

Research Article

Lexical Choice and Syntactic Structure of Solomon Islands Pijin

Shuhang Tang^{1, 2, *} 

¹School of Humanities and Law, Wuyi University, Jiangmen, China

²Faculty of Education and Humanities, Solomon Islands National University, Honiara, Solomon Islands

Abstract

Solomon Islands is not an English-speaking country but a Pijin-speaking one. The Pijin spoken in this country belongs to Melanesia Pijin circle within which there are the other Pijins spoken in Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu. By means of literature reading and qualitative study, Solomon Islands Pijin (SIP) turns out to be from the colonial historical culture, cross-linguistic contact environment, necessary demand for temporary communication and cognitive economy principle. Based on British English, SIP demonstrates a common effort of a smooth communicative demand and diverse dialects. Generally, lexical choice and syntactic structure conform to the basic rules of British English to be more concise, fragmented and straightforward, which is easy to memorize, understand and use. Specifically, the lexicon is primarily made certain transformation on the basis of the phonetics, morphology, and semantics of English lexicon, together with suffixation and special function words. The syntax is mostly based on the local dialects in the aspects of the word order, double subject, specific degree modifier, infinitive structure, “moa” and “nomoa”, and replacement of the original modal verbs. With the development of SIP, the different written forms are employed to convey the message more concisely and effectively. SIP is a lingua franca rooted in local social and historical culture that Solomon Islanders live by being a symbol of language identity for Solomon Islands.

Keywords

Solomon Islands Pijin, Lexical Variant, Sentence Pattern, Function

1. Introduction

Solomon Islands belongs to South Pacific islands countries, being one of the countries along the southern extending zone on the 21st century Maritime Silk Route of China. It is still a strategic landing point during World War II, bearing an important strategic position. Although Solomon Islands is not a big country like an uncultivated land, there is a vast range of areas to dig out. So, in order to know this country, it would be better to know its languages first.

The official language spoken in Solomon Islands is English.

Every citizen who receives an education under the language policy of this country has to master this kind of language. But the local people usually speak Pijin as their daily language, which is taken as their lingua franca. According to the updated data offered by Solomon Islands' Statistic Office, there is an average of 68.4% of the population 5 years and over speaking Pijin. The more developing areas are, the larger proportion it is. For instance, in Honiara, there is about 81% of population speaking Pijin for daily communication; in Western Province,

*Corresponding author: TSHJulie@163.com (Shuhang Tang)

Received: 7 October 2025; **Accepted:** 19 October 2025; **Published:** 7 November 2025



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2025. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

there is about 77.6% of population doing this way as well. In terms of developmental stage, local people take Pijin as their first language. The population speaking this kind of language increases from 1527 in 1976 to 101588 in 2019, which is several hundred multiple increases. Besides, Solomon Islands has many local dialects which are distributed in each province.

Evidently, it can be seen that the studies on Solomon Islands Pijin (SIP) become incredibly important [1]. SIP belongs to Melanesia Pijin circle, namely, the Pijin circle of Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. In reality, the Pijin spoken in Papua New Guinea is also called Tok Pisin, which is what many of the relevant scholars have studied before [2-4]. But currently, there are rather fewer studies on SIP, which primarily focus on its historical and cultural origin to further analyze its evolution and development from language contact [5, 6]. Christine Jourdan's documents indicate that SIP has risen from a stigmatized status, where no one dared identify with the language, to status of legitimacy, as SIP has become embraced as a lingua franca by the current urbanities and is now the cornerstone of their cultural and social life [7]. Nonetheless, according to the current survey of the viewpoints on SIP in the pre-step analysis of this study, there are still many Solomon Islanders that take it as a broken English without committing itself as an independent language. Therefore, it is necessary to identify SIP to be a lingua franca in Solomon Islands by figuring out its unique lexical and syntactic rules.

