

# Palauan English as a newly emerging postcolonial variety in the Pacific\*

Kazuko Matsumoto · David Britain

## 1. Introduction

The Republic of Palau/Beluu er a Belau is an independent nation state of the Western Pacific, consisting of an archipelago of around 350 small islands stretched across 400 miles of ocean. Its nearest neighbours are Indonesia and Papua New Guinea to the south, the Federated States of Micronesia to the east, Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to the northeast, and the Philippines to the west. The islands have a population of around 20,000, of which over 60% live in the largest city and former capital of Koror in 2005 (Office of Planning and Statistics 2006: 23). The capital, in 2006, was moved to Ngerulmud, in Melekeok State on the main island of Babeldaob. For most of the 20th century, Palau was under colonial administration: by Spain (1885–1899), Germany (1899–1914), Japan (1914–1945), and finally, the United States of America (1945–1994). It formally gained its independence in 1994.

This article examines the emergence of an Anglophone speech community in Palau, and aims to do three things: firstly to set the emergence of Palauan English into the context of the country's complex colonial past. Palau's four colonial rulers have exercised control in different ways, with different degrees of settler migration, different attitudes towards the function of Palau as a 'colony', and widely differing local policies, leading to very different linguistic outcomes in each case. The article focusses, however, on the American era and the path to Palauan independence. Secondly, in examining the development of English in Palau, it attempts to apply Schneider's (2007) 'Dynamic Model' of postcolonial English formation to this Anglophone community. This model attempts to provide a holistic social, historical, political and attitudinal as well as linguistic account of the process by which a new English emerges in a colonial environment. As we will see, the case of Palau is important, because few communities in which English

---

\* Our work on Palauan English has been supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan: Ref. No. 22682003 (2010–2013). We would like to thank Bernard Spolsky and the audience at the 2nd LINEE Conference: Multilingualism in the Public Sphere (4–6 May 2012) at Inter-University Centre, Dubrovnik, Croatia for feedback on a previous version of this paper and our research assistants Akiko Okumura; Tobias Leonhardt; Dominique Bürki; and Dorothee Weber for their invaluable contribution to the progress of this research. All remaining mistakes and inadequacies are our own. Since this is merely a progress report, it will subsequently appear in revised form as research articles in professional journals or in edited books.

has emerged as a result of American as opposed to British colonialism have been examined in the model to date. The final aim is to present, based on analyses of recordings of informal conversations among Palauans, an initial portrait of the main phonological, grammatical and lexical characteristics of Palauan English.

## **2. Colonisers from far and wide: A sociolinguistic history of Palau**

### **2.1 Introduction**

The aims of this section are, firstly, to outline a sociolinguistic account of postcolonial English formation that claims to be able to model the linguistic emergence of new English varieties in colonial contexts in its full historical, political, social psychological as well as sociolinguistic context – Edgar Schneider’s ‘Dynamic Model’ (2007). Secondly, we present the complex succession of colonial masters that Palau has had to endure over the past 150 years, and the multiplex linguistic legacies that these have left, focussing on the Anglophone period, from 1945 onwards, when Palau was under American control until, in 1994, it acquired nominal independence whilst remaining in a ‘Compact of Free Association’ with the US.

### **2.2 The Dynamic Model**

Schneider’s (2007) Dynamic Model presents an attempt to produce an all-embracing account of the socio-cultural, historical and sociolinguistic circumstances in which varieties of English have emerged in post-colonial contexts. It tracks the emergence of postcolonial Englishes through five phases from the earliest foundational days of English speakers’ presence in a new community, through the gradual stabilisation, nativisation and legitimisation of a new localised variety to possible and eventual full ‘independence’ of that variety from the original source. The model presents these developments from the differing perspectives of those groups centrally involved in the ultimate creation of the new variety. Schneider calls these groups ‘strands’, and talks principally of two: the settler or ‘STL’ strand – representing the perspectives of those speakers who migrated from the land of the colonial power and their descendants - and the indigenous or ‘IDG’ strand – the indigenous speakers of the colonised territories and their descendants. He also later talks of an ‘ADS’ or adstrate strand, namely ‘speakers of large population groups migrating to a country where the English-speaking population had already established itself’ (2007: 58) – the case of the large Greek population in Australia is one example. As we will see later, the role of the ADS strand is relevant in the case of Palauan English. The term ‘strand’ is a carefully chosen one, ‘to signal that they are interwoven with each other like twisted threads’ (2007: 31). The strands, inevitably, though, especially in the initial stages, are hierarchically ordered with respect to power, a power that strongly influences, for example, the nature of local bilingualism and other outcomes of language contact.

In investigating the STL and IDG strands across the five developmental phases, Schneider, for each, considers four ‘constitutive parameters’ (2007: 33), factors that need to be taken into consideration when accounting for the development of localising Englishes during that phase:

- Socio-political background: the evolving social, historical and political contextual conditions that shape and are shaped by the development of English in those communities;
- Identity constructions: this parameter examines the interrelationships between the different strands, between each strand and its social and political status in the country, and between each strand and its relations with the country from which the STL strand originally came;
- Sociolinguistic conditions: consideration is given here to the dynamic language contact ecologies in the colonised country, and the nature of bilingualism, cross-cultural communication, and the nature of territory-internal communication more generally;
- Linguistic effects: what are the linguistic consequences of the three above-listed strands? What linguistic processes enter play as the English spoken in the colonised territory begins to localise and diverge from that spoken in the source country?

A critical examination of the Dynamic Model in the context of Palau is interesting and important for a number of reasons. The emergence of English in Palau is in many ways dissimilar to many of those presented in Schneider (2007), and consequently provides a useful community in which to test the robustness of the model. First of all, English came to Palau rather later than most of the cases presented thus far – the STL strand did not enter Palau until 1945, after the end of the Pacific War and, as we will see, in many ways it did not arrive at all. And unlike most of the well-examined examples in *Postcolonial Englishes*, the STL strand in the case of Palau comes from the United States rather than Britain and Ireland. Britain’s contact with Palau is and always has been negligible, although famously one of the very first Pacific Islanders to come to the UK was from Palau – Prince Lee Boo, the son of Ibedul (the highest ranking chief of Koror), joined Captain Henry Wilson on a return voyage after the latter had been shipwrecked in Palau in 1783. The story of Lee Boo (Keate 1788) was so popular that in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries more than 20 English and more than 10 foreign-language editions of Keate’s book were published. The one US-source case study in Schneider (2007) comes from the Phillipines, a country where US involvement began half a century earlier in rather different sociopolitical circumstances and was, absolutely unlike Palau, as we will see, ‘unusually intense’ (2007: 140). The Phillipines, however, have themselves played an influential role, to be discussed later, in the development of English in Palau, and should rightfully be seen as an important ADS strand in the Palauan context. Palauan English, then, provides an important additional and somewhat distinct case study of an English gradually emerging in the context of US colonialism, and one in which other postcolonial Englishes have been influential contributors.

Secondly, Schneider admitted that ‘whether the Dynamic Model proposed here has wider applicability beyond contacts with English (and mostly British English) as the colonizers’ language is a matter of speculation, and probably difficult to test given the rarity of comparable cases of long-term and far-reaching quasi-global language expansions’ (2007: 68). Palau’s complex sociolinguistic and colonial history, however, enables us to at least consider the Dynamic Model, not just from the perspective of the progress of English through the different phases, but also another language that, historically, has been disseminated around the

world through colonial and other migrations – Japanese. Japan’s defeat in the Pacific War has meant that many of the colonial contexts in which Japanese was being diffused and localised before 1945 were suddenly and abruptly ended. One interesting sociolinguistic consequence of this has been that there are a number of ex-Japanese colonies, for example in the Pacific, that retain an elderly population of fluent Japanese speakers among which both the linguistic outcomes of Japanese dialect contact during the colonial period, as well as the effects of structural obsolescence of Japanese as the fluent population dwindles since, can be investigated (see, for example, Matsumoto and Britain 2003b, forthcoming a). A good deal of research has been conducted on the social conditions and linguistic consequences of Japanese as a colonial language (especially in Taiwan and the Pacific), but also, importantly, of Japanese as an ADS language in other colonial contexts, especially North and South America, each of which house over 750,000 residents of Japanese descent (Kikumura-Yano 2002: 29: this volume provides an amazingly rich history of Japanese migration and settlement around the world, but especially in the Americas - see also Matsumoto and Britain, forthcoming b). Japanese provides a fascinating potential testing ground for the Dynamic Model, because in some cases it plays (or rather played) the STL role (as in the case of Palau, for example, from 1914 to 1945) and in others a migrant language ADS role (in much of North America, including Hawai’i, as well as South and Central America, especially Brazil, Peru and Argentina) that did not share the powerful and privileged position that British English has had in most of its foreign excursions. Space does not permit us here to report on this ongoing research to critically apply the Dynamic Model to the Japanese diaspora – the Palauan case, as we will see, though, is relevant to the application of the model to both colonial Englishes and colonial Japanese.

## **2.3 The colonial history of Palau**

### **2.3.1 Indigenous languages**

Palauan is an Austronesian language. Its exact position within this family is somewhat disputed, however. Once thought to be Western Malayo-Polynesian, research based on the Austronesian Basic Vocabulary Database (Greenhill, Blust and Gray 2008) suggests it is, like Chamorro, an independent branch of Malayo-Polynesian, closest to the Central Eastern Malayo-Polynesian subgroup. Palauan was spoken at home by 65% of the population in 2005 (Office of Planning and Statistics 2006: 84). For a linguistic description of Palauan, see Josephs (1975; 1990; 1997; 1999); Flora (1974); Wilson (1972); Tkel (2000). It is currently the only national language of the country and is an official language alongside English. Before the Japanese era, Palauan was for the most part an oral language and had no written form. During the Japanese and US administrations, Japanese *katakana* and the Roman alphabet were adopted as phonograms for Palauan (Matsumoto 2001). However, as more and more elderly educated during Japanese administration increasingly pass away, the Palauan writing system is rapidly changing from having dual orthographies to the Roman alphabet only.

