



Pidgins and Creoles: Analysis of the Etymology, Relevant Theories and the Influence of Media

Alp Bugra Oder

Bursa Uludag University, Türkiye

Abstract

Being a common phenomenon, bilingualism occurs when a person acquires two languages. Bilingualism can take place for commercial, political, and educational purposes. Educational purposes aside, the unwavering commercial and political ambitions of bigger civilizations coerced them to colonize smaller civilizations. For this reason, they imposed their languages on the colonized local people. Locals responded to the demands of colonizers by forming their languages called pidgin. As this common language evolved and became the native language of the contiguous generation, the language improved following its linguistic features, that is, creolized. Several theories regarding their origin exist in the literature. Thus; the present review aims to examine and explain these theories concerning their historical background and framework and mention the influence of media on pidgins and creoles appealing to antecedent studies in the relevant literature. Based on the systematic review of different studies, the present review concludes that pidgins and creoles are not inaccurate versions of standard languages, but separate languages worthy of studying. Besides, the theories of pidgin and creole origins are all useful guidelines that require holistic analysis because of their interconnectedness. Theories of polygenesis and monogenesis present this integrity complying with Stammbaum (1871) and Wellentheorie (1872). When it comes to the influence of the media, the present review concludes that mediatic tools, such as television, the Internet, and mobile phones, along with literature and music, enable locals to demonstrate their identity, but may sometimes lead to cyberbullying and illegal acts.

Keywords: Creoles; Media; Pidgins

1. Introduction

The number of bilinguals is more than the number of monolinguals in the world (Grosjean, 2010). As a consequence of certain events such as immigration, and colonization, numerous people acquire different languages in addition to their local languages. To be exemplified, the British colonized the Indians, resulting in the Indians being forced to apply the language of the colonizer to formal settings (Dirks, 2006; Kumar, 2006; Scriver & Prakash, 2007). After the discovery of the American continent, the Spanish, British, Dutch, and French colonized native Americans, imposing their languages on the local people (Hatfield, 2003; Sorsby, 1973; Prem, 1973). All of these led to the emergence of different varieties of these so-called ‘high & low’ languages. Certain languages such as French, English, and Latin spread to an extent that they came to be referred to as ‘Lingua Franca’ meaning ‘a language used for communication among people of different mother tongues’ (American Heritage Dictionary, n.d.). Still, the colonized local people, being deprived of the necessary means for education, were not able to achieve a desirable proficiency in the imposed target language and created their languages, hence pidgin. What one can infer from pidgins is that they are sorts of restricted codes that enable speakers of two different languages to grasp the same message. Muysken & Smith (1995) describe pidgins as speech forms without native speakers that are utilized as a common language between speakers of different languages. Nevertheless, should the speaker of a pidgin pass the language onto his children, the language transforms into a creole.

The main distinction between ‘pidgin’ and ‘creole’ is that pidgins have no L1 speakers, while creoles have native speakers (Mufwene, 1997; Muysken & Smith, 1995). Gürkan (2022) defines creoles as ‘the extension of pidgins with more complexity in form’ (p.45). Although creoles are developed forms of pidgins, they are still weak compared to standardized forms of the languages from which they once emerged. Until recently, most linguists referred to creole and pidgin languages as ‘aberrant’ meaning ‘diverging from the standard’ and not worthy of studying (Bloomfield 1933: 471, as cited in Holm, 2000, p.1). With the emerging trends in language and culture studies, they realized that pidgins and creoles are not erroneous forms of other languages, yet new languages needed to be studied.