2. Formation Mechanism of Solomon Islands Pijin

SIP is deeply rooted in the colonial history of Solomon Islands long time ago [8-11]. Solomon Islands was firstly found and named by Spain, then colonized by Netherlands, Germany and England successively. Therefore, the Pijin spoken at local areas mixed with and borrowed from various languages of colonial countries, which is also called Creolization. Creolization refers to a forming process of new language blending with other languages. In fact, it firstly refers to the process blending with European languages and its colonial languages. The Pijin was thus formed in this process to be based on plantations [12-15]. In about 1880s, the colonists forced the indigenous people in Solomon Islands to plant the crops such as sugarcane and coconut in Queensland, Samoa, New Caledonia, and Fiji [16, 17]. Those indigenous people could not speak English at that time. In order to communicate, they started by a very short and fragmented language. In 1970s, the indigenous people came back to create the Pijin based on plantations, and to develop it to be Solomon Islands Pijin (SIP). In 1978 when Solomon Islands became independent, Pijin obtained certain social status.

Specifically, the formation mechanism of SIP primarily demonstrates in the following four aspects. First, SIP origi-

nates from a specific colonial historical culture background. It is mostly affected by English, especially British English. It indicates that English obviously affects Pijin [6]. The loanwords and cultural borrowings are the very important features for this language [18, 19], in particular the lexicon [20, 21]. By consulting the Pijin dictionaries [22], 95% of defined vocabulary borrow their forms from English and 80% of vocabulary borrow from that directly. Second, SIP generates from a cross-linguistic contact environment. From the perspective of the pure linguistics, SIP saw quite a long period of development. The various dialects in different areas combined with British English evidently affect SIP as well. Under a strong impact of British English, the dialects in different areas are accommodated and assimilated, which gradually develops to be a new social communicative language to convey daily information. It consists of its unique vocabulary and grammatical rules, being a commonly-used communicative language or independent language. Third, a necessary demand for temporary communication is the original force where SIP comes from. Against the colonial background at that time, the Solomon Islanders did not have a common language at the same time had to communicate by means of English. Unfortunately, they did not know how to speak English at all then. They tried to employ a very short and fragmented English to communicate, combined with their local words and their pronunciations. At this moment, SIP came out. In general, English contributes to the form and literal meaning whereas dialects contribute to the grammar and extended meaning [7]. Fourth, based on the cognitive economy principle, SIP manifests the phonetic simplicity, semantic generalization, and expressive directness. In terms of the indigenous people who were mostly not well educated, the most effective method to communicate by English is to ensure a smooth communication based on the least load cognition. Therefore, the pronunciation for a new language is supposed to be close to the local dialects as much as possible, the meaning of hypernym replaces that of hyponym, and a clearer and more straightforward expression is employed to convey information, etc.

3. Lexical Evolution and Variant of Solomon Islands Pijin

The study selects a SIP handbook named *Tok Pijin* [23] as a basic research object. This handbook, the visible English-to-Pijin comparisons, assists the Pijin learners to master how to use this language more effectively in daily life. It presents Pijin as almost urban Pijin, also called Honiara Pijin. It is a little bit different from the Pijins spoken in the communities and villages. The Pijins are greatly affected by the local dialects in pronunciation and script. However, the population in Solomon Islands centrally resides in the capital city Honiara where most of population speaks urban Pijin. Thus, this type of Pijin is chosen as the research object.

The lexicon, a basic linguistic unit, is a primary construc-

tion for Pijin. Its form and meaning have changed in the evolutionary process, generating all kinds of variants. Based on the above formation mechanism, each pair of word between Pijin and English would be carefully compared due to their correspondent meanings. The alternative lexicon of SIP in *Tok Pijin* can be specifically and systematically analyzed to be in the highest frequency. Finally, the lexicon variants can be identified and sorted out in the aspects of phonetics, morphology, semantics, suffix and special function word.

3.1. Phonetic Variant

This kind of variant is different from morphological variant. The phonetic variant refers to the changeable form of the pronunciation rather than of the form that evolves from English. It appears a big difference from English in morphology. In most cases, the two pairs of words are very similar to each other in pronunciation except for certain subtle changes. Unless they are in written form, it is hard to tell whether there apparently is any difference between them in daily life.

The first one is that the vowel *a* is changed to be *e* but remains its pronunciation, such as “bake” and “bekem”, “take” and “tekem”. The difference lies in “m” that is added at the end of the words. They evolve from “bake it” and “take it”. Due to their similar pronunciations, the phrases evolve into the words *bekem* and *tekem*, which is taken as a liaison. In addition, “feel” and “filim” also do the same way. “feel it” does the sound-linking to be “filim” at the same time “ee” is changed to be “i” with the same pronunciation. This is exactly what the second one is.