Two indigenous minority languages, *Sonsorolese* and *Tobian*, both of which belong to a Ponapeic-Trukic, Micronesian group of the Austronesian family, are also spoken by the roughly 100 residents of some Palauan islands (e.g.onsorol Island, Pulo Anna and Mirir Island, and Tobi Island) (Office of Plan-

ning and Statistics 2006: 23) located some 600km south-west of the main island of Babeldaob, (Matsumoto and Britain 2006).

### **2.3.2 Contact with non-local languages**

We can distinguish two types of non-local language in Palau: a) the languages brought to Palau due to foreign state sovereignty over Palau, namely Spanish, German, Japanese and American English, and b) immigrant languages, especially Tagalog and Filipino English. Our main focus in this section of the article is the linguistic impact different colonial powers have had, over the past century or so, when they have specifically and deliberately exercised social, religious or political power in Palau. Before this period, though, Palau did have contact with a number of languages from outside Micronesia. We briefly survey these here (see also Engelberg 2006).

Although more intensive contact with Spanish only began in Palau in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Spain had formally claimed Micronesia in 1686. Most of its focus in the Pacific had been in Guam and, especially, the Philippines, however (Lipski, Mühlhäusler and Duthin 1996: 271, 282). Nevertheless, the 19<sup>th</sup> century Pacific saw a good deal of European (see Tryon, Mühlhäusler and Baker 1996 for an excellent summary), as well as, towards the end of the century, Japanese, contact (see Peattie 1988: 1-33). Of all the European languages in the region, however, English seems to have made the most impact, and a number of authors point to the emergence of pidginised varieties of English across Micronesia as a result of contact between indigenous peoples, on the one hand, and passing ships, traders, whalers, missionaries, beachcombers and deserters on the other (see, for example, Hall 1945, Tryon, Mühlhäusler and Baker 1996, Mühlhäusler 1996, Keesing 1988). Keesing (1988: 4, 89) argued that a relatively stabilised and expanded pidgin had developed in Micronesia by the late 1880s with roots in what he called ‘Worldwide nautical pidgin English’, although he claims that the focal points for it were Kosrae and Pohnpei in what is now the Federated States of Micronesia, to the east of Palau. Chappell (1994), furthermore, suggested that it was not just European sailors and wanderers who had spread the pidgin, but also islanders themselves, since there were a good number of indigenous beachcombers and shiphands who both hopped on and off the islands and helped transmit pidgin English to others on their journeys.

#### **2.3.2.1 The Spanish period**

Palauan language contact with Spanish began in 1885 when Spanish Roman Catholic missionaries landed on Palau for the purpose of converting the islands to Christianity (Hezel and Berg 1980: 373). However, no social, political or economic policies were put into practice, nor were formal education programmes established (Shuster 1978: 149). In 1891, however, the Spanish Capuchins set up a mission station and school in Palau (Engelberg 2006: 9), and the priests occasionally delivered catechism classes; these classes were attended by 48 youths, but most of them were not Palauans but Chamorros from the Northern Mariana Islands (McKinney 1947: 83). The day-to-day pattern of Spanish language use, the teaching methods and the attitudes toward Spanish in Palau are unknown. Nevertheless, it is most likely that Palauan language contact with Spanish was restricted to religious domains only and that their attitude toward Spanish was re-

spectful since it was the language of ‘God’. Roman Catholicism remains the dominant religion in Palau and Palauan has absorbed numerous associated borrowings (e.g. *kerus* and *misang* from Spanish *cruz* and *Misa*, ‘cross’ and ‘Mass’) (Matsumoto 2010b).

### 2.3.2.2 The German period

The German era began in 1899 when Germany purchased almost all of Spain’s former territories in Micronesia as a result of the German-Spanish Treaty that followed Spain’s defeat in the Spanish-American War of 1898 (Rechebei and McPhetres 1997: 121-2). The rationale for German colonisation in Micronesia was to exploit its natural resources in order to contribute to economic development in Germany (Aoyagi 1977: 45). The early period of German control was spent only in converting the islands to Christianity, while seeking potential resources. From 1903, when phosphate deposits were discovered in Angaur as well as when copra production increased, Germany started promoting and greatly expanding commercial and military enterprises in Palau (Hezel and Berg 1980: 397; 421-3). In 1909, workers in the phosphate business included not only hundreds of Palauans, but also many imported labourers: 23 Europeans, 55 Chinese, 98 Yapese and 126 from the central Carolines (Hezel and Berg 1980: 421-3). In 1912, this number increased to more than 800, nearly 90% of whom were from across Micronesia (Firth 1973 in Engelberg 2006: 9-10). However, no information is available as to whether a simple (possibly pidgin) German became the principal lingua franca in the phosphate related business.

With regard to education, in 1902, firstly a small vocational school was established for the training of policemen, where mainly German and maths were taught (Palau Community Action Agency 1977: 195) to between 20 and 30 students (Hezel 1984). Then, from 1907, eight mission schools were opened in Koror and Melekeok (Engelberg 2006: 10-11). In 1914, the final year of the German administration, 361 children out of the total population of 4,200 attended schools, most of whom were children of the *meteet* – the top of the hereditary caste hierarchy (Shuster 1982: 150-2). Positive attitudes towards German have been reported: pupils were anxious to study it, while the Palauans not only asked for the Fathers to open more schools, but built some at their own expense in Melekeok and Ngatmel (Engelberg 2006: 14). Nevertheless, a teaching staff shortage appears to have resulted in less effective teaching methods, such as learning German songs by heart in some schools (Engelberg 2006: 12).

The German population in Micronesia was never large; in 1913, only 259 Germans lived across the whole of the Marshall and Caroline Islands (Aoyagi 1977: 45). Mühlhäusler and Baker (1996: 512) suggest, however, that it was only during the German period that the use of pidginised Englishes was finally suppressed, arguing that they had been used exclusively for communication with outsiders, and once the outsiders they had contact with were speaking German rather than English, the pidgins fell into disuse.

To sum up, German and Spanish control of Palau was ‘symbolic rather than strategic’ (Peattie 1988: 36). Spain located its base in Guam, while the Germans established their headquarters in Yap (Aoyagi 1977: 44-5) – Palau was not their main focus. In addition, their activities would have affected a rather restricted and small area of Palau - Koror. Communication facilities were not developed in Palau at that time, with residents of the largest island of Babeldaob, and the outlying atolls remaining relatively unaffected by

the turmoil and cultural upheaval of these colonial incursions (Hezel and Berg 1980: 435). Thus, although Germany embarked on economic and educational reforms on a larger scale than Spain had, it was not, on the whole, sufficient enough to have a strong effect on Palauan social structure and language.

### **2.3.2.3 The Japanese period**

Nearly thirty years of Japanese occupation of most of Micronesia began in 1914 as a result of the Anglo-Japanese alliance during the First World War (Palau Community Action Agency 1978: 280-281). Micronesia was considered to be valuable not only as a vital strategic advance in any future conflict with the U.S. (Peattie 1988: 42), but also as an outlet for Japan's growing population (Shuster 1978: 9, 42). For that purpose, Japanese colonisation resembles what Schneider (2007: 25) calls a "settlement colony", one formed with a demographic dominance of colonial settlers. Japan established the headquarters of the Nan'yō-chō (the South Seas Bureau) in Koror, made it the capital of the Nan'yō Guntō (South Sea Islands), and subsequently launched radical reforms in the demographic, economic, and educational arenas as well as in the infrastructure of the islands (see below for details). As a result, Palau became the political, economic and educational centre of Micronesia.

First and foremost, there was a massive influx of Japanese immigrants into Palau. In 1935, there was approximately a one to one ratio (6,553 and 6,230 respectively) of Japanese immigrants and Palauan residents, but the Japanese outnumbered Palauans by three to one (17,006 and 6,509) in 1937, and by four to one (23,980 and 6,514) in 1941 (Nan'yō-chō 1928, 1939, 1941, 1942). Furthermore, the majority of these Japanese immigrants in the early period were farmers and fishermen who had been recruited from Japan for their labouring skills, and who worked with the islanders in Japanese enterprises in Palau. Japanese civilian immigrants in Koror lived alongside indigenous Palauan residents in the same neighbourhoods, rather than in exclusive Japanese communities. As a result of this integrated settlement pattern, Palauan children interacted daily with Japanese children. Even before they went to school, they acquired Japanese 'moral codes', aspects of Japanese culture, such as traditional Japanese tales and songs, the Japanese language, jingles used for memorising multiplication in mathematics, and so forth. Ultimately this contact led to a large number of marriages between the Japanese and Palauans, which resulted in the emergence of a considerable Japanese Palauan population on the islands.

The introduction of the first ever nationwide education system also seems to have supported the diffusion of the Japanese language. Although there were some policy changes (e.g., subjects taught) in schools over time, almost all Palauan children received three years of compulsory education and two years of supplementary education, during which all subjects were taught in Japanese by Japanese teachers and the use of Palauan was forbidden. Advanced schools providing a two-year training in carpentry, agriculture, nursing and dressmaking were also present in Koror, at which selected students from other Micronesian islands as well as Palauans communicated in Japanese as a lingua franca.

Furthermore, a money-oriented economy significantly affected the social life and language use of the people. The appearance of Koror changed dramatically, and was described as a "suburb of Yokohama" (Shuster 1978: 13), a "handsome tropical city" (Kluge 1991: 5) and "Little Tokyo" (Leibowitz 1996: 14)

by journalists, missionaries and scholars who visited Koror at that time. Numerous restaurants, cafés, bars, a variety of shops as well as commercial and government offices lined the main street, while factories, laboratories and brothels were built on back streets. In particular, due to an excessive number of private houses, it was said that the small island of Koror appeared overcrowded. Palauans routinely used Japanese as their second language. The degree and frequency of everyday interaction between the Japanese and the Palauans was great enough to have brought about a local variety of Japanese in Palau (Matsumoto and Britain 2003b and forthcoming a).

