

PALAUAN LANGUAGE CONTACT AND CHANGE: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF BORROWING IN PALAUAN

Kazuko Matsumoto
University of Tokyo
kmatsu@boz.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract: This paper presents a sociolinguistic study of Palauan language contact and change in the Republic of Palau in the Western Pacific with special reference to borrowing in Palauan. It explores borrowing in Palauan from three perspectives: investigating to what extent different source languages have influenced Palauan by means of borrowing within two analytical frameworks, the ‘hierarchy of borrowing’ and the ‘contact-induced borrowing scale’; and to what extent borrowing has been linguistically assimilated into Palauan and socially accepted by the speakers by employing such terminologies as *Lehnwort*, *Fremdwort* and *Gastwort* as the conceptual framework. This paper concludes with an emphasis upon the importance of both the domain and face-to-face contact in order to understand the mechanism underlying the process of adopting and retaining borrowing in postcolonial multilingual communities.

Key words: language contact; loanword; domain; contact-induced borrowing scale; hierarchy of borrowing; *Lehnwort*; *Fremdwort*; *Gastwort*; Palau; Micronesia; Oceania; Pacific

1. INTRODUCTION

Borrowing is one of the linguistic outcomes when languages are in contact. The study of borrowing has attracted research in many fields of linguistics, including historical linguistics and theoretical linguistics. Sociolinguists have also examined borrowing, particularly by analysing advertisements, television programmes, commercials and pop songs (e.g., Gabbrielli 2005; Jinnouchi 2007); hence, their studies have tended to be rather limited to the domain of the mass media. Another common approach taken by sociolinguists appears to investigate borrowing in relation to code-switching although their main focus has obviously been upon the latter (e.g., Treffers-Daller 1994; Gardner-Chloros 2009). In fact, very few sociolinguistic investigations have applied the concept of ‘**domain**’ itself to examine the mechanisms that underlie the process of borrowing, despite the fact that much sociolinguistic research has demonstrated that the ‘**domain of language use**’ (Fishman 1972) is a useful analytical tool for explaining patterns of language use in various multilingual communities. It is not clear, therefore, whether and how the domains can help us account for the adoption, retention and borrowability of borrowing in multilingual communities. As we will see later, Palau provides an ideal community in which to observe the changing borrowing patterns associated with varying language use in a range of domains. Just within the last 110 years until 1994, Palauan has come into contact with such major world languages as Spanish, German, Japanese and English to varying degrees, because of colonisation. Thus four or five living generations have

experienced different language use in a range of domains depending upon the administrative policy, and this is clearly reflected in the extent and change of borrowing. Therefore, this study will pay great attention to the domain in which borrowing first occurs, is adopted or becomes obsolete, while exploring borrowing in Palauan from three perspectives: investigating to what extent different source languages have influenced Palauan by means of borrowing from the viewpoints of the ‘hierarchy of borrowing’ (Romaine 1995) and the ‘contact-induced borrowing scale’ (Thomason and Kaufman 1988); and to what extent borrowing has been linguistically assimilated into Palauan and socially accepted by the speakers by employing such terms as *Lehnwort*, *Fremdwort* and *Gastwort*. In other words, I assess not only linguistic properties (i.e., borrowability of different grammatical categories and the linguistic assimilation of borrowing) but also the social characteristics of borrowing (i.e., the degree and domain of contact where borrowing initially occurs, is maintained or becomes obsolete, as well as the perception of borrowing by speakers). The first section will summarise the history of language contact in Palau dating back over a century, explaining the sociolinguistic repercussions of political, economic and social developments through the course of Palauan history, together with the consequent multilingualism in contemporary Palau. This overview is essential to portray the different types of ‘contact’ that each colonial power brought about and the consequent borrowing in the present day. The second section will explain the three frameworks on which the following analyses of borrowing will be based. The third section will present the analyses of borrowing in Palauan both qualitatively and quantitatively on the basis of a wide range of data. I demonstrate that both the domain and face-to-face contact are crucial factors in understanding the social and linguistic mechanisms that underlie the process of adopting and maintaining borrowing in postcolonial multilingual communities.

2. PALAUAN LANGUAGE CONTACT HISTORY

The Palau Islands are an archipelago located in the Western Caroline region of the Pacific, with a population of 20,300 (Office of Planning and Statistics 2005). The Austronesian indigenous language, Palauan, has, as a result of a century of colonial domination by Spain, Germany, Japan and the US, come into prolonged contact with a number of non-local languages. Table 1 below summarises, in chronological order, the relationship between the colonial contact languages and the specific factors during their reign that engendered language contact.

The history of Palauan language contact may be roughly classified into the following three stages on the basis of causes of the contact: a classic stage where the propagation of religion urged Palauans to learn missionary words (Spanish and German); a pre-modern stage where mainly political and military domination by foreign nations obliged the Palauans to learn the dominant language at school (German, Japanese, and then American English); and a contemporary stage where scientific, technological advances, economic growth and cultural hegemony have led the Palauans to have contact with languages from developed countries, such as American English and Japanese. I will now look closely at the history of Palauan language contact with those four languages.

Table 1: Language contact history in Palau

<i>Period</i>	<i>Language in contact</i>	<i>Factors engendering contact</i>	<i>Administration</i>
1885 – 1899 (14 years)	Spanish	Christianity	Spanish administration
1899 – 1914 (15 years)	German	Christianity Commercialism Militarism	German administration
1914 – 1945 (30 years)	Japanese	Imperialism Commercialism Militarism	Japanese administration as Japan's Mandate authorised until 1933 by the League of Nations
1945 – 1994 (49 years)	(American) English	Politics Militarism	American administration as the US Trust Territories of Pacific Islands authorised by the United Nations
1994 to Present Day	(American) English Japanese	Politics Tourism Cultural hegemony	The Republic of Palau (Compact of Free Association with the US)

Source: Based on Matsumoto (2001)

2.1. Palauan language contact with Spanish and German

Palauan language contact with Spanish began in 1885^[1] 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 respectful since it was the language of 'God'.