The above two types of variants actually refer to the phonetic symbols to rewrite the letters. The vowel *a* is written to be /ei/ in phonetic symbol, thereby it is simplified to be “e” in Pijin; the diphthong *ee* is to be /i:/, thereby simplified to be “i”. It is worthy to note that the final vowels as “e” and “i” are not totally written in accordance with phonetic symbols but omitted by /i/ and /:/ . Based on the last chapter, Pijin is for communication in a concise and smooth way. Therefore, in the evolutionary process, it omits the letters usually pronounced with less aspiration (with a less forceful puff of air) than in English as possible to produce an intermediate sense of pronunciation. For example, “easy” is changed to be “isi” in which “ea” is written to be /i:/ in phonetic symbol. So, it is directly simplified to be “i”. Another example is that “y”. It is written to be /i/ in phonetic symbol. So, the phonetic symbols replace the original letters in written form while the consonant *s* remains to be a liaison with the vowel *i*. Perhaps one of the most representatives is that “doctor” is changed to be “dokta” and “who” is changed to be “hu”. Due to their British phonetic symbols being /'dɒktə/ and /hu:/ respectively, they almost spell out based on their phonetic symbols straightly.

3.2. Morphological Variant

The morphological variant refers to a pair of words that are

very similar in form but different in pronunciation. In fact, it can be easily confused with phonetic variant. In general, the words similar to each other in morphology basically remain the original pronunciations, so do those in phonetics. In comparison, the morphological variants are more distinguishable in pronunciation, and keep the key letters. For example, “old man” is changed to be “olo man” in which “d” is changed to be “o”. Sometimes “d” is straightly dropped. Therefore, there is a distinction in pronunciation except for morphology. Moreover, “stand up” is changed to be a single word *stanup*. It omits “d” to make a liaison between the consonant *n* and vowel *u*, but the two words are still extremely similar to each other in morphology.

It can be seen that this kind of phonetic distinction primarily manifests the pronunciation in the middle of the word, which is more evident than other situations. Meanwhile, the words remain consistent in morphology but slight changes. As mentioned above, the pronunciation of “d” is not that evident. Thus, it indicates a common letter transformation in Pijin to change or omit based on the pronunciation of the original word. In addition, many consonant combinations are difficult for Melanesian to pronounce. They would insert extra vowels into the tone clusters [19]. Besides, both “ch” and “th” changed to be “s” is another transformation, such as “March” to be “Mas” and “month” to be “mans”. This is because the pronunciations of “ch” and “th” are similar to “s”, which is in favor of local people to spell out. In this case, the vowel *o* has its correspondent letter *a* based on its pronunciation /ʌ/. Conforming to the cognitive economy principle, “o” is directly changed to be “a” to benefit memorize and use. It is worthing that “th” can also be changed to be “t”, such as “brother” to be “brata” and “with” to be “wetim”. What’s more, “sh” can also be changed to be “s” like “finish” to be “finis” or “finisim” that is added with “im” afterwards.

The phonetic distinction caused by this kind of morphological transformation is mostly based on the lack of similar cacuminal and retroflex sound in local dialects. The original “ch” “th” “sh” altered to be “s” or “t” is favorable for pronouncing and understanding. “th” can still be altered to be “d” under other conditions.

3.3. Semantic Variant

The semantic variant refers to a pair of words that are similar in meaning but different in pronunciation and form. This kind of Pijin lexicon is almost entirely apart from the original lexical pronunciation, form and constitution, but relate to each other in the basic meaning. After sorting the language evidence out, the semantic distinction is not only about one-to-one, but more about many-to-one. It implies that two or over two English words correspond to one Pijin word in meaning, which further involves the different thinking patterns behind these two languages. For example, “really” and “extremely” correspond to “barava”, representing certain highest degree. Similarly, there are also many-to-one words

for phonetic variants, such as “talk” and “speak” corresponding to “tok”; “feel” and “experience” corresponding to “filim”; “what” and “which” corresponding to “wat”; “hidden” and “secret” corresponding to “haid”; “paddle” and “row” corresponding to “padolom”; “rugged” and “rough” corresponding to “raf”; “conference” and “meeting” corresponding to “miting”. There are even “exit”, “stay”, “halt” and “remain” simultaneously corresponding to “stap” for semantic variants.