#### **2.3.2.4 The American period**

“When the United States captured Micronesia from Japan in World War II, the territory presented America with a dilemma: how to reconcile traditional American views in favour of self-government and self-determination with the belief that American control of Micronesia was required in order to defend the United States and to maintain international peace and security” (McHenry 1975:2, see also Täuber and Han 1950: 109). Such a belief had crystallised because Japan’s strategy of using military bases in Micronesia as stepping-stones to Hawaii during the Pacific War had demonstrated how vulnerable the US may become to an attack if it did not retain Micronesia under its immediate control (Anglim 1988: 3, 7-8; McHenry 1975: 70; Solomon 1963: S-2 in Aldridge & Myers 1990: 17). This dilemma has shaped America’s relationship with Palau (and the rest of Micronesia) ever since. In 1947, Palau was placed as a ‘Trust Territory’ under the control of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, the role of which was ‘to supervise the administration of Trust Territories and to ensure that Governments responsible for their administration took adequate steps to prepare them for the achievement of the Charter goals (the United Nations n.d. a), namely ‘to promote the political, economic and social advancement of the Territories and their development towards self-government and self-determination. It also encouraged respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and recognition of the interdependence of peoples of the world (the United Nations n.d. b). The ‘Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands’ (hereafter TTPI), including Palau, was formed in 1947 and was administered on behalf of the United Nations by the United States.

So began half a century of US dominance. This dilemma above led to a rather different form of administration and contact to what Palau had previously experienced. The confidential US Solomon Report (1963 in Anglim 1988: 10) showed that having *no* economic development plan was, in fact, the *intentional* US policy, making the Palauan economy totally dependent on the US, and leaving no operative industry. Meanwhile, the US encouraged the growth of the Palauan public sector by providing generous salaries for government employment and by privileging its workers to buy American luxury items and imported food, hence making the poorly-paid private sector unattractive and underdeveloped (Anglim 1988: 9). Furthermore, in order to produce a local elite that would be loyal to the US, it manipulated official appointments and provided necessary American funds to do so (US Solomon Report 1963 in Anglim 1988: 10). Thus, this left little possibility for self-sufficiency in Micronesia. As a result, Micronesia struggled to achieve independence from the US, and of all the UN Trust Territories in the world it took Palau the longest time to gain independence. And despite independence, all of the ‘independent’ countries’ that emerged from the



TTPI are in a 'Compact of Free Association' with the US, and are heavily reliant on American funding in return for providing access, potential or real, to the US military.

In terms of education, the school system and the availability of American teachers varied over time depending upon changes in the foreign political climate and the US federal budget. Up until 1962, Micronesian educational issues were 'to a great extent forgotten by the American government' (Shuster 1982: 179); there were no qualified teachers or textbooks, and only a limited budget (Palau Community Action Agency 1978: 487). As a consequence, initially the new schools employed some well-educated Palauans who had attended schools during the Japanese period, and hence education took on a 'Japanese flavour'. So, from as early as 1948, although the school system appears to have been Americanised (i.e., elementary from grades 1 to 6; and intermediate schools from grades 7, 8 at first and 9 in 1950) (Shuster 1982: 183), the intermediate school included previous Japanese vocational programmes (see above) and *shushin* education (which refers to the Japanese moral education taught as a subject during the (pre-)war period (Shuster 1982: 183).

Later the civil administration initiated an "Bilingual Education Program for Micronesia" (Trifonovitch 1971). The main concerns were (1) how to teach English without English-speaking teachers; (2) which language should be used as the medium of instruction in elementary school, English or mother tongue?; (3) when to start teaching English, from the first day of entering school, after acquiring English conversational skills or after becoming literate in their mother tongue (Trifonovitch 1971: 1068-78). However, due to the lack of funds and English-speaking teachers, these discussions about 'English-teaching' came to nothing. Conversely, such inadequate support and conditions led those local islanders that had received advanced training in Guam or Truk to create their own local education. Local efforts were made to publish bulletins: e.g. *Geography of Micronesia* (1953); and *Teacher's Guide in Developing Good Citizenship* (1953) (Shuster 1982: 193). Some booklets of elementary school readings, such as Palauan legends, were also issued: the *Eight Palauan Legends* (1957) and *The Coconut Crab and the Hermit Crab* (1962) (Shuster 1982: 212).

From 1962 until 1980, "tens of millions of aid dollars" together with American personnel poured into Palau (Shuster 1982: 199). The Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuba Missile Crisis intensified the Cold War confrontation between the US and the Soviet Union, reminding the US once again of the strategic importance of Micronesia (Shuster 1982: 197). As a result, support for educational programmes expanded enormously, introducing American-style education similar to that in the US mainland, including American textbooks and the American standard of school grades (i.e. 1-6 elementary; 7-9 junior high; and 10-12 senior high) to Palauan schools (Abe 1986: 205; Shuster 1982: 200). The Vocational School was re-established as the Micronesian Occupational College in 1969, while the American Dependent School (see below) ceased to exist<sup>1</sup> (Shuster 1982: 203-6). Twenty-four American contract teachers firstly arrived, and between 1966

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1964, 6 Palauan students were integrated among the 17 Americans, but in the early 1970s, such an integrated class disappeared, since "there were too few American children any longer to warrant such special classes" (Shuster 1982: 204, 206).

and 1970, many young Peace Corps Volunteers replaced them in Palauan schools (Shuster 1982: 199, 208). By the end of 1966, the first 323 volunteers had arrived in Micronesia, and in 1968 there was one volunteer to every 100 Micronesians (Lingenfelter 1974: 59 in Abe 1986: 206). Furthermore, during the 1970s and 1980s, a large proportion of the US funds<sup>2</sup> were used to send more than 75% of Palau's high school graduates to US colleges each year (Shuster 1982: 216). This all led to the creation of a Palauan-English bilingual elite, educated in the US and working for high salaries in public sector government offices.

Regarding demography, overall, only a small number of Americans were stationed in Palau, such as military and administrative personnel, missionaries, school teachers, members of the Peace Corps, judges and attorneys, and then only temporarily – no systematic Anglophone immigration took place. It appears that the volunteers, unlike the American officials, were rather idealistic and sympathetic to the islanders – there was some interaction between the volunteers and Palauans, but their short contracts and small numbers in comparison to the islanders suggest that they made relatively little linguistic impact. Perhaps the biggest demographic changes that the US period brought to Palau was: (a) the expatriation of all earlier Japanese settlers and (b) the importation of Filipino labour, employed by Palauans thanks to the so-called 'compact money' from the US.

Overall, while the Japanese era saw a rather interventionist and integrationist approach at engendering consent, the US period was characterised by a distant hands-off stance. Thus, it is most likely that the intensive Japanese administrative strategy in Palau was far more influential upon Palauan society and language, with respect to infrastructure, demography, economy, education, belief systems and lifestyle, than either the earlier European or the later American domination.

However, given America's longer period of control (i.e., for half a century) and on-going financial aid, there are, of course, a number of similarities in the sociolinguistic consequences of these two most recent colonial periods in the history of Palau. During each administration, recognition of Japanese or English as the high status language as opposed to Palauan as the low language (i.e., diglossia) was established, while the usual linguistic compartmentalisation was reinforced so that the colonial languages were used in the school, legal, administrative, and written domains, while Palauan was mainly spoken in the home and traditional domains. Moreover, Japanese-Palauan or English-Palauan bilingualism became the norm, while the use of Japanese or English borrowing and code-switching in Palauan conversation has come to function as a typical 'in-group' language behaviour among the different generations. However, the crucial difference is that the use of Japanese was not restricted to those official domains; on the contrary, face-to-face interaction in Japanese was commonplace in everyday life – in the neighbourhood, at work and in the marketplace (Matsumoto 2010a, 2010b and Matsumoto and Britain 2003a).

We now turn to apply Schneider's (2007) Dynamic Model to the context of American control of Palau and the emergence of Palauan English. During the first foundation phase (roughly from 1945 to 1962), then, as we have seen, the socio-political background was that English was brought to Palau during the Pa-

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, Palau received \$357,200 in 1978, \$841,300 in 1979 and over one million dollars for 1980 (Shuster 1982: 213), for a population of just over 12,000 as of 1980 (Office of Planning and Statistics 2006: 23).

cific War when the US Navy conquered Micronesian islands one by one, defeating Japanese army and navy bases there (Hazel and Berg 1980). At the end of WWII, Micronesia, including Palau, became firstly part of the 'US Navy occupational territories' before entering the UN's TTPI under the control of the US (Hazel and Berg 1980: 497). The largest demographic change during this early phase was the repatriation of Palau's Japanese residents. From October 1945 to May 1946, 104,213 Japanese and 31,619 Okinawans were deported from Micronesia as a whole, and 34,773 Japanese were repatriated from Palau (Palau Community Action Agency 1978: 426-7; 452). The repatriation of such a large number of Japanese and Okinawans meant that Palau's principal sources of labour, consumers and capital suddenly disappeared, leaving the total population of Palau as small as 6,184 in 1947 (Abe 1986: 230). On the other hand, the US administration brought only a few administrators and military personnel who were temporarily stationed on each island (Aoyagi 1977: 49); Micronesia was never to see the arrival of large numbers of American workers and settlers.

In terms of identity constructions, the STL strand, if one could use that label for the temporary and short-term US military and TTPI personnel stationed in Palau, was clearly conscious that under no circumstances would their homeland ever be Palau. Officially, of course, settlement was not one of the assigned functions of their control over the islands – their task was to prepare the islands for ultimate independence, knowing that *full* independence was, actually, detrimental to US foreign and military policy. So, they focused on their assigned work, such as providing US aid packages including food and clothes and dealing with war compensation, without conspicuous efforts to integrate into the local community. In the early period of American rule, for example, in 1952, the American Dependent School for the children of Americans employed in Palau was established by American parents who supported materials and salaries for the teachers (Shuster 1982: 200). American children had a greatly different school life from the Palauans; government taxis transported them between home and school, while an American teacher taught them in their own special building, with access to an abundance of teaching materials (Shuster 1982: 202).