The German era began in 1899 when Germany purchased almost all of Spain's former territories in Micronesia according to the German-Spanish Treaty as a result of 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 domination 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 (Hezel and Berg 1980: 397; 421-3). In 1909, workers in the phosphate business included not only hundreds of Palauans, but also more imported labourers: 23 Europeans, 55 Chinese, 98 Yapese and 126 from the central Carolines (Hezel and Berg 1980: 421-3). In 1912, they increased to more than 800, nearly 90% of whom consisted of various Caroline Islanders (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 (PCAA 1977: 195) to between 20 and 30 students (Hezel 1984). Then, in 1907, the first mission school opened in Koror with 54 students, followed by four more mission schools in Koror and another in Melekeok in 1908, and then by three more in the following years (Engelberg 2006: 10-11). The school programme lasted for three years and was devoted mainly to catechism and German language studies in addition to basic maths, geography, art and music (Shuster 1982: 150-2; Aoyagi 1977: 45). In 1914, the final year of German administration, 361 children out of the total population of 4,200 attended schools, most of whom were from high ranking families (Shuster 1982: 150-2)^[2]. Positive attitudes toward German have been reported: Palauan pupils were anxious to study German, while the Palauans not only requested the Fathers to open more schools, but built schools 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 had never been large; in 1913, only 259 Germans lived in the whole of the Marshalls and Carolines (Aoyagi 1977: 45).

To sum up, German and Spanish domination in Palau was ‘symbolic rather than strategic’ (Peattie 1988: 36). Spain located her base in Guam, while the Germans established their headquarters in Yap (Aoyagi 1977: 44-5); hence, Palau was not their main focus. In addition, all the changes and contact would have affected a rather restricted small area of Palau, Koror. Communication facilities were not developed in Palau at that time, and this indicates that all the changes spread slowly; in particular, residents of the largest island of Palau, Babeldaob, and the outlying atolls remained relatively unaffected by this turmoil and cultural upheaval (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.

2.2. Palauan language contact with Japanese and American English

Nearly thirty years of Japanese occupation began in 1914 as a result of the Anglo-Japan alliance during the First World War (PCAA 1978: 280-1). The rationale behind Japanese domination was not merely imperialistic and commercial (Shuster 1978: 41), but also concerned the ongoing Japan-US conflicts (Imaizumi 1990: 4-6, 13-4). Micronesia was considered to be valuable as an outlet for Japan’s growing population (Shuster 1978: 9, 42) and as a vital strategic advance in any future conflict with the US (Peattie 1988: 42). The headquarters of the Nan’yō-chō (the South Seas Bureau) was established in Koror, Palau, which meant that Palau became the centre of Micronesia for the first time in its history. Japan launched radical reforms in the demographic, economic, and educational spheres as well as the infrastructure of Palau. Firstly, there was a massive influx of Japanese civilian immigrants into Palau. They outnumbered Palauans by an approximate ratio of four to one in 1941, when about 24,000 Japanese and 6,000 Palauans were living in Palau (Nan’yō-chō 1942: 36-7). Furthermore, the majority of these Japanese immigrants 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. These Japanese civilian immigrants in Koror, most of who were male, lived with indigenous Palauan residents in the same neighbourhoods, rather than establishing exclusive Japanese communities. As a result, a

large number of marriages between the Japanese and Palauans occurred, which led to the emergence of a considerable Japanese-Palauan population on the islands. Thus, through their everyday contact with Japanese in the neighbourhood as well as home domains, as Hezel and Berg (1980: 474) describes, the Palauan norms of living, eating and drinking have come to vigorously incorporate Japanese practices.

The first ever nationwide education system was also introduced. Although there were some changes in the policies (e.g., subjects taught) at the schools, 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 for training in carpentry, architecture and nursing were also available in Koror for two years or so, at which selected students from other Micronesian islands and the majority Palauans communicated in Japanese as a lingua franca. Moreover, several out-of-school educational organisations were set up in order to enable Palauan graduates to further incorporate the Japanese social system as well as Japanese thought into their daily lives (see Matsumoto 2001 for details).

Furthermore, a money-oriented economy affected Palau and the social life of the people to a great extent. The appearance of Koror changed dramatically, and was described as a 'suburb of Yokohama' (Shuster 1978: 13) or a 'handsome tropical city' (Klunge 1991: 5) by journalists and missionaries who visited Koror at that time. Numerous restaurants, cafés, shops, bars, and 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 is said that the small island of Koror looked extremely packed. This all created a situation in which Palauans used Japanese as their second language in social life in general.

Half a century of US domination started at the end of the Pacific War, in which the Japanese strategy of using military bases in Micronesia as stepping-stones to Hawaii made the US aware of the strategic military value that Micronesia had for the US. For that reason, the US wished to maintain permanent access to Micronesia, but, at the same time, it needed to appear to be providing democratic free choice and advancing self-government in Micronesia, in order not to lose its own international credibility (Anglim 1988: 1). This dilemma led to yet another form of administration and contact. The confidential US Solomon Report (1963 in Anglim 1988: 10) shows that having *no* economic development plan was, in fact, the intended US policy to make the Palauan economy totally dependent on the US, leaving no operative industry. The US encouraged the growth of the public sector by providing generous salaries for government employment and by privileging them 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, the US manipulated official appointments and provided American funds (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 from the US.