Wardhaugh (2006: 58) mentions that pidgins and creoles lack certain linguistic features, such as articles, copula, and grammatical inflections (as cited in Özüorçun, 2014, p.1). Studying the morphology of the Hawaiian English creole, Speidel (1987:10) notes that Hawaiian English contains bound morphemes, yet the use of grammatical morphemes differs as either being omitted or altered (as cited in Rodgers, 1996, p.222). A similar example can be drawn from Sranan, the earliest known English creole, using which the Dutch settlers learned to communicate with Surinamese locals:

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| a. <i>Oudy</i> | <i>Howdy.</i> |
| b. <i>Oe fasje joe tem ?</i> | <i>How fashion you stand ?</i> |
| c. <i>My bon.</i> | <i>Me good.</i> |
| d. <i>Joe bon toe ?</i> | <i>You good too ?</i> |
| e. <i>Ay.</i> | <i>Aye.</i> |

(Holm, 2010, p. 255)

The example illustrates the amalgamation of a colonized (substrate) and two standard languages (superstrate). The omission of inflections is observable in both columns, being more in English-based sentences. Gürkan (2022, p.43) presents Nigerian Pidgin with their English translations:

Table 1

Nigerian Pidgin	Translation
I no no	I don't know
Watin?	What?
I dey come	I am coming
How na?	How are you ?
I wan chop	I want to eat
Gi mi	Give it to me
I don't taya	I am tired
Abi ?	Isn't it?
I no gree	I don't agree
Listen well-well	Pay attention
Am	He/She It

The morphosyntactic differences arise between Nigerian Pidgin and their English translations as the table demonstrates. Furthermore, the table indicates that Nigerian pidgin is an underdeveloped, English-lexified language with omission of inflections and reduplication as observed in 'Listen well-well' and 'I no no'.

Given the differences between creolized languages and their lexifiers (standard languages), the present review aims to contribute to the existing literature on pidgins and creoles by scrutinizing pidgins and creoles relevant theories and etymological consideration on the word 'Pidgin' and touching upon the impact of media on pidgins and creoles turning to antecedent studies.

2. Etymology of 'Pidgin' and Relevant Theories

There is no consensus on the etymology of the term 'pidgin' so far as the literature is concerned. Yet, it has long been correlated to when non-native Chinese English speakers coined mutual terms to be able to communicate with the traders (Baker, 1987; Baker & Mühlhausler, 1990; Bolton, 2000; Hancock, 1979; Kleinecke, 1959; Selby et al., 1995; Shapiro, 2010; Suraiya, 2020). Kleinecke (1959) hypothesized that the word pidgin may also have derived from a South American word '-Pidian' meaning people though the evidence is not robust (as cited in Hancock, 1979, p.81) and contradicting its etymological definition according to the etymological dictionary (see Online Etymological Dictionary).

Etymological definitions of the word aside, there have been numerous theories put forth to explain how these pidgins formed in the first place:

- *Baby-Talk Hypothesis*
- *Monogenetic/Relexification Hypothesis*
- *The Nautical Jargon Theory*
- *The Independent Parallel Development Theory*
- *The Universalist Theory*

Ifechelobi et al. (2015, pp.209-210)

2.1. Baby-Talk Hypothesis

Baby-Talk Hypothesis associates the development of pidgins with that of toddlers. According to Steinberg (1993, p.23), Baby Talk contains oversimplified features, which entails the modification of vocabulary and syntax as in ‘pee-pee’ for urine and ‘choo-choo’ for train. These vocabulary words utilize reduplication which involves the repetition of certain sounds. Though pidgins have reduplicated terms as in ‘Wuru wuruJaga jaga, Kia kiaKata kata (Ifechelobi et al., 2015, p.210)’ and possess similarly simplified features with the Baby Talk, Wardraugh & Fuller (2021) and Ifechelobi et al. (2015) claim that it lacks concrete evidence as the history suggests. The strongest refutation comes from Alleyne (1971) who puts forth that remnants in Haitian Creole, Saramaccan, and Saranan indicate the historical evolution of these languages (as cited in Mufwene, 2015).

2.2. Monogenetic/Relexification Hypothesis

The Baby-Talk Hypothesis, having been disregarded by sociolinguists, paved the path for a new hypothesis, the Monogenetic or Relexification Hypothesis, to be coined by Lefebvre & Lumsden (1994), who advocate that the underlying linguistic structure of pidgins resembles those of European languages (as cited in Migge, 2003, p.6). They further argue that relexification, reanalysis, and dialect leveling take more credit than other hypotheses combined and the hypothesis must be the continuation of the theory of SLA. According to Wardraugh (1998), the hypothesis bears truth regarding the colonization of the British and Portuguese in the American continent:

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Portuguese relexified this language; that is, they introduced their vocabulary into its grammatical structure, so that a Portuguese-based Pidgin came into widespread use as a trade language (as cited in Ifechelobi & Ifechelobi, 2015, p.9).