On the other hand, despite the fact that Micronesian educational issues were largely ignored, as mentioned earlier, the IDG strand knew that those who collaborated with the colonisers would benefit the most, since they had already lived through three colonial administrations. There was competition among Palauan villages to provide the best school and the best trained teachers (Shuster 1982: 182). While no English-speaking teachers and inadequate funds were provided to Palau by the American administration, nine new school buildings were constructed by Palauan craftsmen with the co-operation of all the villagers, using local materials in 1946 (Honolulu Advertiser 1946 in Shuster 1982: 182). As the obvious readiness of the Palauans to engage in American education indicates, the IDG seems to have been willing to accept the STL language and, once again, a new social order. However, access to the STL strand and their language was very limited for ordinary Palauans.

Sociolinguistic conditions during the first phase did not encourage frequent interaction between STL and IDG beyond the work domain, since language contact between the STL and IDG strands occurred only among a small group of local elite who received teacher training in Guam or Truk as well as the few who were employed by the TTPI government; ordinary Palauans scarcely had an opportunity to access English.

This is because, as mentioned earlier, the US planned to produce a ‘local elite whose interests would thereby become linked with those of the US’ (US Solomon Report 1963 in Anglim 1988: 10). The American government targeted the traditional elite, such as the two high chiefs, the titleholders and the matrilineal kin of the *meteet* (see above) whose prestige, power and authority had been challenged and reduced during the Japanese colonial administration (Vidich 1952: 272), and who were understandably keen to regain their lost status. Consequently, this elite resumed their position of control and governed Palau according to traditional norms and “native customary law” (Vidich 1952: 298). However, a superficial division of executive, legislative and judicial functions allowed the traditional elite to determine what constituted “native custom”, one consequence of which was a regular abuse of power (Vidich 1952: 297-8). Thus, backed by slogans such as “Palau for the Palauans” and “Democracy for Palau”, the US government turned the traditional elite into the new compliant local political leaders, to run the territory in the interests of the traditional elite at the local level, and in the interests of the Americans supralocally (Vidich 1952: 344). Consequently, the situation in Palau provides a clear example of Schneider’s claim that, in the initial foundation phase, “in some cases, the settlers ... privilege members of the local elite by teaching them their language...in any case, in the IDG strand, marginal bilingualism develops, predominantly among a minority of the local population” (2007: 34-35).

In terms of linguistic effects, and given the extremely limited STL strand, no strong linguistic impact upon the IDG strand could be observed. English as a lingua franca was used only among local elites when meeting representatives of other districts for TTPI meetings, the Micronesian languages of the TTPI being mutually unintelligible. In the STL, government and military personnel stayed temporarily, making few efforts to acquire Palauan. But perhaps because of the lack of an STL, and perhaps partially because of America’s officially ‘non-colonial’ trusteeship role in Micronesia, Palauan toponymic borrowings were readily observable during this early period – Palauan place and landmark names were used routinely in Palauan English, and indeed few places ever acquired English names. Much later on, some newly made parks in Koror received English names (e.g., *Long Island Park* and *Ice Box Park*), the Koror dock built by the Japanese was renamed from Japanese *hatoba* to English *T-Dock*, and some of the remoter islands and landmarks of major attraction to foreign tourists and divers have acquired English names (e.g. Seventeen Islands and Oolong Channel).

The second phase ‘exonormative stabilization’ can be said to have begun in around 1962 when the Cold War confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union was intensified, reminding the US of the strategic importance of Micronesia. Consequently, US President Kennedy began to dramatically accelerate development in the Trust Territory, investing enormously, with particular emphasis on education (Shuster 1982: 196-8). This means that for the first time, a sizable number of Americans teachers and Peace Corp Volunteers arrived in Palau together with American educational system and teaching material. Thus, some form of social stabilization under US control was beginning to materialise.

At this time, international pressure for rapid decolonisation was increasing (Roff 1991). Other UN trustees - Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand – were preparing in the 1960s to terminate their trusteeships in the Pacific, and a number of independent Pacific nations emerged as a result – Nauru, Samoa,

and Fiji, for example. In 1965, therefore, the US established the Congress of Micronesia, an assembly with representatives from each of the six districts of Micronesia (i.e. the Marshall Islands, Pohnpei, Chuuk, Yap, Palau and the Northern Mariana Islands) which legislates only on local matters (Anglim 1988: 11). In 1967, the Congress of Micronesia set up “a status commission” to discuss the Territory’s right to self-determination (Anglim 1988: 11). However, in 1976, the US reached a separate agreement with the Marianas that approved their changed political status to become the ‘US Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands’ (Anglim 1988: 11), a similar status to that held by Puerto Rico. This led to the end of Micronesia as one political unity. Palau and the Marshall Islands voted for their own independent political status, as the Republic of Palau in 1976 and as the Republic of the Marshall Islands in 1977, respectively (Kobayashi 1994: 213). The remaining districts in the TTPI, namely Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei and Kosrae formed the Federated States of Micronesia. In 1978, the US Secretary of the Interior abolished the Congress of Micronesia.

In 1983, national referenda in both the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia approved and signed a “*Compact of Free Association*” (see below) with the US and, consequently, became independent nations. These agreements between the US and the two new Micronesian states and between the US and the US Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas left Palau as the last UN Trust Territory in the world. The reason for delay in the case of Palau was that some provisions of the proposed Constitution of Palau, particularly relating to its nuclear ban and its ban on giving legal ‘eminent domain’ to non-Palauans, were deemed to be ‘in conflict with US ambitions for Palau’ through the Compact of Free Association (Anglim 1988: 14; Roff 1991: 99). In return, the Palauan constitutional authorities required the US to: (1) provide substantial financial subsidies to the islands and (2) give islanders the legal status of ‘habitual residents’, allowing them the unhindered right to live and seek employment in the US (Anglim 1988; Roff 1991). The required number of votes to support the Compact of Free Association was not reached in *seven* Palauan national referenda over 10 years. Several attempts were made to revise the constitution or revise the compact agreement in order to win Palauan approval. A violent conflict between those in favour of and those against the Compact of Free Association with the US intensified. Palauan politics became embroiled in corruption - bribery was used to lend support to the compact, blackmail was rife, schools were suspended (Anglim 1988; Roff 1991). A number of murders, shooting sprees, firebombings and the strafing of boats and houses belonging to the Chief Justice and anti-Compact leaders and lawyers occurred, while the first two Presidents of Palau died under suspicious circumstances (Anglim 1988; Roff 1991). Economic pressure was also used; the US reduced the level of its support to Palau, while 900 out of 1300 government employees were laid-off and directed to support the Compact campaign (Anglim 1988: 21-7). This continued for over ten years while the majority of Palauans persistently opposed the Compact of Free Association. In 1992, however, through a manipulation of the Palauan constitution that lowered the required threshold to a simple majority, and because the only realistic choice was between the agreement and continued US colonial rule, Palau entered into the Compact of Free Association with the US. The US terminated the last UN trusteeship in the world, and subsequently in 1994, at last, Palau technically became a sovereign state, the Republic of Palau.

The US persistently avoided portraying these territories as colonies - they were initially 'in trust' to the US, and then later in a 'Compact of Free Association'. Independence has, however, brought little real evidence that Palau can act independently on the international stage. It almost always votes with the US in the UN, for example on issues where Israel or Cuba are involved, with senior Palauan minister Sandra Pierantozzi recently admitting that 'we don't want to jeopardise that relationship, because it would affect Palau's economic welfare (Pierantozzi 2009, 30 October). It has also rehoused former inmates of Guantanamo Bay detention centre. It even holds its Presidential elections on the same day as those in the US. So on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2012, while Barack Obama retained the American presidency, Tommy Remengesau Jr. defeated incumbent Johnson Toribiong in the Palauan Presidential vote. Its total financial reliance on US funds has rather tempered ambitions to be fully independent.

Palau has actually ultimately served a military role for the US only potentially. The US identified Micronesia as a key strategic site for military purposes for two reasons. Firstly, it serves as a first-line of defence for the US (see above). Secondly, during the Cold War, the US saw Micronesia as a conveniently isolated nuclear weapons laboratory due to its geographical remoteness in the Pacific, and as a strategic aircraft carrier due to its location (Lynch 1973: 133-4; Pomeroy 1951: 169 in Anglim 1989: 3). It turns out that although the Compact of Free Association gives the US the *right* to have military bases in Palau, it has not yet chosen to have any. However, the importance for the US is that it reserves the right to use Palau for military purposes if necessary, and to prevent other nations from using Palau for such purposes.

In terms of identity constructions during the second phase, two different sets of relationships in Palau need to be considered; the first is the relationship between the IDG and STL from 1962 onwards, while the second is the relationships between the IDG Palauans and an ADS adstrate strand from the mid-1980s until today. Firstly, as seen earlier, Palau received a relatively large number of Americans for the first time during the period of 1960s and 1970. They were again temporary and short-term personnel, yet the volunteers were said to be different from the earlier American officials (Abe 1986: 206; Shuster 1982: 208). First and foremost, the volunteers were required to receive 350 hours of local language and cultural lessons in Hawai'i before departing to each island (Trifonovitch 1971: 1082; Rachebei and McPhetres 1997: 251). These young, enthusiastic volunteers, who did try to communicate in the local language, gave the islanders confidence that their language and culture also deserved the respect and esteem of the outside world (Shuster 1982: 208). Also, they tended to be more sympathetic to the islanders, often criticising US administration policies in Palau (Abe 1986: 206; Rachebei and McPhetres 1997: 251-252). Thus, language contact between the STL and IDG strand during the second phase was no longer restricted to the small local elite who had monopolised access during the first phase, but rather broadened to include a broader spectrum of Palauans, so that ordinary islanders were likely to have better access to the STL and their English at school and work than before.

However, during the 1970s and 1980s when generous US funds sent many Palauan high school graduates to US colleges, it was often the children of the local elite who gained selection, since they could afford to attend private American high schools in Koror where English had been the medium of instruction. On

one hand, although the accessibility of ordinary Palauans to an STL strand temporarily improved in Palau during the 1960s and early 1970s, there are no longer American teachers nor Peace Corps Volunteers in Palauan public high schools today. Once again, there was a good degree of distance between ordinary Palauans and the STL strand. On the other hand, many elite Palauan children had, and continue to have, daily face-to-face interaction with Americans not only in Palau, but also on American soil, thanks to the continuation of funds devoted to higher education. Segregational elitism also characterises the use of English in Palau. The local elite who, as a consequence of American education have access to *American* English take some pride in this and know that knowledge of English and its associated different worldview “gives them an extra edge of experience and competitiveness within their own native group” (Schneider 2007: 37). Ironically, it is this elite who, at the local political level, have been promoting Palauan as a national language, and increasing its visibility in local schools, while sending their own children off to the US for an education in English (Matsumoto and Britain 2003a).