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 educational

budget. During the early periods 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 (PCAA 1978: 487). As a consequence, initially the new schools employed some well-educated Palauans who had attended the Japanese schools and hence took on a ‘Japanese flavour’; later, Palauans were able to produce their own teacher-training bulletin and textbooks (Shuster 1982: 183, 212). From 1962, when the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuba Missile Crisis intensified the Cold War confrontation between the US and the Soviet Union, the US was reminded of the strategic importance of Micronesia (Shuster 1982: 197) and American-style education was begun. The support for educational programmes expanded enormously. A similar educational system as in the mainland US was introduced, including elementary and high schools and two years of higher education. American textbooks were introduced, and twenty-four American contract teachers arrived initially, followed by 323 young Peace Corp Volunteers by the end of 1966 who replaced the teachers (Shuster 1982: 199, 208; Abe 1986: 206). The classes began to be delivered in English from the first grade (Abe 1986: 205), whereas a large proportion of the US funds were used to send more than 75% of Palau’s high school graduates to US colleges each year during this intensified period (Shuster 1982: 216). This all led to the creation of the Palauan-English bilingual elite, educated in the US and working for high salaries in government offices.

Regarding demography, overall, a small number of Americans were temporarily stationed in Palau, such as military and administrative personnel, missionaries, school teachers and members of the Peace Corps, but no systematic Anglophone immigration took place. It seems to be true that, unlike the American officials, the volunteers were idealistic and sympathetic to the islanders so that there was interaction between the volunteers and Palauans to some extent, but their short contracts and small numbers in comparison to the islanders suggest that their effect upon the Palauan language on the island may not have been as great as it appears. Perhaps the biggest demographic change that the US period brought to Palau was the expatriation of all of the Japanese settlers.

Overall, while the Japanese era saw a rather interventionist and integrationist approach at engendering consent, the US period was characterised by an aloof hands-off stance. Thus, it is most likely that the Japanese administrative strategy in Palau was far more influential upon Palauan society and language, regarding its infrastructure, demography, economy, education, thought and living style, than either the earlier European or the later American domination. In particular, the degree and frequency of everyday interaction between Japanese and Palauans appear to have been the greatest among the four colonial powers due to a massive influx of Japanese civilian settlers.

However, given the longest domination (i.e., for half a century) and on-going financial aid from the US, it may not be a surprise to see similarities in their sociolinguistic outcomes. During each administration, recognition of Japanese or English as a high status language as opposed to Palauan as a low language (i.e., diglossia) was established, while the 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 ‘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 social life, such as in the neighbourhood, work and shop domains.

2.3. Multilingualism in contemporary Palau

Palau finally became a technically independent nation in 1994 after approving and signing the agreement of the Compact Free Association with the US. However, given the lengthier and more intensive contact with Japan and the US, it seems reasonable that the impact of both countries should still appear to be of significance for Palau. English has remained as the official language along with the indigenous language, Palauan, while the teaching of Japanese as an additional language has been widely adopted in Palauan high schools and college. Palauan as the only national language has succeeded in expanding its use in wider domains than before to some extent; on radio, at work, in shops as well as in the neighbourhoods, Palauan is predominantly spoken. Nevertheless, the sociolinguistic situation in Palau still appears to be diglossic, since official documents, school textbooks and newspapers are still written in English. It is the past and present relationships between Palau and the former colonial nations that have contributed to the formation of the current multilingualism. Most older Palauans over the age 75 are Palauan-Japanese bilinguals, but since 1945 competence in Japanese has diminished rapidly, leaving many middle-aged Palauans as 'semi-speakers', and the younger islanders, who are bilingual in Palauan and English, as potential L2 learners. Furthermore, a small English monolingual elite has begun to emerge, worrying some that it might be a symptom of early Palauan language death.

Thus, over the last century, Palau has experienced dramatic socio-political, economic, educational and demographic changes, creating Palauan language contact with Spanish, German, Japanese and English to differing degrees. It will be explored later how those social changes and contact have contributed to the Palauan language structure in the form of borrowing.

3. FRAMEWORK ON THE STUDY OF BORROWING

3.1. Hierarchy of borrowing

It has widely been accepted that the ease of borrowing moves from high to low, corresponding from lexical items through morphology to syntax (cf. Section 3.3.). This is called the 'hierarchy of borrowing'. Romaine (1995: 64-5), for example, explains that lexical items are the most frequently borrowed; in particular, nouns are predominantly borrowed among the categories of lexical items; derivational and inflectional morphology is next most likely to be borrowed; and syntax is the least likely to be borrowed.

In the analysis section, I will quantitatively investigate the borrowability of different grammatical categories mainly by examining the proportion of original grammatical categories of borrowing in the source languages on the basis of the *Palauan-English Dictionary* (Joseph 1990). Qualitatively, however, I will add some useful and relevant

examples of borrowing which were observed or recorded during my long-term participant observation in Palau^[3].

3.2. Linguistic assimilation and social acceptance of borrowing

Three German terms are often adopted by philologists to describe the process of linguistic assimilation and social acceptance of borrowing. McArthur (1992: 623) defines each of them as below:

A *Gastwort* (guest-word) is an unassimilated borrowing that has kept its pronunciation, orthography, grammar, and meaning, but is not used widely... A *Fremdwort* (foreign-word)... has been adapted into the native system, with a stable spelling and pronunciation (native or exotic), or a compromise has been made by translating all or part into a native equivalent... A *Lehnwort* (loanword) proper is a word that has become indistinguishable from the rest of the lexicon and is open to normal rules of word use and word formation (bold emphasis added).

Important here is that those terms not only capture the different degrees of linguistic assimilation of borrowing into the recipient language, but also indicate the difference in social acceptance or awareness of borrowing as vernacular or foreign by the speakers.

Practical difficulties, however, in using this conceptual framework should be pointed out. Firstly, *Gastwort* seems to be difficult to distinguish from code-switching owing to its linguistic properties as well as its non-widespread use. It is noteworthy, however, that when more than one language is juxtaposed in a person's utterances in a multilingual society, in practice, the distinction between borrowing and code-switching becomes too fuzzy to draw a line. As Woolard (2004: 82) explains, although there have been controversies over the distinction, the current trend is to acknowledge 'the fuzziness of language systems'. In this study, therefore, some examples of *Gastwort* may include potential code-switching.