Voorhoeve (1973) discusses the issue of relexification based on three different creoles spoken in Surinam. The results of the comparison demonstrate that Sranan relexified almost completely toward English whereas Saramaccan partly did so. Muysken & Smith (1990) put particular emphasis on function words for the analysis of pidgins and creoles, stating that:

‘they tend to be innovative in creole languages concerning the relevant lexifier languages (p.1).’

In light of the propositions of the students, the Monogenetic/Relexification Hypothesis linking pidgins and creoles to common ‘superstrate’ European language(s) is likely to hold some truth in that analyses of linguistic structures of pidgins and creoles in accordance with historical evidence point out an obtrusive shift to a superstrate lexifier.

2.3. The Nautical Jargon Theory

Though there may be multiple researchers claiming that the nautical vocabulary was the core of pidgins and creoles, its coinage belongs to Reinecke (1938) who analyzed pidgins and creoles in his doctoral dissertation entitled ‘Marginal Languages: a sociological survey of the creole and trade jargons’ (Holm, 2000, p.38). The theory posits that it was the seafarers, voyagers and seamen who contributed to the development of pidgins and creoles. Khan & Akter (2021, p.168) contemplate that the theory deserves credit in that the word ‘capsise’ has been observed in both West Atlantic and Pacific Pidgins. Literature of the Enlightenment Era is also an indicator of the nautical vocabulary along with vernacular words as highlighted in Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (Jones, 2018). Jones (2018)

further mentions that sailors lacked sociolinguistical competence owing to their alienation from society. According to Ifechelobi & Ifechelobi (2015), having analyzed the theories concerning the origin of pidgins, Elugbe & Omamor (1996) are in favor of the monogenetic/relexification hypothesis being subtly similar to the nautical jargon hypothesis as both surmise one common Indo-European origin.

The contemplations regarding the theory have been attested, yet the literature argues that it cannot be the only explanation on account of the similarities that pidgins with different lexifiers hold (Isa et al., 2015; Khan & Akter, 2021;). If this had been the case, almost all of the actively spoken languages would have formed pidgins, merging with the minority languages since it was not only the English, Spanish, and French who had voyaged the world, but Arabs, Asians, and many ancient civilizations, as well.

2.4. Independent Parallel Development Theory

The first mention of the theory can be traced back to Lucien Adam who aimed to elucidate whether substratum languages played a role in the development of creoles. His book, *Les idiomes négro-aryen et maléo-aryen*, (1882) indicates that substratum languages highly influenced the way creoles formed (Meijer & Muysken, 1977, p.25). Eight decades later, Robert Hall officially put forth the theory of independent parallel development theory in 1966 and considered that pidgins and creoles developed independently at some point and that the similarities they bore with Indo-European languages are relatable to their common origination. According to Hall Jr (1952, 1966a), the major impact was the influence of a substratum language, which he found with abrupt structural change and comparative method. Although the credibility circumventing the influences of substratum languages, especially on Atlantic and Pacific pidgins and creoles, is undeniable, it is only constricted to Atlantic and Pacific, overlooking other pidgins and creoles, such as Southern and Eastern African Swahili pidgin and Ethiopian-Arabic pidgin (Isa et al.,2015, p.19;). Two main limitations also arise regarding the IPD:

- 1- There are no clear cases of genuinely independent development
- 2- African slaves came from rather diverse places

(Al Salman, 2013; Sebba, 1997; Todd, 2003)