Secondly, a relationship between the IDG and an ADS strand has been developing in recent years. During the mid-1980s when flights between Manila and Koror enabled many Palauans to travel, the Philippines began to be viewed “as a more advanced metropolitan country” than Palau where higher education, medical care, shopping and recreational facilities were more highly developed and more readily available (Alegado and Finin 2000: 361). However, during the same period, a stream of Filipino contract workers, many with college degrees and professional experience, began landing in Palau mostly to take up low-paying employment as service workers under the supervision of Palauans (Alegado and Finin 2000: 361), but also to take up professional roles as doctors and teachers. This has led to the development of a community that amounts to roughly 20% of the whole population of Koror, the largest city (Office of Planning and Statistics 2006: 71). Tensions have risen, however, between Filipino migrants and Palauans, since young, unskilled and untrained Palauans often felt that their potential jobs were being ‘stolen’ by Filipinos. The term *chad ra Oles* (literally, “people of the knife”) came to be applied to the Filipinos, because of their reputation for using knives as weapons when fighting (Alegado and Finin 2000: 361). Although Filipinos’ views of their treatment by Palauans is generally favorable, there have been incidents of alleged mistreatment of foreign workers in Palau, including “physical and verbal abuse, working overtime and on days off without pay, withholding monthly salary, deductions from monthly salary for the amount of airfare and substandard housing” (Alegado and Finin 2000: 362).

On the other hand, Filipinos are active participants in culturally significant activities in Palau (e.g., planting taro and reef fishing). Since domestic helpers have intensive and close daily interaction with Palauan families, it is said that “it is all but impossible to avoid some level of integration and assimilation above and beyond that of a hired wage employee” (Alegado and Finin 2000: 365). This view was supported by (a) interview data which show that most feel that they “have to varying degrees become members of the extended family household in which they are employed”, (b) census data “from the Immigration and Customs Division, as of the mid 1990s, at least one hundred non-Palauans, of whom approximately 50 % were Filipinos, were married to Palauans” and (c) the fact that many of them have mastered a good command of spoken Palauan (Alegado and Finin 2000: 365). So, it appears that while the IDG find the STL su-

perior, but distant, their relationship with the Filipino ADS strand is much closer and intimate.

As far as sociolinguistic conditions during the second phase are concerned, it is clear that Palauan-English bilingualism has increased due to: (a) radical educational reform (i.e., the enormously expanded US funding pot not only introduced both American education programmes and English-speaking teachers to Palau but also sent Palauan high school graduates to US colleges), and (b) daily contact with Filipino migrant workers, usually in English. Although some say that many domestic helpers have acquired Palauan, some effects of English being used as the lingua franca between Palauans and Filipinos are also observable: (a) even elderly Palauans, who used to be bilingual in Palauan and Japanese, have begun to use English at home, and (b) Palauan children have become fluent in English but, it is claimed, deficient in Palauan (Pierantozzi 2000: 355). Furthermore, concerns have been raised that since Filipino domestic helpers often take care of Palauan children, they no longer acquire the traditional cultural values that had previously been passed from generation to generation (Pierantozzi 2000: 355).

Schneider has argued (2007:39-40) that this second phase is the “kick off phase for the process which is linguistically the most important and interesting one, viz. structural nativisation, the emergence of structures which are distinctive to the newly evolving variety”. The linguistic characteristics of Palauan English are presented in Section 3 below. In addition, code-switching and mixing is common, and Tagalog words have begun to be borrowed into English, suggesting that everyday interaction with the ADS strand is having a linguistic impact on Palauan English too.

Has Palauan English entered the nativisation phase? This is difficult to judge, given that only very preliminary steps have been made so far to investigate the structure of Palauan English. Schneider suggests that “in former exploitation colonies... the STL strand is often demographically weakened or even almost completely removed after independence, but the effects and attitudes generated by them linger on and remain effective. Factors like the appreciation of English, its persistent presence with important functions, and the desire to maintain contacts with the former colonial power and to participate in international communication have the same effect as the physical presence of large numbers of English speakers...the pressure to accommodate to English usually affects primarily the IDG strand people, leading to widespread second language acquisition of English and sometimes almost complete language shift or even language death” (2007:42). Palau has never had anything but an extremely sparsely present STL strand, but certainly the economic benefits of English are widely recognised (as are those of Japanese, especially in the tourist industry), it retains its diglossic High status in Palauan government and administrative life, and is used to an increasing extent as Palau participates more and more in regional and global forums, political, but also cultural, sporting and environmental. Matsumoto’s (2001) survey of language attitudes in Palau clearly showed islanders’ awareness of the importance of English (and Japanese) in Palau, as well as strong agreement for the need to maintain both languages. Nevertheless, the local language Palauan was deemed to be the most important on the islands, and the one most wanted to preserve. Palauan is, at this point at least, still a robust healthy and valued language on the islands.



### 3. Linguistic characteristics of Palauan English

We are unaware of any other research that examines the structural properties of the Englishes of Palau, nor, for that matter, any other contemporary Micronesian society. The sketch we provide here, therefore, should be seen as an initial descriptive foray rather than a detailed synthesis of an existing body of literature. As we will see, a number of the characteristics of Palauan English we highlight provide interesting possibilities for further, deeper analysis, an analysis that will enable a closer examination of the more precise linguistic embedding and constraints on individual variable phenomena. We also highlight here the many similarities between Palauan English and its nearest well-described Anglophone ‘neighbour’ – Phillipines English (hereafter, PhilE), and we discuss, later, how we might explain these similarities.

The description of Palauan English below comes from analyses of an extensive corpus of Palauan English collected by the first author on a number of research fieldwork trips to Palau over the past decade. Recordings were made of informal conversation amongst pairs of Palauans – family members, couples, friends, workmates in a range of settings, such as homes, cafes and workplaces.

#### 3.1 Palauan English phonology

##### 3.1.1 Vowels

**Table 1: Palauan English vowels: summary**

KIT	i	GOAT	oː - oʊ
DRESS	e	GOOSE	u
TRAP-BATH	ɛ - a, a	PRICE	ai
LOT	a - ɑ	CHOICE	oi
STRUT	a - ɐ	MOUTH	aʊ - ɑʊ
FOOT	ʊ	NEAR	ɪ
CLOTH	ɑ	SQUARE	eː
NURSE	ɜː - ɜː - ə	START	aɪ - a
FLEECE	i	NORTH	oɪ
FACE	eː - ei	happy	i
PALM	a - æ	horsES	ɛ
THOUGHT	ɑ - ɒ	commA	a

#### Commentary

- KIT and DRESS are relatively close in Palauan English, and this leads to considerable overlap between close KIT and a relatively short FLEECE vowel. A similar pattern for PhilE is reported by Llamzon (1997: 46), McArthur (2002: 346) and Tayao (2004: 1051);
- /a/ is highly variable, both at the inter- and intra-speaker level. While many words in the BATH set are consistently realised as [a], and many in the TRAP set are fronted and raised relative to [a], fur-

ther closer examination of /a/ is required to determine the exact phonological definition of this split in Palauan English. Similar variability is noted for PhilE by Llamzon (1997: 46);

- While some tokens of STRUT in our data were relatively mid-open, and some tokens of LOT relatively back, there is a good deal of overlap of these two sets;
- NURSE is highly variable. Many rhotic tokens have back midclose vowels, while some non-rhotic tokens have central midopen vowels that are relatively short;
- FLEECE and GOOSE are parallel and especially close vowels at the front and back. There are no signs of diphthongisation, and no signs of fronting of GOOSE;
- FACE and GOAT are similarly parallel – the nuclei of each are mid-close and short for each, with little if any glide. There are no signs of GOAT fronting;
- THOUGHT is mostly, but not entirely unrounded, but nearly always short. Rhotic forms (NORTH) tend to have a relatively close back vowel;
- Generally PRICE and MOUTH have fully open nuclei and a full glide to close position at the front and back respectively, though there is evidence of some glide reduction for MOUTH;
- Both START and PALM can be short, and, in the case of PALM, also very front;
- NEAR and SQUARE are both monophthongs;
- happY is consistently tense;
- Fully unstressed vowels are rare, and consequently the vowel of the final syllable of, for example, horsES is routinely realised as [ɛ] (see Tayao 2004: 1050, who reports the same for PhilE);
- The final vowel of words in the commA class is almost always realised as [a].

### 3.1.2 Consonants

- /p t k/: The voiceless stops almost always lack aspiration, as they do, according to Llamzon (1997: 46) and Tayao (2004: 1053) in PhilE. There is a good deal of variation in the realisation of /t/. Intervocally, both across word boundaries and word-medially, /t/ can be realised not just as a [ɾ] flap, but also as a glottal stop [ʔ]. /kw/ clusters are often [k] (e.g. ‘equipment’ [e’kipment]).
- /b d g/: These are often devoiced, not only in word-final position, but also initially and medially (e.g. ‘gun’ [kan]; ‘guilt’ [kilt]; ‘digging’ [dikiŋ]).<sup>3</sup> Llamzon (1997: 46, 47) finds the same for PhilE. /d/ word finally is also, among some speakers, realised as [ð] or [θ]. Palauan English undergoes heavy –t/-d deletion, in past tense morphemes as well as monomorphemes, and before vowels as well as preconsonantly.
- /θ ð/: Variation reigns here - /θ/ can be realised as [t], especially in /θr/ clusters, [d] or even [ð], as well as [θ]. /ð/ can be pronounced as [d] as well as [ð] (see Llamzon 1997: 46, 48; McArthur 2002:

<sup>3</sup> An interesting case of a hypercorrection has been noted in Palau’s newspaper *Tia Belau*: “The damages and losses they are requesting amount to \$485 per week since mid March for their inability to fish or collect *grabs*, different shells, sea cucumber, and other marine species for sale at the market” (Two arrested for machete attacks (2012, 7 September) *Tia Belau* [Koror, Republic of Palau]. Retrieved 10 November 2012, from <http://tiabelanewspaper.com/?p=594>; our emphasis).