Second, the stability of spelling and orthography of loanwords cannot be an indicator to distinguish these three terms in this study. Since Palau is traditionally an oral society, 'stable spelling' even for Palauan is not yet widespread. Moreover, different generations are literate in different orthographies (i.e., Japanese *katakana* and the Roman alphabet) (see Matsumoto 2001). My analysis of this conceptual framework will be qualitative based upon my participant observation, ethnographic interviews and conversational data by different generations.

3.3. Contact-induced borrowing scale

Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74-6) postulate that 'degree of contact' determines whether or not different types (i.e., lexical, phonological, phonetic and morpho-syntactic) of borrowing are likely to take place. That is, degree of borrowing is mostly dependent on the intensity of contact between the two peoples speaking the languages, and that given high-intensity contact, anything could be borrowed. Here, 'intensity of contact' involves factors of 'attitude and cultural pressure' and 'time and level of bilingualism' (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 46-57). A different hierarchy called the '**borrowing scale**' at five

different levels was then proposed, which takes contact intensity as its main variable and lists the likely sorts of borrowing for scenarios of ever increasing intensity of contact. Table 2 shows the borrowing scale at five levels (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74-6).

Table 2: Borrowing scale (Thomason and Kaufman 1988)^[4]

<i>Category</i>	<i>Intensity of contact</i>	<i>Type of borrowing</i>
1	Casual contact	Lexical borrowing only
2	Slightly more intensive contact	Slight structural borrowing; phonological borrowing is likely to be confined to the appearance of new phonemes with new phones, but only in loanwords
3	More intensive contact	Slightly more structural borrowing; in phonology, borrowing will probably include the phonemicisation, even in native vocabulary, of previously allophonic alternations.
4	Strong cultural pressure	Moderate structural (syntactic) borrowing
5	Very strong cultural pressure	Heavy structural (morphological) borrowing

There seems to be a disagreement between the ‘hierarchy of borrowing’ and the ‘contact-induced borrowing scale’; the former argues that syntax is hardest to borrow, while the latter makes the same assertion about morphology. Although recent studies tend to focus upon the latter (e.g., Garrett 2004: 57), this paper will examine what is applicable to the case of borrowing in Palauan. My analysis on this scale will be qualitative based upon both the Palauan language contact history provided in Section 2 and my findings of analyses based upon the first two frameworks. Additionally, a relevant phonological analysis will be briefly sketched.

4. ANALYSIS OF BORROWING IN PALAUAN

To begin with, it would be useful to have an overall picture of borrowing in Palauan. Table 3 illustrates to what extent each source language has contributed borrowings to Palauan on the basis of two Palauan-English dictionaries published in 1977 (McManus) and 1990 (Joseph), the former of which was counted by Engelberg (2006). Overall, it spotlights the greatest proportion of Japanese borrowing; approximately 60% of borrowing comes from Japanese. The second highest contributor is English; more or less a quarter of borrowing has English origin. Both Spanish and German loanwords amount to less than 10%.

Table 3: Proportion of borrowing in Palauan according to source language

	<i>1977</i>		<i>1990</i>	
English	128	23.4%	290	28.3%
Japanese	345	62.9%	601	58.8%
German	51	9.3%	39	3.8%
Spanish	23	4.2%	89	8.7%
Others	1	0.2%	4	0.4%
<i>Total</i>	548	100%	1023	100%

Sources: McManus (1977 in Engelberg 2006) and Joseph (1990)

In a strict sense, the two dictionaries may not be comparable; notably, the 1990 dictionary has greatly expanded the number of lexical items, implying that the 1977 dictionary may have rather limited coverage of the language. Therefore, the difference in the proportion of borrowing with different origins between 1977 and 1990 should not automatically be interpreted as an increase or decrease of borrowing from each source language. For instance, the rise in the proportion of Spanish loanwords in 1990 does not mean that new Spanish words have been recently borrowed, but rather that some Spanish words may have been missed by the 1977 dictionary. In contrast, although the proportion of Japanese borrowing appears to somewhat fall at first glance between 1977 and 1990, the number of Japanese borrowings clearly indicates a dramatic rise from 345 in 1977 to 601 in 1990.

However, it also seems to be true that there have been some changes in borrowing in Palauan. For instance, the number of German borrowings appears to have declined. It is likely that the domains of borrowing depending upon the source language help us explain some reasons for those changes. Spain brought Christianity to Palau for the first time, together with numerous missionary words (e.g. *kerus* and *misang* from Spanish *cruz* and *Misa*, meaning ‘cross’ and ‘Mass’), and the majority of Palauans have remained Christian. Therefore, it makes sense that those Spanish missionary words have been preserved in the religious domain.

German borrowing, on the other hand, is associated with not only missionary words in the religion domain but also with the names for modern products, concepts and systems in the military, factory and education domains. German words in the latter domains have tended to be replaced by the subsequent Japanese loanwords, since the Japanese colonial government implemented far more thorough social reforms in Palau in these domains. For instance, the words for ‘grammar’ and ‘letter’ were first adopted from German *Grammatik* as *kramatik* and *Brief* as *berib*, but they came to coexist with or even appear to be supplanted by the Japanese *bunpoo* and *tegami* (Pal. *bumpo* and *tengami*).