2.5. Universalist Theory

The most recent theory concerning the formation of the pidgins and creoles is concerned with their development just like the standard (superstrate) languages. The Universalist Theory is based on the Universal Grammar proposed by Chomsky in 1965 and postulates that language develops innately as a consequence of biomechanisms of the human brain. Bickerton, the propounder of the Universal Theory states that a child born to a pidgin-speaking family has no choice but to acquire it as his L1 (Vicente, 2007, p.24). Thus; Bickerton proposes Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH). The theory acknowledges that creoles evolved from pidgins, yet it recognizes their development as an incremental process similar to what happens when children acquire the language. Since a pidgin contains such features as simplified syntax, polysemic vocabulary from a limited repertoire, reduplication, and simplified phonology, it closely resembles to holophrastic use of words in two- and three-word utterances stage as Steinberg (1993, p.7) mentioned. When pidgins develop and start to be spoken as native

languages by subsequent generations, they transform into creoles along with crude vocabulary and syntactic features. Isa et al. (2015) classify the development stages into four stages:

Table 2

<i>Social situation</i>	<i>Linguistic correlation</i>
<i>1- Marginal Contact</i>	<i>Restricted Pidgin</i>
<i>2- Nativization</i>	<i>Extended Pidgin</i>
<i>3- Mother tongue development</i>	<i>Creole</i>
<i>4- Movement towards standard language (not necessarily input language)</i>	<i>Decreolization</i>

(p.9)

The LBH can be a useful framework to understand how creoles develop from pidgins to standard languages. It appeals to cognitive aspects of pidgins and creoles in that it links the emergence of creoles with the first language acquisition as well as the evolution of language in the human species (Romaine, 2000, as cited in Vicente, 2007, p.17).

2.6. Monogenesis/Polygenesis Theories: Broadening The Scope

Five theories as mentioned above, along with others (see. Vicente, 2007, pp. 13-16), are interconnected, which is understandable from their approaches to the issue of pidgin and creole formation. Nonetheless, there are two significant theories, which comprehensively explain how the pidgins form. Standing alone as two distinctive theories, both polygenesis, and monogenesis can be utilized to elucidate other theories. Harris (1994) explained two theories concisely:

'Monogenesis: The monogenetic theory of pidgin origin states that all pidgins are derived from an early Portuguese-based pidgin carried around the world by trading ships'

'Polygenesis: The polygenetic theory, on the other hand, says that pidgins arise out of communicative necessity as, when and where they are needed.'

summarized from (p.28)

She further mentions that the polygenetic theory makes intuitively more sense from a sociolinguistic point of view.

Vicente (2007) commentates on the monogenism and polygenism of pidgins and creoles:

'Monogenetic hypothesis emerged after some creole comparative studies when plenty of similarities were noticed among them, more significant than the similarities between each one and its superstrate'

'Polygenetic hypothesis puts the similarities that many creoles share down to parallel development of proto-languages of different origins, considering the superstrates of the same language family responsible for such similarities'

summarized from (p.16)

Similar to Harris, Vicente (2007) states that the monogenetic theory is not enough to explain Indo-European-based (English/French/Spanish) creoles. Therefore; it is of special importance to turn to polygenetic theory, which is based on the Stammbaum theory of Schleicher (1871) and Wellentheorie of Schuchardt and Schmidt (1872). Stammbaum's theory proposes a tree

model for the interrelationship of the Indo-European languages, while Wellentheorie favours a common language (Proto-Indo-European) from which Indo-European languages derive and alter depending on a region, dialect, and context (Holm, 2000; Vicente, 2007). Polygenetic theory, therefore, provides more solid foundations for understanding the origin of pidgins than monogenetic theory which correlates the origin of all pidgins to a single resource, Portuguese-based pidgin.

3. Pidgins and Creoles and Media

All the languages emerge out of a need for communication. Whether written or spoken, the world has witnessed different sorts of communication throughout history. With the formation of languages and the invention of writing, kings, and lords started to dispatch their heralds to other civilizations for a variety of purposes, such as declaring war or ceasefire, compromising, and trading. As time progressed, literacy increased and more books began to be written, the telephone and radio were intended, all of which greatly contributed to the dissemination of the knowledge. The past two decades underwent a series of changes in terms of the ways of communication. Nassa (2011) believes that the wireless communication is one of the means that brought novelty to the communication. Moreover, various social media platforms, such as WhatsApp, Facebook, Twitter (now X), Instagram, altered the way that people communicate, hence use the language. One of these changes, as Salihoğlu & Gürkan (2022, p.114) mentioned in *Sociolinguistics & Language Teaching*, is the emergence of emoticons and emojis as ways to convey messages. They noted that such a language change can take place as a result of religious, political, technological and historical events (p.115). Most recently, a comparatively new platform called 'Tiktok' proved to be influential on language change with its famous users using different styles and registers for their trademark (Lisdawati, 2021).