In addition, there is another type of semantic variant, merely, semantic clarity, simplicity and directness. Let us take “day after tomorrow” and “day before yesterday” for examples, they correspond to “neks tumoro” and “las iestede” respectively. What is more, “mine” can correspond to “blong/bilong mi”, “yours” to “blong/bilong iu”, and “whose” to “blong/bilong hu”.

It is also noted that there are two types of distinctive semantic features existed in Pijin. The first one is semantic generalization, such as “make clear about” or “clarify” usually presents to be “talem gut”. It generalizes such a definite and concrete meaning to be just “good”. Likewise, “shake off an illness” presents “finisim siki/sick”, generalizing “shake off” to be “finisim”. The second one is the shift of part of speech, such as “harsh talk” altered as “tok koros” and “talk loudly” altered as “bikmaos”, that is, adjective-noun structure altered to be verb-adverb structure and verb-adverb structure to be a single noun respectively. Especially “bikmaos”, it originates from such a slang in English as “bigmouth”, which means “talk too much”.

3.4. Suffixation

There is another distinctive feature in lexical choice, which is exactly suffixation. These suffixes reflect the special historical background of Solomon Islands in depth, which shows the dominant identity of SIP.

Perhaps one of the most typical instances is “fala”, also written as “fela”. Affected by colonial history, this suffix originates from “fellow”. This is because the indigenous people were often called “One fellow came here” by the colonizers when doing the labor. During this period, the colonizers were at an exclusive status without regarding the indigenous people as equal as them. Once they needed someone to do the labor, they would say this way. “one fellow” in this context has gradually been evolving into “wanfala” and “mifala”, being a quantifier suffix. In English, the cardinal numbers such as one, two, three can be used to mark numbers. While in Pijin, “wanfala”, “tufala”, “trifala” ... that are added with such a quantifier suffix as fala to mark numbers. When added after certain pronouns like “mi” and “iu”, they would become “mifala” and “iufala” to present “we” and plural “you”. In addition, this suffix can still be used to describe the demonstrative pronouns, such as “this” to be “desfala” and “another” to be “narafala”. It also receives attention that the monosyllabic adjectives can be described in this way, such as “good” to be “gudfala”, “big” to be “bikfala”, and “old” to be

“olfala”.

Another typical suffix is “m”, “im” and “em”, indicating a verb to be a transitive verb. The cases are as follows: “tok” originates from “talk” and “speak”, but “tokim” means “talk or speak to somebody”; “fait” originates from “fight”, but “faitim” means to be followed by the objects that fight with [18]. “wande” is added with “m” to express a desire for someone else to perform the action of the verb like “wandem dokta”; “laek” is added with “em” to precede “someone else” to express the similar meaning like “laekem Jon” [24].

3.5. Special Function Words

There are some special function words in Pijin that reveal unique features in lexical choice. The first one is pronoun. The typical pronoun is “hem”, stemming from “him” in English. It refers to all the third-person singular, including “he”, “she”, “him”, “her”, and “it”. The cases like “himself”, “herself”, “itself” present “hem seleva” in Pijin; others like “his”, “her”, “its” present “blong/bilong hem”. If we want to express the third-person plural like “they” and “them”, then “olketa” would be the choice. Let us take “themselves” and “their” as examples. They express “olketa seleva” and “blong/bilong olketa” respectively in Pijin. “olketa” is also written as “oketa”. Nowadays, the young group in Honiara tends to employ “ota” orally to simplify its pronunciation. It stems from “all together” in English. For example, “brothers and sisters”. They are added with “s” to present the plural “brother” and “sister”. However, in Pijin, it should be “olketa barata an sista” by adding olketa to present plurality.

Likewise, the third-person singular is not marked for the verb. Nevertheless, there is such a future tense auxiliary word as bae or baebae, such as “I’ll see you tonight” to be “Bae mi lukim iu tunaet”, and “Where will you go?” to be “Bae iu go wea?”. When “bin” is added immediately after the predicate marker or before the verb, the sentence refers to past time like “Fred hem i bin wokabaot”. Moreover, there is a marker for complete action that equals to the perfect tense form for the verb, namely, “finis”, usually following the verb.