- 346; Tayao 2004: 1053 for similar findings in PhilE).
- /z/: A voiced realisation is rare in Palauan English (and in PhilE - Llamzon 1997: 46, 48; McArthur 2002: 346; Tayao 2004: 1054), apart from among some very proficient speakers. Words such as ‘is’ and ‘was’ are routinely pronounced [is] and [was];
  - /ʃ tʃ ʒ/: /ʃ/ is usually realised as [s] (e.g. ‘fishing’ [fisɪŋ], ‘she’ [si]), or occasionally [sʰ]. /tʃ/ is mostly pronounced [ts] (e.g. ‘taro patch’ [taropats], ‘each’ [its]). /ʒ/ is variably realised as [ts] or simply [s]. Palauan English patterns like PhilE in these cases (McArthur 2002: 346; Tayao 2004: 1054).
  - /ŋ/: Although in –ing morphemes /ŋ/ can be realised with an alveolar or more dental nasal stop, the velar predominates.
  - /r/: Palauan English is semi-rhotic. Although further investigation is needed, Palauan English is not, unlike some other semi-rhotic varieties, strikingly less rhotic in unstressed syllables, presumably as a consequence of the more syllable timed nature of the variety’s prosody, and the consequent relative lack of clearly unstressed syllables. Palauan English’s semi-rhoticity also has consequences not only as can be seen in Table 1, for the vowel system, but also for the way in which hiatus is resolved (see below). In prevocalic position an alveolar tap is the most frequent realisation, as in PhilE (Llamzon 1997: 47, 48; McArthur 2002: 346).
  - /h/: Palauan English realises /h/ consistently.
  - /l/: Palauan English makes a distinction between [l] prevocalically and [ɫ] non-prevocalically, though the latter is not especially ‘dark’.
  - /ju/: Palauan English deletes the palatal glide after coronals and /m/, but retains it after oral labials, velars and /h/.

### 3.1.3 Prosody

The hiatus resolution system of Palauan English is variable. Although it is not unusual to find the hiatus from a high front vowel to the following vowel being resolved with a [j] glide (‘very angry’ [verɪjɑŋɡrɪ]) and that from a high back vowel being resolved with a [w] glide (‘go away’ [ɡowawe<sup>1</sup>]), the predominant consonant used to resolve hiatus in Palauan English is a glottal stop (e.g. ‘my older boy’ [maiʔoɫɔɪboi]). Hiatus resolution after a non-high vowel is also mostly accomplished with the glottal stop - linking and intrusive /r/ are virtually but not entirely absent. The use of the glottal stop as a hiatus breaker, furthermore, extends to the definite and indefinite article systems – see below in the section on grammatical characteristics of Palauan English.

Palauan English appears to have a rather syllable timed rather than stress timed prosody. Heavily reduced syllables are rare and speakers, for example, tend to utter full forms of many of the small function words that are often highly reduced in Inner Circle varieties. Except in the grammaticalised verbal forms ‘wanna’, ‘gotta’ and ‘gonna’, ‘to’ is almost always [tu] and not [tə]; furthermore, ‘my’ is always [mai] and not [mə], ‘of’ is [ɔv] and not [ə], etc. This characteristic of Palauan English is also widely reported for PhilE (Gonzales 1983: 155; Thompson 2003: 52; Llamzon 1997: 46; McArthur 2002: 346; Tayao 2004: 1055).

In light of the above, it is perhaps not surprising that assignment of stress is both variable and often patterns in ways unlike those found in Inner Circle varieties. The examples below from our data provide evidence both of the lack of reduced syllables, and Palauan English's distinctive stress assignment for some words:

'hoping'	[ho'piŋ]
'grandchildren'	[grantsi't'drɛn]
'exam'	['eksəm]
'open'	[o'pen]
'secretary'	[sekri'tari]
'forget'	['fɔrget]
'permission'	[pɛrmi'sjɔn]
'compost'	[kɔm'pɔs]
'discipline'	[disi'plin]
'complicated'	[kəmpli'keɪrt]

Similar claims are made about PhilE (Thompson 2003: 53; McArthur 2002: 346; Tayao 2004: 1055-57).

### 3.2 Palauan English morphosyntax

#### 3.2.1 Present tense and verbal concord

In our data, the most frequently occurring non-standard variability in the present tense verbal system concerns morphological marking of third person singular contexts. Zero marking is very frequent in Palauan English, as in (1), (2), (3) and (4):

- (1) he really appreciate what I've done
- (2) and she always complain about her headache
- (3) I don't give a shit for who get hurt
- (4) because my father drinks...uhm, yeah, he drink

This is a commonly reported characteristic of PhilE too (Thompson 2003: 53; Bautista 2000: 149; McArthur 2002: 346).

Example 4 above raises the intriguing question of whether 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular marking in Palauan English patterns, as in many British and North American varieties, according to the so-called Northern Subject Rule, whereby *-s* is favoured after noun phrases (and non-adjacent pronouns), but disfavoured after adjacent pronouns.

Non-marking also extends to irregular verbs such as 'have', as in (5), (6) and (7):

- (5) she haven't tasted any fruit at all
- (6) he have all eight girls
- (7) his oldest son already have grandchildren

The use of *is*, or much more usually 's, in plural existentials, an extremely widely reported phenomenon across the world's Englishes, is also common in Palauan English, as in (8), (9) and (10):

- (8) there's 16 year olds renting a X rated film
- (9) there's a lot of older people there
- (10) there is the veterans from US

Occasionally, existentials are formed with 'it' rather than 'there', as in (11):

- (11) it's a lot of rivers over there

Compound determinatives with *-one* and *-body* generally adopt the same verbal marking as third person *plural* subjects, as in (12) and (13):

- (12) because everyone are behaved or they have manners
- (13) it was quiet and nice and everybody were happy

Much more rarely, other forms of non-standard concord are found, as in (14) and (15) (see Bautista 2000: 149 for similar findings from PhilE):

- (14) because they has to say showa or something
- (15) so this kind of guy are rare

Invariant BE occurs sporadically, as in (16), as does copula deletion, as in (17):

- (16) how about you [Cathy]? you be so quiet in the corner.
- (17) yeah, you a teacher, you're not supposed to smoke

### 3.2.2 Past tense formation

In general, past tense forms such as the preterite and the past participle, when employed, are used as in Standard American English. The past tense is frequently, however, unmarked in the verbal morphology but accomplished by the use of temporal adverbs or clauses denoting past time, followed by present tense or unmarked verb forms (18, 19, 20 and 21):

(18) [Michael] and [Jane] already break up

(19) at that time, rice is very expensive and only few people can afford that to eat

(20) but when they were young, I need somebody to help me

(21) but when we were young we never argue with our chores we rotate our chores in the house and if I don't do my assignment, I'll be ashamed to ask for dinner

In narratives, a past tense form in one clause is often followed by subsequent clauses in which the verbs are (variably, but predominantly) in the present tense, as in (22) and (23):

(22) she got married and have kids and end up working in the Pacific Resort

(23) so we were, you know, very good, we never fight, we never argue, we never went hungry

In past tense do-support constructions with subject-auxiliary inversion, the preterite rather than infinitive form of the lexical verb is often used, as in (24) and (25):

(24) did you went there to snorkel?

(25) did you ate your lunch yet?

### 3.2.3 Negation

The use of two or more negatives in a clause where Standard English requires just one – negative concord – is such a frequently occurring feature of the world's Englishes that Chambers (2004) labels it a 'vernacular universal'. It appears, however, to be infrequent in Palauan English (26, see further 27 below):

(26) I'm not in favour of nobody

Furthermore, secondary contractions of already contracted negated auxiliary verbs – variants such as 'ain't', not infrequent in Britain and North America, are also rare in Palauan English, as in (27):

(27) there ain't no big money

Palauan English rarely uses 'never' as a negator with definite time reference as in (28):

(28) yeah somebody bungee-jumped and never came up

### 3.2.4 Adverbs

Generally, adverbs are formed from adjectives as in Standard American English, but occasionally the adverbial and adjectival forms are identical, especially in the case of 'good', as in (29) and (30):

(29) we're handling our lives good

(30) so we don't spell it good

### 3.2.5 Prepositions

As is often reported for Outer and Emerging Circle Englishes, Palauan English can differ from Inner Circle Englishes in its choice of prepositions (31, 32 and 33), or indeed whether or not one is required, as in (34) and (35) (see Bautista 2000: 152-154; Thompson 2003: 53 for PhilE):

(31) once you spank your kids, they'll put you to jail

(32) I share stories to boys, my friends

(33) and I get really pissed off from her

(34) they knocked the door and my brother came out

(35) he wanted to go Guam

### 3.2.6 Plurality

The morphological marking of plurality is highly variable in Palauan English (36, 37, 38 and 39):

(36) fifteen more minute

(37) girls clean and they're the one who even fix the shoes

(38) two hot tea, please

(39) wash your hand before you come too close to me!

Some lexemes that are routinely pluralised in Inner Circle Englishes are often treated as singular in Palauan English, as in (40):

(40) you want sunglass, I'll buy you one

Occasionally lexemes treated as mass nouns in Inner Circle Englishes are treated as count nouns and attract plural morphemes in Palauan English (and in PhilE – Thompson 2003: 53), as in (41):

(41) he's selling fishing gears

If a noun is preceded by a determiner or (non-numeric) quantifier which is semantically plural, the noun often lacks what is, in essence, redundant plural marking, as in (42 - 48):

(42) they just left her in one of the room

(43) one of my brother become elder of the church

(44) there's several long distance carrier

- (45) we don't have enough word in Palauan
- (46) he was like one of my dad's favourite son
- (47) you have any classmate you know that's single?
- (48) some of my classmate, they turn on the candle after the light out

Sometimes the indefinite article can precede non-overtly morphologically marked plural lexemes (49) and (50):

- (49) that's the Palauan term for a smart or intelligent people
- (50) she cannot have a children.