With that being said, since pidgins and creoles are acknowledged as languages, they must be subjected to change on account of social media, as well. However, an important distinction between a pidgin and a creole, mother tongue development (Isa et al., 2015), interferes as the latter appeals to a larger population and has more entries than the former does (Webb, 2013, p.304). Still, both play an important role in building social networks, cultural awareness in digital media (p.246). Migge (2020) correlates this to 'mediated language practices' and propounds that the research body relevant to the impact of media on pidgins and creoles is multidimensional and progressive with literature, broadcast media, music and electronic media and computer-mediated communication (CMC).

Shields-Brodsber (1992) opines that talk shows in Jamaica not only inform locals of political issues of Jamaica, but also present them with different styles and conversational strategies for further discussion about the national and international issues. In similar vein, the local news in Guadeloupe provide locals with a rich variety of input in Haitian-French creole (Managan, 2011). Regarding Jamaican Creole and Nigerian Pidgin, Deuber & Hinrichs (2007) point to the development of orthography of these contact languages by means of computer-mediated communication. Dupre (2012) analyzes the text messages of 18-to 25-year olds and adduces how the Internet and mobile phones and restricted codes of short messages determine the current communicative trends.

Analyzing the cases of violent acts in Cameroon through different methodologies, Tumfah (2022) concludes that the violent acts and atrocities perpetrated by both separatists and government military on the Anglophone population are rapidly escalating. And, the propaganda carried out within the social media contributes to it (p.25). Often classified as a creole-like language, Singlish (Singaporean English) presents another example. Pugsley (2007) states that

the fear of authorities towards Singlish used in national sitcoms triggers the movement of so called 'Speak Good English' and damages the identity of Singapore. Rather than writing in the language that they are literate (English), most of the young speakers of Tok Pisin, Jamaican Creole and Bislama residing in urban areas tend to text in their respective creoles and switch codes between the lexifier (English) and creolized language (Handman, 2013; Jourdan, 2021, Moll, 2015; Vandeputte, 2018). As for Jamaican creole, Moll (2015) describes that users of the creole find its use in texting more legitimate and representative of their identity.

4. Conclusion

The present review concludes that pidgins and creoles are not erroneous languages as previously described, yet separate languages that once derived (or not) from such standard languages as, English, French and Spanish. The etymology of the word 'pidgin' is most likely to be adopted from the Chinese word 'Pijin' meaning 'business' which was widely used by Chinese traders to communicate with foreigners, yet there are different contemplations regarding the origin of the word (see Kleinecke, 1959).

The theories pertaining to the origin of pidgins are interconnected to one another and each one of them is useful for gaining an insight into their nature. Nevertheless, some theories, such as Baby Talk and The Nautical Jargon hypotheses overlook the other phenomena that took place in the formation of pidgins. Monogenetic/Relexification hypothesis, along with The Independent Parallel Development and The Universalist hypotheses are more sound. To elucidate the origin of pidgins, it is prerequisite to turn to Monogenesis and Polygenesis theories, which complement what others lack (see p.6). According to Vicente (2007) and Harris (1994), the polygenetic theory makes more sense according with the preceding Stammbaum theory of Schleicher (1871) and Wellentheorie of Schuchardt and Schmidt (1872), both of which propose that dialectical and regional differences were influential in the formation of subsequent languages.