However, the subsequent half-century of US domination sometimes led to the obsolescence of some Japanese borrowings in the domains where German and Japanese words had been in competition. Good illustrations of this are that the words for ‘hospital’ and ‘company’ were first adopted from Japanese *byooin* (Pal. *bioing*) and *kaisha* (Pal. *kaisia*) but came to coexist with or even seem to be superseded by the English borrowings *osbitar* and *kombalii*. Nevertheless, the exception seems that the so-called ‘core’ vocabulary, such as body parts, numbers and words that express ‘feeling’ and ‘sense’, have remained Japanese: e.g., *chi*^[5] and *chude* (Jp. *i* and *ude*, meaning ‘stomach’ and ‘arm’); *mang* and *niziu* (Jp. *man* and *niju*, ‘ten thousand’ and ‘twenty’); *choisi* and *samui* (Jp. *oishi* and *samui*, ‘tasty’ and ‘cold’). As Holmes (2008: 28) pointed out, in diglossic situations, there is a tendency that ‘the H vocabulary includes many more formal and technical terms such as *conservation* and *psychometric*, while the L variety has words for everyday objects such as *saucepan* and *shoe*’. In the case of Japanese borrowing in Palauan, however, not only formal words, but also those for everyday items and expressions were transferred from the high language through face-to-face interaction with neighbouring Japanese settlers and co-workers.

Thus, the reasons for all of those changes in borrowing depending on source language highlight the importance of the domain and intensity of ‘contact’ as well as everyday face-to-face interaction in order to understand the change in borrowing.

4.1. Hierarchy of borrowing in Palauan

As the ‘hierarchy of borrowing’ predicts, it turns out to be true that lexical items are predominantly borrowed. Table 4 shows the proportion of grammatical category of original words and phrases borrowed in Palauan.

Table 4: Grammatical category of original words and phrases borrowed in Palauan

	Noun & N. Phrase		Adjective & Adj. Phrase		Adverb		Verb & V. Phrase		Others		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Spanish	88	98.9	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	89	100
German	35	89.7	0	0.0	1	2.6	2	5.1	1	2.6	39	100
Japanese	506	84.2	33	5.5	4	0.7	54	9.0	4	0.7	601	100
English	277	95.5	2	0.7	0	0.0	11	3.8	0	0.0	290	100

Source: Joseph (1990)

As expected, nouns are most frequently borrowed amongst the grammatical categories in any language. It is worth noting, however, that of all the non-nouns, only 17 out of 108 are not of Japanese origin. As far as Spanish and German loanwords are concerned, their entire original grammatical category turned out to be nouns with only a few exceptions; one Spanish adjective (Sp. *cristiano*, Pal. *keristiano*, meaning ‘Christian’), one German adverb (Ger. *auswendig*, meaning ‘by heart’; Pal. *chausbengdik* (v.t.), meaning ‘know/learn thoroughly, memorise’) and one German verb (Ger. *schenken*^[6], ‘give as gift’; Pal. *ousengk*^[7] (v.i.), ‘give a gift to; thank’). It is interesting that this particular German adverb borrowed as a verb in Palauan corresponds to the German teaching method adopted during their regime (i.e., learning German songs by heart).

English also shows a similar pattern to the earlier European languages. Overall, over 95% of the English lexicon is nouns, but also ten verbs and one verb phrase have been borrowed, including *saing* (Eng. sign), *tsienz* (change) and *kohei* (go ahead)^[8].

Japanese borrowing shows a clearly different pattern from the others. Over 500 Japanese nouns and a noun phrase have been borrowed, including core vocabulary as illustrated above. Moreover, a considerable number of adjectives, adverbs, verbs and interjections were adopted and maintained. The adjectives mostly consist of words expressing ‘feeling’ and ‘sense’ as exemplified above, while the adverbs include *daitai* (Jp. *daitai*, meaning ‘about’), *dosei* (Jp. *doose*, ‘after all’), *tokuni* (Jp. *toku ni*, ‘in particular’) and *sekkaku* (Jp. *sekkaku*, ‘with considerable effort’). Amongst the numerous verbs, interesting examples involve *nenneng* (Jp. *nenne*, meaning ‘go to sleep’) and *bo mchensi*^[9] (Jp. *enshi*^[10], meaning ‘sit down’), both of which are used to address babies or small children (i.e., baby talk). The interjections also show interesting cases: Japanese formulaic expressions such as *yorosik* (Jp. *yoroshiku*, ‘please; regards’) and *odaizini* (Jp. *o-daiji ni*, ‘Take care!’), both of which are used to end a conversation, have been adopted in Palauan.

Beyond lexical items, neither derivational nor inflectional morphology alone was borrowed from any source language into Palauan. It may be worthwhile to note, however, that some Japanese and English morphemes were adopted as a part of the loanword, although they were not attached to Palauan words. For example, some English borrowings usually

include the plural '-s': e.g., *kiis* (Eng. keys), *chauts* (Eng. outs, a baseball term) and *donats* (Eng. doughnuts), although they are used as a singular in Palauan (Josephs 1984: 90).

Similarly, the Japanese prefix *o-* and suffix *-san*, both of which indicate politeness, are incorporated into many Japanese loanwords. As shown by *okane* (Jp. *o-kane*, meaning 'money'), *okiak* (Jp. *o-kyaku*, 'customer') and *chosoroi* (Jp. *o-soroi*, 'matching, identical'), *o-* is always attached to them. The latter, *-san*, is adopted as *-sang* in Palauan, often being attached to a personal name, occupation etc.; e.g. *daikusang* (Jp. *daiku-san*, meaning 'carpenter') and *oningiosang* (Jp. *o-ningyō-san*, 'doll'). The elderly and middle-aged Palauans who are fluent and semi-speakers of Japanese tend to be aware that both affixes signify politeness, while the young Palauans with a little Japanese knowledge usually do not. Young Palauan gangsters would, therefore, demand *okane* rather than *kane*, although they are not asking for money politely!

Furthermore, both adjective (negative) and verb phrases from Japanese might support the higher borrowability of Japanese; both the negation *-nai* and the aspect form *-teiru* (adopted as *-teru* in Palauan) are blended into Japanese loanwords in Palauan. *Chauanai* (Jp. *awa-nai*, 'does not match'), *kikanai* (Jp. *kika-nai*, 'not effective') and *otsuriganai* (Jp. *o-tsuru ga nai*, 'have no change') are examples of the former, while *komatter* (Jp. *koma-tteiru*, meaning 'be in trouble'), *skareter* (Jp. *tsukare-teiru*, 'be tired'), and *kangkeister* (Jp. *kankeishi-teiru*, 'be related') are examples of the latter.