'Much', used with non-count singular nouns in Inner Circle Englishes, is frequently used with count nouns in Palauan English, as in (51), (52), (53) and (54):

- (51) there's not really much Chinese stores
- (52) there's not that much rangers working during swing shift
- (53) even I have so much kids, no one can replace one
- (54) I like the olden days, now too much problems.

### 3.2.7 Pronouns

Pro-drop strikes us as being more frequent in Palauan English than one would expect in Inner Circle conversational English, as in (55, 56, 57):

- (55)
  - A: eighty four? oh, not eighty five?
  - B: yeah yeah she's eighty three now
  - A: no, gonna be eighty five
- (56) compare price of fish...from here to Guam is very different...over there is three ninety five a pound
- (57)
  - A: that's [Tom]...want to be perfect.
  - B: all right
  - A: want to do everything just right

On rare occasions, relative clauses can have resumptive pronouns, for example (58) and (59):

- (58) but those are the things that she think they're important



(59) we are supposed to set the rules and tell the domestic helper that these are the rules that they have to abide by them.

Equally rare are subject relative clauses with a zero pronoun, as in (60):

(60) you know we have this game was taught by Japanese

### 3.2.8 Comparison

A good number of varieties have ‘double comparison’ and use *both* the inflectional ending (*-er* for comparatives and *-est* for superlatives) *and* the appropriate analytic marker (*more* or *most*). Palauan English is no exception, as in (61):

(61) he knows more better where to find the turtle

### 3.2.9 Question formation

It is not infrequent for the subject rather than the verb to follow the WH- form in questions, as in (62) and (63):

(62) where our governor is hiding?

(63) what time you gonna call?

### 3.2.10 Definite and indefinite articles

On occasions, placement of articles differs somewhat from that in Inner Circle varieties, including inclusion of the article where such Inner Circle varieties would not have one (64) and the reverse as in (65) and (66) (for PhilE, see Bautista 2000: 150-151; Thompson 2003: 53; McArthur 2002: 346):

(64) I saw my mother sitting on the bench outside with the blood on the dress

(65) my mother always go to taro patch

(66) I don't want my candidate to lose election

Descriptive grammars suggest that for both the definite and indefinite article systems, Standard (British) English is allomorphic, with different forms before vowels than before consonants. Following consonants are preceded by ‘a’ and ‘the’ [ðə], whereas following vowels are said to attract indefinite ‘an’ and definite ‘the’ [ði]. Britain and Fox (2009) have highlighted that actually few varieties - Inner or Outer Circle - totally adopt this strict allomorphy, with many using the preconsonantal forms in prevocalic position, and inserting a glottal stop to resolve the ensuing phonological hiatus. Palauan English also only variably maintains this allomorphy, with preconsonantal [ðə] + [ʔ] used before the vowels in (67), (68), (69), (70); For examples of lack of vowel-sensitive allomorphy for the indefinite article, see (71), (72) and (73):

- (67) you listen to the instructor
- (68) he's gonna help me get the stuff from the airport
- (69) he died at the age of 92
- (70) because of the alcohol and the drugs and that
- (71) there's a old age center
- (72) he's a old man
- (73) they are looking for a place in the Pacific region to put a importer for regional research

### 3.3 Palauan English Lexis

Examples of borrowings from Palauan, Tagalog and Japanese into Palauan English are found, as one would expect, particularly when a speaker refers to local and cultural objects or events. In addition, nonce borrowings or code-switching occur spontaneously.

Examples include: *a bai* (as in 74) – the Palauan term for a traditional men's meeting place; *matay* (as in 75), from the Tagalog for 'die':

- (74) you know, there's traditional *a bai* near the airport
- (75) he *matay* already

Some English lexemes are translations of earlier deeply cultural borrowings. The Palauan English word 'custom' (example 76) is a direct translation of the Japanese word 'shukan', which had earlier been borrowed into Palauan as 'siukang' to signify a core family obligation of traditional Palauan culture and communal life that involves a series of exchanges of food, services, gifts and money in order to help community members build houses or boats, or pay for weddings and funerals or celebrate the arrival of children.

- (76) and my mother used to...every time there is a custom, she called me and take money "why don't you just, you know, why don't you call your other daughters?". every time there is a custom, "[Sue] give me money give me money"

The word 'ngasech' (literally 'coming up') is a borrowing from Palauan, to denote a gathering to mark a married woman's first successful delivery of a baby. 'Toluk' is a small shallow dish carved from turtle shell, often used as a form of money paid to women for their 'custom' (see above). It is sometimes referred to locally as 'women's money' or 'Palauan money'.

The word 'crafter' is used for craftswoman/craftsman. 'Medivac' - the air transportation of people to a place where they can receive urgent medical attention – can be used as a verb in Palauan English: 'X was medivac yesterday to the Philippines'<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Villagers ask officials to fix damaged sewer system in Melekeok, pay compensation (2012, 5 November) Tia Belau [Koror, Republic of Palau]. Retrieved 10 November 2012, from <http://tiabelaunewspaper.com/?p=110>

Not surprisingly, Palauan English tends to adopt American over British lexis. Palauans consequently sometimes refer to ngasech as ‘baby showers’, ‘tourneys’ instead of ‘tournaments’ and when an event is ‘slated’, it is being scheduled and not harshly criticised.

### 3.4 Discussion

Palauan English appears, on the one hand, far more striking phonologically than grammatically, but, on the other, incorporates many of the features, both phonological and grammatical, that Schneider portrays as typical of postcolonial Englishes in general: vowel shortening, loss of short-long contrasts (2007: 72), shortening or ungliding of diphthongs, the stopping of /θ ð/, the reduction of word initial aspiration (2007: 73), shifts in stress (2007: 74) and syllable timing (2007: 75); absence of nominal plural marking (2007: 83); third person –s omission (2007: 83); a lack of yes-no question inversion (2007: 84); and ‘idiosyncratic’ article use (2007: 85). Indeed several of these features are, furthermore, characteristics of English as a Lingua Franca (Seidlhofer 2005: 92) – English used by speakers of different first language backgrounds as a means of communication.

It clearly shares many characteristics especially with Phillipine English, as we have seen above, but it is not straightforward to ascertain precisely the cause of this similarity. On the one hand, there has been large-scale migration of workers from the Phillipines, many of whom play key roles in the linguistic socialisation of children in Palau - as childcarers and domestic workers, but also as teachers. On the other hand, the indigenous languages of Palau and the Phillipines are both members of the Malayo-Polynesian subfamily of Austronesian, and so there could well be substrate effects involved too. Furthermore, although today well roughly 20% of the population of Koror stems from the Philippines, this is a relatively recent trend. There have been migrant workers in Palau since the end of the Pacific War, but in small numbers until the mid-1980s - significant Philippine influence on Palau does not spread over the entirety of the island’s Anglophone period. And the fact that Palauan English shares many features with Outer Circle Englishes world-wide also leads us to be somewhat sceptical about a specific and crucial role of the Filipino migrant worker. Investigations of Micronesian Englishes that have witnessed much less Filipino immigration may ultimately help us more robustly evaluate the strength of different contributions to the structure of contemporary Palauan English. Lexically, as one might expect, Palauan English incorporates a number of borrowings from both Palauan – some of which were originally from Japanese - and Tagalog.

### 4. Conclusion

This article has attempted to plot the linguistic consequences of Palau’s complex path to independence over the past 120 years, and especially the latter half of that journey. Different colonial rulers have policed Palau in very different ways and left very different legacies. The most intensive intervention was undoubtedly that during the Japanese era – for the Japanese, like no other colonial ruler, Palau was a *settlement* colony, with Japanese migrants outnumbering the locals. At no other time in Palau’s colonial history has there been anything more than a trickle of colonial settlement. Not surprisingly, then, it is Japanese which has had the most impact on the local language, with numerous borrowings integrated, including for food, culture and

core terms expressing feelings and emotions (Matsumoto and Britain 2003a, Matsumoto 2010).

The American period, as we have seen, began otherwise, with almost total indifference and little attempt to develop the islands or prepare them, as in fact was their duty under the UN Trust mandate, for independence. As political circumstances changed, so did American policy, somewhat, but there was never an influx of American migrants, and consequently, and because of aid policy, most contact that Palauans had with Americans was in the United States during periods of college training. Unlike many of the cases in Schneider (2007), therefore, the colonial ‘motivation’ was not settlement, nor indeed exploitation in a typical sense – there were few natural resources to exploit. And it was not even to establish military bases. The US has never done so. But as we have seen, the US’s maintenance of Palau served (and continues to serve, given the Compact of Free Association) important *potential* geopolitical functions, functions which may become more important, for example, in the context of the increased global and especially regional power of the People’s Republic of China. In Schneider’s terminology, then, we can nevertheless argue that Palau served as an exploitation colony: ‘the primary goal...is to secure...political and military interests in a region, not to spread the English language or ...cultural influence’ (2007: 65). Certainly the US did little to spread the English language, and rather than bringing the English language to Palau, it brought (some) Palauans to the English language. Palauan English seems currently to be at the second exonormative stabilisation phase in the Dynamic Model, but the potential for nativisation seems great given the continued lack of American (English) input to everyday life in Palau.