Lastly, the review points out that the impact of media on pidgins and creoles are fairly observable within different contexts, such as literature, music, broadcast media, and electronic media (Migge, 2020, p.2). Talk shows, news, social media platforms and computer mediated communication tools such as Internet and mobile phones enrich pidgins and creoles and provide speakers distinctive styles and registers (see. Deuber & Hinrichs, 2007; Dupré, 2012; Handman, 2013; Jourdan, 2021; Managan, 2011; Migge, 2020; Moll, 2015; Pugsley, 2007; Tumfah, 2022; Vandeputte, 2018). And, these styles and registers reflect the idiosyncrasy of their identity (Jourdan, 2021; Moll, 2015). However, the misuse of such media platforms is woefully common, which brings off cyberbullying and other illegal acts (Tumfah, 2022).

References

- Al-Salman, I. A. K. (2013). Jordanian Pidgin Arabic. *Yarmouk University MA thesis*.
- Baker, P. (1987). Historical developments in Chinese pidgin English and the nature of the relationships between the various Pidgin English of the Pacific region. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 2(2), 163–207. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.2.2.04bak>
- Baker, P., & Mühlhäusler, P. (1990). From business to pidgin. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 1(1), 87-115.
- Bolton, K. (2000). Language and hybridization: Pidgin Tales from the China Coast. *Interventions*, 2(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136980100360788>

- Deuber, D., & Hinrichs, L. (2007). Dynamics of orthographic standardization in Jamaican Creole and Nigerian Pidgin. *World Englishes*, 26(1), 22-47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971x.2007.00486.x>
- Dirks, N. B. (2006). *The scandal of empire: India and the creation of imperial Britain*. Harvard University Press.
- Dupré, F. (2013). TXT msg'ing among French reunion 18-to 25-year-olds. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 28(1), 137-153. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.28.1.06dup>
- Elugbe, B. O., & Omamor, A. P. (1991). Nigerian pidgin: Background and prospects. (*No Title*).
- Grosjean, F. (2010). Myths about bilingualism. www.francoisgrosjean.ch/myths_en.html (*the acceded data: 19.04. 2019*).
- Gürkan, S. (Ed.). (2022). *Sociolinguistics & Language Teaching*. Eğiten Kitap.
- Hancock, I. F. (1979). *On the origins of the term pidgin* (pp. 81-6). Ghent (Belgium): E. Story-Scientia.
- Handman, C. (2013). Text messaging in tok pisin: Etymologies and orthographies in Cosmopolitan Papua New Guinea. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 54(3), 265-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14735784.2013.818288>
- Hall, R. A. (1952). Pidgin English and linguistic change. *Lingua*, 3, 137-146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(52\)90014-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(52)90014-4)
- Hall, R. A., Jr. 1966. Pidgin and creole languages.
- Harris, B. P. (1994). Chinook jargon: Arguments for a pre-contact origin. *Pacific Coast Philology*, 29(1),28. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1316345>
- Hatfield, A. L. (2003). Intercolonial and interimperial relations in the Seventeenth Century. *History Compass*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1478-0542.059>
- Holm, J. (2000). *An introduction to pidgins and creoles*. Cambridge University Press
- Holm, J. (2010). Contact and change: Pidgins and creoles. *The Handbook of Language Contact*, 252-261. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch12>
- Ifechelobi, Jane & Eburuaja, Chiagozie & Ifechelobi, Uzoma. (2015). Beyond Barriers: The Changing Status of Nigerian Pidgin. Vol. 3. 208-216. 10.15640/ijll.v3n1a26.
- Isa, B. Z., Halilu, K. A., & Ahmed, H. K. (2015). The concept of pidgin and creole. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(3), 14-21.
- Jones, B. (2018). Strange vernaculars: How Eighteenth-century slang, cant, provincial languages, and nautical jargon became English. *The Mariner's Mirror*, 104(2), 233-235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.2018.1454133>
- Jourdan, C. (2021). Pidgins and creoles: Debates and issues. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 50(1), 363-378. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-121319-071304>
- Khan, I. J., & Akter, S. (2021). Pidgin and Creole: Concept, origin, and evolution. *British Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 164-170. <https://doi.org/10.34104/bjah.02101640170>
- Kumar, K. (2006). Empire and English nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 12(1), 1-13.
- lingua franca. (n.d.) *American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition*. (2011). Retrieved September 9 2023. <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/lingua+franca>