No syntax of any source language appears to have been borrowed into Palauan. Interestingly, however, both Japanese and English borrowings can be borrowed at the sentence level. For example, the following were observed in Palauan conversation: *atama dame, okanenai, demo zenzen mondainai* (Jp. *atama wa yoku-nai, o-kane wa nai, demo zenzen modai-nai*, meaning 'I'm not clever, have no money but it's no problem')^[11]; *it kang mub* (Eng. 'It cannot move'), which is used when one tries to move something heavy.

Thus, given that Japanese borrowing in Palauan is found to fall into a far wider range of grammatical categories, it may be concluded that of all the contact languages in Palau Japanese borrowing shows the highest borrowability in Palauan. The numerically second greatest contributor to borrowing, English, comes next with several verbs being borrowed, and then the least contributors in number, Spanish and German, indicate shallow borrowability having only nouns being borrowed aside from a few exceptions.

4.2. Linguistic assimilation and social acceptance of borrowing in Palauan

Spanish and German loanwords are very often modified to fit Palauan phonological rules and morphological constructions (see Joseph 1984 for details). In terms of linguistic assimilation, therefore, they may be categorised as *Lehnwort*. However, the awareness of people recognising those words as foreign-originated words seems to depend upon both the word itself and the generation of the speakers. Because these words are chronologically the oldest and the degree of their linguistic nativisation is high, the younger generation does not tend to realise that they are loanwords. However, since many borrowings with Spanish and German origins are related to religion, the older generation still recognises all of them as non-native but do not necessarily know which language they originally came from. As

times goes by, however, it is likely that they will eventually lose their foreignness in Palauans' awareness. Hence, they are in a transitional stage from *Fremdwort* to *Lehnwort*.

In the case of Japanese and English borrowing, however, the distinctions proposed by the three terminologies might be difficult to apply neatly, since Palauan contact with Japanese and English has resulted in both societal and individual bilingualism in Palauan-Japanese and Palauan-English. That is, the elderly, who are bilingual in Palauan and Japanese, use Japanese borrowings that are linguistically unassimilated into Palauan, keeping their pronunciation^[12], grammar and meaning; i.e., *Gastwort*. By contrast, youngsters, who are Palauan monolinguals or Palauan-English bilinguals, use Japanese loanwords that are nativised into Palauan; viz. *Fremdwort*. The reverse is true for English borrowings. The young Palauan-English bilinguals tend to preserve the original English pronunciation, grammar and meaning when English words are borrowed into Palauan conversation (Josephs 1984: 82); hence, *Gastwort*. In contrast, the elderly Palauan-Japanese bilinguals, who have lower or no command of English, often use English borrowings that are linguistically Palauanised; i.e., *Fremdwort*. Thus, the linguistic assimilation of Japanese and English loanwords depends upon the generation of speakers who are bilingual in different combinations of languages.

However, the social acceptance and awareness of people recognising those words as vernacular or foreign turn out to be more complex. Although Japanese borrowings are chronologically newer than Spanish and German, Japanese loanwords include names for everyday life items and feelings, so that some young generations in fact did not recognise that they are of foreign origin; hence *Lehnwort*. That is, variations have emerged in the recognition of Japanese borrowing in Palau depending on the generation of speaker as well as the domain of borrowing. Thus, overall, Japanese borrowings appear to show the widest range of linguistic and social assimilation, from *Gastwort* to *Fremdwort* and further to *Lehnwort*. The chronologically newest English borrowings seem to fall into both *Gastwort* and *Fremdwort*, but since they often remain distinguishable from the indigenous lexicon, they cannot be yet categorised as *Lehnwort*.

In summary, it was shown that the level of bilingualism is a more important factor than the age of loanwords in understanding the linguistic assimilation of borrowing in multilingual Palau (i.e., Japanese *Gastwort*), while the domain where borrowing is adopted also seems to be a more crucial element than the recentness of the borrowing in gaining the social acceptance of borrowing as vernacular (i.e., core vocabulary from Japanese vs. missionary words from European languages).

4.3. Contact-induced borrowing scale in Palauan

As we have seen, due to their 'symbolic' domination by Spain and Germany, 'cultural pressure' would have been weak; contact was short in time and less intensive in degree; and even individual 'bilinguals' scarcely existed, although a positive 'attitude' toward learning German was observable. In other words, the degree of contact was minimal; hence, Palauan contact with Spanish and German is applicable to category one, 'casual contact', in the borrowing scale. The predicted type of borrowing in that category in fact corresponds to Spanish and German borrowing in Palauan, i.e., 'lexical borrowing only'.

By contrast, far more intensive contact with Japanese has led to a longer-term ‘bilingualism’ in a much wider section of the population of Palau. During the Japanese regime, Japanese was used not only in the educational and administrative domains, but also in the work, shop and neighbourhood domains. Positive ‘attitudes’ toward Japanese as well as Japanese borrowing have also been expressed by contemporary Palauans (see Matsumoto 2001 for details). According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 74-95), this sort of scenario often brings about either category two (slightly more intense contact) or three (more intense contact). The important difference in linguistic consequence between these two slightly different degrees of contact intensity is whether the use of a new phoneme is restricted to borrowings or is extended to the recipient language (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 74-75). As Joseph (1984) explains, the influx of Japanese loanwords has in fact resulted in the establishment of five new phonemes in Palauan (i.e., /n/, /f/, /h/, /p/ and /z/). Their use was firstly restricted to Japanese and then extended to Spanish and English loanwords. Taking /h/ as an example, among the three allophones that the Japanese phoneme /h/ has, the voiceless glottal fricative [h] has been established as a single allophone for the new Palauan phoneme /h/ (Joseph 1984: 85). Some Spanish loanwords with orthographic g or j (e.g., *birhen*, Sp. *Virgen*, ‘Virgin’) are currently pronounced either as the voiceless velar fricative [x] or [h], while English loanwords with /h/ have been mostly adopted in Palauan with /h/ (e.g., *hos*, Eng. *hose*) (Joseph 1984: 86). Thus, although a closer examination of their impact upon the pronunciation of Palauan lexical items is needed, the extended use of the new phonemes brought by Japanese into non-Japanese-originated words suggests that Palauan contact with Japanese falls into category three.