Besides, there is topical emphasis word nao that is obligatory when the special question words are moved to the beginning of the sentence, such as “Wea nao axe?” emphasizing the axe that the speaker talks about and “Waswe nao car ia blue?” emphasizing the car that the speaker talks about. The latter example further involves such a demonstrative determiner or question particle as ia or yia [7, 25]. As a demonstrative determiner, it demonstrates a pause of tone based on the proximity principle [26]; while as a question particle, it is put to the end of a sentence like “Hu nao datwan lo dea ia?”.

4. Sentence Constitution and Function of Solomon Islands Pijin

Many Solomon Islanders regard Pijin spoken in Solomon Islands as a kind of causal oral expression. As stated above,

Pijin delivers message directly and simply. But still, it has its own grammatical rules.

Firstly, SPP and SVO are the basic word orders that generate variants [18]. For example, “John is walking up the mountain”. It expresses “John hem wakabaot go antap long maonten” in Pijin, dividing the original single verb into two successive verbs. Another example is “He is under the table”. It expresses “Hem lo udanit tebol”, dividing the original preposition into two prepositions. Both of them are typical of SPP word order. Definitely, there exists such a word order variant as SVPP. For example, “Paul is in his car”. It expresses “Paul hem stap insait long ka bilong hem”, inserting “stap” with verbal function between “hem” and “insait”.

In addition, “Where are you going?” expresses “Iu go lo(ng) wea?” in Pijin; “How old are you?” is transformed to be “Iu hao ol?” or “Iu how old yia?”. Regardless of their lexical variants, it is evident that the original OSV is transformed to be SVO. When it comes to express the idea that someone or something (an actor) performs an action or that someone or something (an experiencer) experiences a state, the normal word order for these sentences is SV, which is commonly called intransitive sentences. Notice the following sentences: “Hem i ranawe” and “Susana i save” [25].

Secondly, the double subjects are prevalent. Different from English, it is quite common in Pijin to repeat a subject for emphasis, that is, to place it outside the sentence and use a pronoun in its place within the sentence. It is sometimes called double subject or topicalized subject. Notice the additional pronouns *hem* and *olketa* in the sentences like “John hem i save” and “Wanem blong olketa pikinini blong iu?” respectively.

Thirdly, specific degree modifiers go backward. One of the most representatives is “very”, such as “very drunk”, “very hungry”, and “very pleased” to express “drunk no gud”, “hanggre tumas”, and “hapi tumas” in Pijin. No matter “no gud” or “tumas” to replace “very”, both follow the verbs or adjectives.

Fourthly, infinitive structure is omitted or replaced. In Pijin, the infinitive structure as “to do” does not exist. For example, “have been to Aruligo” is directly expressed as “kasem Aruligo”, especially followed by a proper noun. In the basic sentence patterns, the infinitive structure is replaced by “fo”, such as “to meet” substituted with “fo mitim”, “to see” substituted with “fo lukim”, “to come” substituted with “fo kam”, “to enter” substituted with “fo go insaet”. If there is a need to connect an indirect object, such an all-purpose preposition as “lo(ng)” is frequently in place of the infinitive structure. The cases are that “walking to the shop” is substituted with “wakabaot go lo stoa”, “the old road to Binu” is substituted with “ol/olfala rot go lo Binu”, and “follow Miss Ami to school” is substituted with “folom Mis Ami go lo skul”. Definitely, the indirect objects can be put back or ahead. Thus, “lo(ng)” is used entirely depending on the indirect objects regardless of their positions. Besides, “lo(ng)” stems from “along” in English, which means “to”, “in”, “on”, “for”, “at”,

“with”, “by”, “along”, “through” and “before” [24, 27, 28], so as to denote direction, location and function [7].

