/ Chica!	11	10
Chihuahua	Birthday	¡Ay chihuahua!	¿Another/ cumpleaños?/Ten mucho fun.	10	6
Amistad	Christmas	Thinking of Our Amistad	At this time of giving,/I want to darte gracias/ for giving me/your amistad./It has been,/ and will always be,/a priceless tesoro./Feliz Navidad	10	7
Mocos	Birthday	Los birthdays are like mocos.	The more you have,/ ¡the más difficult respirar!;/¡Felicidades!	7	8
Average number of participants				11 (37%)	9 (30%)