In the case of contact with English, although everyday face-to-face contact with Americans hardly existed, the longest institutional bilingual policy in the educational and administrative domains led to the high level of Palauan-English ‘bilingualism’ and positive ‘attitudes’ toward English as well as Palauan-English code-switching (see Matsumoto 2001 for details), recently resulting in English monolinguals among an elite group of the population (i.e., language shift). According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 47-8), this sort of scenario may be categorised as a ‘shift situation’ which is distinguished from a ‘maintenance situation’ where the ‘intensity of contact’ in the borrowing scale is applicable. In other words, English borrowing cannot fall into any category in the borrowing scale, but rather should be explained from a different perspective (i.e., shift situation) with a different scale. Due to limited space, I cannot go into the details on the different scale for the ‘shift situation’ here (see Thomason and Kaufman 1988), but at least it should be emphasised that, given the fuzzy distinction between borrowing and code-switching, a further study of frequently observed code-switching between Palauan and English as well as the ‘shift situation’ may uncover a new perspective on the English contribution to Palauan language change in the future.

Finally, the discrepancy in the order of the ease of borrowing between the ‘hierarchy of borrowing’ and the ‘contact-induced borrowing scale’ needs a brief comment. It turned out that it is not possible to determine whether syntax or morphology is hardest to borrow on the basis of Palauan data, since, as demonstrated in Section 4.1, neither morphology nor syntax was borrowed from any source language into Palauan.

To sum up, despite the facts that positive attitudes seem to have existed towards all of the four source languages and that English has had a greater duration of contact and level of

bilingualism than Japanese, it turns out that Japanese falls into the highest category in the borrowing scale among the four source languages. Thus, the overriding factor affecting the adoption and maintenance of borrowing in the case of Palau appears to be whether the islanders had face-to-face interaction in everyday domains.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study highlighted the importance of the domains and face-to-face contact in order to understand the mechanism underlying the process of adopting and retaining borrowing from three perspectives. First, through examining the hierarchy of borrowing and the contact-induced borrowing scale in Palauan, we observed that Japanese had the greatest influence upon Palauan. Japanese borrowing was found in a wider range of grammatical categories and established five new phonemes in Palauan. Second, through analysis of the linguistic assimilation of borrowing into Palauan, we are able to spotlight that in the case of a fluid multilingual speech community, the speakers' ability in the source language affects the degree of linguistic assimilation, so that *Gastwort* is observable among Palauan-Japanese bilinguals, despite the fact that it was nearly a century ago that Japanese began being transferred to Palauan. Thirdly and perhaps most interestingly, through examining the social acceptance of borrowing by Palauans, we found that the perception of borrowing varies depending upon the domain in which the borrowing is adopted. The influx of civilian Japanese settlers led to everyday face-to-face interaction between Japanese and Palauans in the neighbourhood, work and shop domains, so that even Japanese core vocabulary, words expressing 'feeling' and 'sense' and baby talk have become part of Palauan, losing their foreignness. In short, although this is still speculative, borrowing may begin through indirect contact, but ultimately may need to reach local everyday interaction before core vocabulary and new phonemes are put in place in postcolonial multilingual communities. Thus, the crucial role of social infiltration and face-to-face contact in informal domains is highlighted.

NOTES

* This is part of an on-going research project with David Britain of Bern University, supported by the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan: 15720097(2003-2005); 18720100 (2006-2009); 22682003 (2010-2013). I would like to thank David Britain and Tom Gally for their useful comments; Shuichi Yatabe for sharing his ideas on how to categorise Japanese borrowing; my research assistant Akiko Okumura for painstakingly counting borrowings. All remaining mistakes and inadequacies are my own.

[¹] Contact before 1985, see Engelberg (2006: 8-10) for more details.

[²] Only one German public school offered sixth-year advanced education in Saipan, and only one Palauan finished it (Shuster 1982: 151; Imaizumi 1990: 4).

[³] This research forms part of a broader investigation into multilingualism, cultural and linguistic hegemony, language maintenance and shift, and dialect contact and obsolescence (see Matsumoto 2001; 2010; forthcoming; Matsumoto and Britain 2003a; 2003b; 2006; forthcoming a; forthcoming b). A variety of data were gathered in the former Palauan capital, Koror, since 1997 involving nearly a year of participant observation; 121 ethnographic interviews; 233 ethnographic questionnaires; and over 100 hours of recorded spontaneous conversation, as well as many hours of informal discussions. For this article, however, I selected only the relevant data to explore borrowing.

[⁴] Due to a limited space, the scale is simplified here and mainly shows the aspects relevant to Palauan.

[⁵] Note that <ch> is the orthographic representation of a glottal stop.

[⁶] As pointed out by Engelberg (2006: 6), it may also be derived from the German noun *Geschenk* meaning 'gift'.