Fifthly, “moa” and “nomoa” are widely used at the end of a sentence. “moa” equals to “again” and “later”, such as “see you again” transformed to be “lukim iu moa” and “see you later” transformed to be “lukim iu moa”. There is a need to highlight the usage of “nomoa”. It means opposite to “moa”, namely, no. It is put at the end of a sentence very often in Pijin. In addition, it is still employed to underline the negation like “I’m doing nothing” transformed to be “mi stap nating nomoa”. “nothing” in the original sentence has already been replaced by “nating”, but “nomoa” is still added at the end of the sentence to underline the negation. While “That’s it” and “I am going this way” even do not consist of any negatives, they are transformed to be “Hem nomoa” and “Mi go olsem nomoa” respectively. They make such potential meanings as “no more than” and “definite choice” explicit for the listeners. It is worthwhile that the general questions in English are added with “o nomoa” in Pijin to relieve the tone and provide a negative option. The cases are that “Do you live nearby?” is transformed to be “Iu stap kolsap o nomoa?” and “Do both of you have the same parents?” is transformed to be “Iutufala bon lose mami an dadi o nomoa?”.

Sixthly, modal verbs are replaced by some notional verbs, such as “save”, “kanduit”, “fitim fo”, “inaf (naf) fo”, and “mas”. In Pijin, “save” covers a wide range of meanings. When followed by a verb, it can express physical ability, competence or habit and thus can be translated as either “can”, “know how to”, or “be accustomed to”, such as “Olketa i save fiksime motoka”. In comparison, “fitim fo” and “inaf (naf) fo” do not share the same wide range of meanings as “save”. “fitim fo” conveys the idea of competence, either physical, mental or emotional. “inaf (naf) fo” indicates skill at performing an action. The cases are “Man ia fitim fo waka long ofis” and “Gele ia inaf fo lanem langwis” respectively. On the contrary, “kanduit” is opposite to “save” that also covers a wide range of meanings. It can mean physical inability, lack of knowledge or lack of permission or authority like “Olketa i kanduit fiksime motoka”. In addition, “mas” indicates that the actor is obliged to carry out the action of the verb, equaling to such a modal verb as *must* in English. [25].

5. Conclusion

In a word, SIP is not a broken English but an independent language with distinctive dialect features. Though based on British English, this kind of language still plays a role as a lingua franca in daily communication for Solomon Islanders. SIP holds its own unique lexical and syntactic rules in the Melanesia Pijin circle. According to the language policy carried out by Solomon Islands, not everyone can speak English unless he or she receives an education. Thereby, a Solomon Islander might not know how to speak English but he or she does know how to speak SIP. There is a need to clarify its status and identity as a language. Definitely, a whole range

of the basic rules of SIP cannot be covered only by this paper but listed some typical and frequently-used ones. This paper expects to throw out a minnow to catch a whale by proposing the brand-new and intriguing topic for the further studies.

Supplementary Material

The supplementary material can be accessed at <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20251306.11>

Abbreviations

SIP Solomon Islands Pijin

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the collaborative supervisors, Professor David Gegeo, Ms. Leonora Houma, and other relevant teachers of Faculty of Education and Humanities at Solomon Islands National University for their guidance in the aspects of lexical origin, morphological standardization and linguistic term!

Author Contributions

Shuhang Tang is the sole author. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work is supported by a grant from the Regional Studies Special Project of Wuyi University in 2025 (Grant No. QYGB25029).