#### References:

- Abe, G. (1986). *An ethnohistory of Palau under the Japanese colonial administration*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Lawrence: University of Kansas.
- Aldridge, B. and Myers, C. (1990). *Resisting the Serpent: Palau’s Struggle for Self-Determination*. Baltimore, Maryland: Fortkamp Publishing Company.
- Alegado, D. and Finin, G. (2000). Exporting people: The Philippines and contract labor in Palau. *Contemporary Pacific* 12: 359-370.
- Anglim, J. (1988). Palau’s strategic position places Palauan democracy at risk. *Working Paper of the Peace Research Centre, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University* 40: 1-42.
- Aoyagi, M. (1977). 文化変容と社会組織－ミクロネシア、ヤップとパラオの場合 [Culture changes and social organisation: The case of Yap and Palau in Micronesia], *史苑 Shien* 37: 43-65.
- Bautista, M. (2000). The grammatical features of educated Philippine English. In L. Bautista, T. Llamzon and B. Sibayan (eds.), *Parangal nang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 146-58.
- Britain, D and Fox, S. (2009). The regularisation of the hiatus resolution system in British English: a contact-induced ‘Vernacular Universal’? In M. Filppula, J. Klemola and H. Paulasto (eds.) *Vernacular Universals and Language Contacts: Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*. London: Routledge. 177-205.
- Chambers, J. K. (2004). Dynamic typology and vernacular universals. In B. Kortmann (ed.), *Dialectology meets typology: dialect grammar from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 127-145.
- Chappell, D (1994). Secret sharers: indigenous beachcombers in the Pacific Islands. *Pacific Studies* 17: 1-22.
- Engelberg, S. (2006). The influence of German on the Lexicon of Palauan and Kosraean. In K. Allan (ed.) *Selected Papers from the 2005 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. <http://www.als.asn.au>
- Flora, M. (1974). *Palauan Phonology and Morphology*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. San Diego: University of

- California, San Diego.
- Gonzalez, A. (1983). When does an error become a feature of Philippine English? In R. Noss (ed.), *Varieties of English in South-east Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press. 150-172.
- Greenhill, S. J., Blust, R., and Gray, R. D. (2008). The Austronesian Basic Vocabulary Database: From Bioinformatics to Lexomics. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics* 4: 271-283.
- Hall, R. (1945). English Loan-Words in Micronesian Languages. *Language* 21: 214-219.
- Hazel, F. X. (1984). Schools in Micronesia prior to American Administration. *Pacific Studies* 8: 95-111.
- Hazel, F. X. and Berg, M. (1980). *Micronesia: Winds of Change*. Saipan: Omnibus Program for Social Studies-Cultural Heritage, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.
- Imaizumi, Y. (1990). 日本の軍政期南洋群島統治 1914-22 [Japanese naval administration in Micronesia 1914-22], 国際関係学研究 [*Studies on International Relations*], 17: 1-18.
- Josephs, L. (1975). *Palauan Reference Grammar*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Josephs, L. (1990). *New Palauan-English Dictionary*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Josephs, L. (1997). *Handbook of Palauan Grammar: Volume I*. Koror: Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Ministry of Education.
- Josephs, L. (1999). *Handbook of Palauan Grammar: Volume II*. Koror: Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Ministry of Education.
- Kabayashi, I. (1994). *The U.S. Confidential Paper & termination of the U.N. Trusteeship: Solomon Report, Independence of Micronesia*. Tokyo: Toshindo.
- Keate, G. (1788). *An Account of the Pelew Islands, Situated in the Western Part of the Pacific Ocean. Composed from the Journals and Communications of Captain Henry Wilson, and some of his Officers, who, in August 1783, were there Shipwrecked, in the Antelope, a Packet belonging to the Hon. East India Company*. York: Edward Peck.
- Keesing, R. (1988). *Melanesian Pidgin and the oceanic substrate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kikumura-Yano, A. (ed.) (2002). *Encyclopedia of Japanese descendants in the Americas: an illustrated history of the Nikkei*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.
- Kluge, P. (1991). *The Edge of Paradise: Americans in Micronesia*. New York: Random House.
- Leibowitz, A. (1996). *Embattled island: Palau's struggle for independence*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Lingenfelter, S. (1974). Administrative officials, Peace Corps lawyers and directed change on Yap. In D. Hughes and S. Lingenfelter (eds.), *Political Development in Micronesia*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University. 54-71.
- Lipski, J., with Mühlhäusler, P. and Duthin, F. (1996). Spanish in the Pacific. In S. Wurm, P. Mühlhäusler and D. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas: Volume 2: 1: Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 271-298.
- Llamzon, T. (1977). The phonology of Philippine English. In M. Bautista (ed.), *English is an Asian Language: the Philippine context*. Sydney: Macquarie Library Ltd. 41-8.
- Matsumoto, K. (2001). Multilingualism in Palau: Language contact with Japanese and English. In T. E. McAuley (ed.), *Language change in East Asia*. London: Curzon Press. 84-142.
- Matsumoto, K. (2010a). The role of social networks in the post-colonial multilingual island of Palau: Mechanisms of language maintenance and shift. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 29(2): 133-165.
- Matsumoto, K. (2010b). Palauan language contact and change: A sociolinguistic analysis of borrowing in Palauan. In J. Dobovsek-Sethna, F. Fister-Stoga and C. Duval. (eds.), *Linguapax Asia: A retrospective edition of language and human rights issues, Collected proceedings of Linguapax Asia Symposia 2004 – 2009*. Tokyo: Linguapax Asia. 36-52.

- Matsumoto, K. and Britain, D. (2003a). Language choice and cultural hegemony in the Western Pacific: Linguistic symbols of domination and resistance in the Republic of Palau. In M. Dedaic and D. Nelson (eds.), *At war with words*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 315-357.
- Matsumoto, K. and Britain, D. (2003b). Contact and obsolescence in a diaspora variety of Japanese: The case of Palau in Micronesia. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics* 44: 38-75.
- Matsumoto, K. and Britain, D. (2006). Palau: Language situation. In K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics: Volume 9*. Oxford: Elsevier. 129-130.
- Matsumoto, K. and Britain, D. (forthcoming a). A short-lived discourse-pragmatic innovation: The tags *desho* and *daro* in obsolescent Palauan Japanese. In Kazuko Matsumoto and David Britain (eds.), *Diaspora Japanese*, Special Issue of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Matsumoto, K. and Britain, D. (forthcoming b). The sociolinguistics of the Japanese Diaspora: An overview of Japanese migration history and language contact. In Kazuko Matsumoto and David Britain (eds.), *Diaspora Japanese*, Special Issue of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- McArthur, T. (2002). *Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McHenry, D. (1975). *Micronesia: Trust Betrayed*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- McKinney, R. (1947). *Micronesia under German rule 1885-1914*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Palo Alto: Stanford University.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1996). German in the Pacific area. In S. Wurm, P. Mühlhäusler and D Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas: Volume 2: 1: Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 345-351.
- Mühlhäusler, P. and Baker, P. (1996). English-derived contact languages in the Pacific in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (excluding Australia). In S. Wurm, P. Mühlhäusler and D Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas: Volume 2: 1: Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 497-522.
- 南洋庁 Nan'yō-chō [South Seas Bureau] (1928, 1939, 1941, 1942) 南洋群島要覽 [*Annual Report on Micronesia*]. Tokyo.
- Office of Planning and Statistics (2005) *2002-2003 Census of population and housing of the Republic of Palau*. Koror.
- Office of Planning and Statistics (2006) *2005 CENSUS Volume II: Census Monograph Population and Housing Profile*. Koror.
- Palau Community Action Agency (1977). *A History of Palau: Traders and Whalers, Spanish Administration, German Administration: Vol. 2*. Koror: PCAA.
- Palau Community Action Agency (1978). *A History of Palau: Japanese Administration, US Naval Government: Vol. 3*. Koror: PCAA.
- Peattie, M. (1988). *Nan'yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia 1885-1945*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pierantozzi, S. (2000). Palauans and guest workers: An opinion paper. *Contemporary Pacific* 12: 349-358.
- Pierantozzi, Sandra (2009, October 30) Palau supports US against Cuba for aid. Interview posted to *ABC Radio Australia*. Retrieved 10th November 2012, from <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/radio/onairhighlights/palau-supports-us-against-cuba-for-aid>
- Rechebei, E. and McPhetres, S. (1997). *History of Palau: Heritage of an Emerging Nation*. Koror: Ministry of Education.
- Roff, S. (1991). *Overreaching in Paradise: United State Policy in Palau since 1945*. Juneau: The Denali Press.
- Schneider, E. (2007). *Postcolonial Englishes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. In A. Hornby (ed.), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, R 92.
- Shuster, D. (1978). *Major patterns of social change instituted in Micronesia during Japanese colonial rule, 1914-*

1940. Unpublished Term Paper. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Shuster, D. (1982). *Islands of change in Palau: Church, school, and elected government, 1891-1981*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Täuber, I. and Han, C. (1950). Micronesian Islands under United States Trusteeship: Demographic Paradox. *Population Index* 16: 93-115.
- Tayao, M. (2004). Philippine English: Phonology. In E. Schneider, K. Burrige, B. Kortmann, R. Mesthrie and C. Upton (eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English: Volume I: Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1047-59.
- Thompson, R. (2003). *Filipino English and Taglish: language switching from multiple perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Tkel, D. (2000). *Conversational Palauan*. Guam: Micronesian Language Institute, University of Guam.
- Trifonovitch, G. (1971). Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In T. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics: Linguistics in Oceania, Vol 8*. The Hague: Mouton. 1063-87.
- Tryon, D., Mühlhäusler, P. and Baker, P. (1996). English-derived contact languages in the Pacific in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (excluding Australia). In S. Wurm, P. Mühlhäusler and D. Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas: Volume 2: 1: Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 471-495.
- The United Nations (n.d. a). The United Nations and Decolonisation: Trusteeship Council. Retrieved 10th November 2012, from <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/trusteeship.shtml>
- The United Nations (n.d. b). The United Nations and Decolonisation: International Trusteeship System. Retrieved 10th November 2012, from <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/its.shtml>
- Vidich, A. (1952). *The Political Impact of Colonial Administration*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Wilson, H. (1972). *The Phonology and Syntax of Palauan Verb Affixes*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

#### **Data Sources:**

- Two arrested for machete attacks (2012, 7 September) *Tia Belau* [Koror, Republic of Palau]. Retrieved 10 November 2012, from <http://tiabelanewspaper.com/?p=594>
- Villagers ask officials to fix damaged sewer system in Melekeok, pay compensation (2012, 5 November) *Tia Belau* [Koror, Republic of Palau]. Retrieved 10 November 2012, from <http://tiabelanewspaper.com/?p=110>