- [7] The Palauan prefix *ou-* ‘derives verbs that designate ownership or use of, control over, or participation in the entity designated by the stem itself’ (Josephs 1984: 110).
- [8] There are some records (e.g., *Nihon kokugo dai-jiten* 2001), however, that the English phrase ‘go ahead’ had already been adopted into Japanese in Japan as *goohee* particularly in the fields of navy as well as fishing industry before Palauan had contact with Japanese. Therefore, it is not clear whether it directly comes from English or via Japanese.
- [9] This particular loanword is used only in this phrase (Joseph 1990: 51).
- [10] The word *enshi* appears to be a geographical dialect term used when asking small children to sit down.
- [11] In both Japanese and Palauan, null subjects are possible.
- [12] Although Josephs (1984: 82) explains that Japanese loanwords are totally assimilated into the Palauan phonological system, it is not very likely that he intended to examine the different use of borrowing across different generations.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abe, G. (1986) *An ethnohistory of Palau under the Japanese colonial administration*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Kansas, Kansas.
- [2] Anglim, J. (1988) ‘Palau’s strategic position places Palauan democracy at risk’, *Working Paper* 40: 1-42. Peace Research Centre, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra.
- [3] 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(2): 43-65.
- [4] 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*. Retrieved February 2010, from <http://www.als.asn.au>
- [5] Fishman, J. A. (1972) ‘Domains and the relationship between micro- and macro-sociolinguistics’. In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell. 435-53.
- [6] Gabbrielli, R. R. (2005) *A Sociolinguistic Analysis of English loanwords in Japanese Television Commercials*. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.
- [7] Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009) *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Garrett, P. B. (2004) ‘Language contact and contact languages’. In A. Duranti (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell. 46-72.
- [9] Hazel, F. X. (1984) ‘Schools in Micronesia prior to American Administration’, *Pacific Studies* 8: 95-111.
- [10] Hazel, F. X. and M. L. Berg (1980) *Micronesia: Winds of Change*. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands: Saipan.
- [11] Holmes, J. (2008) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (3rd edn.). London: Longman.
- [12] 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. Department of Advanced Social and International Relations, University of Tokyo, Tokyo.
- [13] Jinnouchi, M. (2007) *外来語の社会言語学 [Sociolinguistics of Borrowing]*. Kyoto: Sekaishisoshia.
- [14] Josephs, L. S. (1984) ‘The impact of borrowing on Palauan’. In B. W. Bender (ed.) *Studies in Micronesian Linguistics*, C-80: 81-123.
- [15] Josephs, L. S. (1990) *New Palauan-English Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- [16] Kluge, P. (1991) *The Edge of Paradise: Americans in Micronesia*. New York: Random House.
- [17] McManus, E. G. (1977) *Palauan-English Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- [18] Matsumoto, K. (2001) ‘Multilingualism in Palau: Language contact with Japanese and English’. In T. E. McAuley (ed.) *Language Change in East Asia*. London/New York: Routledge. 84-142.
- [19] Matsumoto, K. (2010) ‘The role of social networks in the post-colonial multilingual island of Palau: Mechanisms of language maintenance and shift’, *Multilingua* 29(2): 133-165.

- [20] Matsumoto, K. (forthcoming) 'Diaspora Japanese as an endangered contact variety in the Pacific: Evidence from the Republic of Palau'. In L. Landweer and P. Unseth (eds.) *The Sociolinguistics of Melanesia*, Special Issue of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- [21] Matsumoto, K. and D. Britain (2003a) 'Investigating the sociolinguistic gender paradox in a multilingual community: A case study from the Republic of Palau', *International Journal of Bilingualism* 7(2): 127-152.
- [22] Matsumoto, K. and D. Britain (2003b) '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. N. Nelson (eds.) *At War With Words*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 315-357.
- [23] Matsumoto, K. and D. Britain (2006) 'Palau: Language situation'. In K. Brown (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd edn.) Vol. 9. 129-131. Oxford: Elsevier.
- [24] Matsumoto, K. and D. Britain (forthcoming a) 'Japanese dialect contact and death in the Republic of Palau'. In K. Matsumoto and D. Britain (eds.) *The Sociolinguistics of the Japanese Diaspora*, Special Issue of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- [25] Matsumoto, K. and D. Britain (forthcoming b) 'Palauan English'. In D. Schreier, P. Trudgill, E. Schneider and J.P. Williams. (eds.) *The Lesser-Known Varieties of English*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [26] McKinney, R. (1947) *Micronesia under German rule 1885-1914*. Unpublished MA Dissertation, Stanford University, California.
- [27] McArthur, T. (1992) *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [28] 南洋庁 Nan'yō-chō [South Seas Bureau] (1942) *南洋群島要覧 [Annual Report on Micronesia]*. Tokyo.
- [29] *日本国語大辞典 Nihon kokugo dai-jiten [Dictionary of Japanese]* (2001) (2nd edn.) Tokyo: Shōgakkan.
- [30] Office of Planning and Statistics (2005) *2002-2003 Census of population and housing of the Republic of Palau*. Koror.
- [31] Palau Community Action Agency (1977) *A History of Palau: Traders and Whalers, Spanish Administration, German Administration*. Vol. 2. Koror.
- [32] Palau Community Action Agency (1978) *A History of Palau: Japanese Administration, US Naval Government*. Vol. 3. Koror.
- [33] Peattie, M. R. (1988) *Nan'yō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia 1885-1945*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- [34] Rechebei, E. D. and S. McPhetres (1997) *History of Palau: Heritage of an Emerging Nation*. Koror: Ministry of Education.
- [35] Romaine, S. (1995) *Bilingualism* (2nd edn.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [36] Shuster, D. (1978) *Major patterns of social change instituted in Micronesia during Japanese colonial rule, 1914-1940*. Unpublished Term Paper, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- [37] Shuster, D. (1982) *Islands of change in Palau: Church, school, and elected government, 1891-1981*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- [38] Thomason, S. and T. Kaufman (1988) *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Oxford: University of California Press.
- [39] Treffers-Daller, J. (1994) *Mixing Two Languages: French-Dutch Contact in a Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- [40] Woolard, K. (2004) 'Codeswitching'. In A. Duranti (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell. 73-94.