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the outcome of this research work has been reported in this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- [1] Baptista, M. A Review of Creolization and Pidginization in Contexts of Postcolonial Diversity: Language, Culture, Identity. *Language*. 2021, 97(1), 200-204.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0005>
- [2] Smith, G P. Growing up with Tok Pisin: Contact, Creolization, and Change in Papua New Guinea's National Language. London: Battlebridge. 2002.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x0445006x>
- [3] Winford, D. An Introduction to contact Linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell. 2003.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1395.2008.00007.x>
- [4] Smith, G P., Siegel, J. Tok Pisin. In S M. Michaelis, P. Maurer, M. Haspelmath, & M. Huber (Eds.), *The Survey of Pidgin and Creole Languages*. 2013, pp. 214-222.
- [5] Aikhenvald, A Y. Trade, Mines and Language: The Chinese in Papua New Guinea. Chapter 8 in *The Chinese in Papua New Guinea*. Australia: ANU Press. 2024.
- [6] Dutton, T. Language Contact and Change in Melanesia. In P. Bellwood, J J. Fox, & D. Tryon (eds.), *The Austronesians*, Canberra: ANU Press. 2025.
<https://doi.org/10.22459/a.09.2006.11>
- [7] Jourdan, C., keesing, R. From Fisin to Pijin: Creolization in the Process in the Solomon Islands. *Language in Society*. 1997, 26(3), 401-420.
- [8] Sankoff, G., Laberge, S. On the Acquisition of Native Speakers by a Language. *Kivung*. 1973, 6(1), 32-47.
<https://doi.org/10.9783/9781512809589-014>
- [9] Sankoff, G., Brown, P. The Origins of Syntax in Discourse: A Case of Tok Pidgin Relatives. *Language*. 1976, 52(6), 31-66.
- [10] Romaine, S. English and Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea. *World Englishes*. 1989, 8(1), 5-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.1989.tb00431.x>
- [11] Smith, G P. Creolized Tok Pisin: Uniformity and Variation. In R J. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the Pacific*. 1990, pp. 197-209.
- [12] Bennett J A. Solomon Islands Pidgin. In S A. Wurm (Ed.), *New Guinea and the Neighboring Areas: A Sociolinguistic Laboratory*. The Hague: Mouton. 1979, pp. 64-72.
- [13] Siegel, J. Plantation Pidgin Fijian. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 1986, 21, 1-72.
- [14] Watson-Gegeo, K A., Gegeo, D W., Fito'o, B. Critical Community Language Policies in Education: Solomon Islands Case. Chapter 20 in *The Oxford Handbook of Language Policy and Planning*, Oxford: Oxford University. 2018.
- [15] Watson-Gegeo, K A. English in the Solomon Islands. *World Englishes*. 1987, 6(1), 21-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.1987.tb00174.x>
- [16] Keesing, R. Melanesian Pidgin and Oceanic Syntax: Further Evidence from Solomons Languages. In Harlow R (Ed.), *Austronesian Linguist*, Auckland: Te Reo. 1991.
- [17] Siegel, J. Language Contact in a Plantation Environment: A Sociolinguistic History of Fiji. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 1987.
- [18] Todd, L., Mmühlhäusler, P. Idiomatic Expressions in Cameroon Pidgin English and Tok Pisin. 1978.
<https://doi.org/10.15144/pl-a54.1>
- [19] Wurm S A. Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1977.

- [20] Mead, M. Growing up in New Guinea: A comparative Study of Primitive Education. *Nature*. 1932, 130(78), 304-306. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1785224>
- [21] Mühlhäusler, P. Samoan Plantation Pidgin English and the Origins of New Guinea Pidgin: An Introduction. *Journal of Pacific History*. 1976, 11(2), 122-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223347608572295>
- [22] Simons L L., young, H. Pijin blong Yumi: A Guide to Solomon Islands Pijin. Honiara: Solomon Islands Christian Association. 1978.
- [23] RAMSI Public Affairs Unit. Tok Pijin: A Quick Guide to Speaking Pijin. Australia: Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands. 2011.
- [24] Robert A H J. Pijin Languages. *Scientific American*. 1959, 200(2), 124-135.
- [25] Huebner T., Horoi S R. Solomon Islands Pijin Grammar Handbook. Vermont: The Experiment in International Living Brattleboro. 1979.
- [26] Lynch, J. Pidgins, Creoles and Koinés. In *Pacific Languages: An Introduction*. Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press. 1988.
- [27] Romaine, S. Relative Clauses in Child Language, Pidgins and Creoles. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*. 1984, 4(2), 257-281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268608408599327>
- [28] Laycock, D C. *Materials in New Guinea Pidgin (Coastal and Lowlands)*. Canberra: Australian National University. 1970. <https://doi.org/10.15144/pl-d5>

Biography



Shuhang Tang is a lecturer at Wuyi University, School of Humanities and Law. She completed her PhD in Linguistics from Guangdong University of Foreign Studies in 2023, and her Master of Foreign Language and Literature from Guangxi University in 2018. Currently, Dr. Tang has published four dictionaries in one of the highest publishers in China, The Commercial Press.

Research Field

Shuhang Tang: foreign linguistics, Pacific islands countries studies.