- Lisdawati, I. (2021). Language style and register used by famous content creators in tiktok application. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 9(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v9i2.2192>
- Managan, K. (2011). Koud Zyé: A glimpse into linguistic enregisterment on Kréyòl television in guadeloupe1. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 15(3), 299–322. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00490.x>
- Meijer, G., & Muysken, P. C. (1977). On the beginnings of pidgin and creole studies: Schuchardt and Hesseling.
- Migge, B. (2003): Creole Formation as Language Contact. The case of the Suriname Creoles. *Studies in Language - STUD LANG*. 29. 700-706. 10.1075/sl.29.3.09par.
- Migge, B. M. (2020). Mediating Creoles: Language practices on a YouTube show. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*, 35(2), 381-404.
- Moll, A. (2015). *Jamaican Creole Goes Web: Sociolinguistic styling and authenticity in a digital 'Yaad'* (Vol. 49). John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Mufwene, S. S. (1997). Jargons, pidgins, creoles, and koines: What are they? *CREOLE LANGUAGE LIBRARY*, 19, 35-70.
- Mufwene, S. S. (2015). The emergence of creoles and language change. In *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 348-365). Routledge.
- Muysken, P., & Smith, N. (1990). Question words in pidgin and creole languages.
- Muysken, P., & Smith, N. (1995). The study of pidgin and creole languages. *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*, 3-14.
- Nassa, V. K. (2011). Wireless Communications: Past, Present and Future. *Dronacharya Research Journal*, 50.
- Özüorçun, F. (2014). Language Varieties: Pidgins and Creoles. *LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (2), 114-123. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/euljss/issue/6286/84357>
- Pidgin (n.)*. Etymology. (n.d.). <https://www.etymonline.com/word/pidgin>
- Prem, H. J. (1992). Spanish colonization and Indian property in central Mexico, 1521–1620*. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82(3), 444–459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1992.tb01969.x>
- Pugsley, P. (2007). At home in Singaporean sitcoms. *M/C Journal*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.5204/mcj.2695>
- Rogers, T. S. (1996). Poisoning pidgins in the park: The study and status of Hawaiian Creole. *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, 221-235.
- Scriver, P., & Prakash, V. (Eds.). (2007). *Colonial modernities: building, dwelling and architecture in British India and Ceylon*. Routledge.
- Sebba, M. (1997). *Contact languages: Pidgins and Creoles*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- SELBY, A., SELBY, S., & Ting-shue, T. (1995). CHINA COAST PIDGIN ENGLISH. *Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 35, 113–141. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23889966>
- Shapiro, R. (2010). Chinese pidgin Russian. *Pidgins and Creoles in Asian Contexts*, 25(1), 5–62. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.25.1.02sha>

- Shields-Brodber, K. (1992). Dynamism and assertiveness in the public voice: Turn-talking and code-switching in radio talk shows in Jamaica. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 2(4), 487-504.
- Sorsby, V. G. (1975). *British Trade with Spanish America Under the Asiento 1713-1740* (Doctoral dissertation, University of London).
- Steinberg, D. D. (1993). *An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Longman.
- Suraiya, S. (2020). Pidgins and Creoles: Birth of Languages. *Jurnal Adabiya*, 19(1), 57-66.
- Tamfuh, W. M. (2022). The social media, human dignity and linguistic violence in Cameroon: A socio-pragmatic perception. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 10(7), 24–120. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejells.2013/vol10n724120>
- Todd, L. (2003). *Pidgins and creoles*. Routledge.
- Vandeputte L. 2018. L'ambiguïté des représentations à l'égard du Bislama, langue nationale du Vanuatu (Mélanésie). In *Vanuatu: oscillation entre diversité et unité*, ed. M Boubay-Pagès. Toulouse, Fr.: Press. Univ. Toulouse 1 Capitole. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.putc.3165>
- Vicente, V. S. (2007). English-based pidgins and Creoles: From social to cognitive hypotheses of acquisition. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem*, 5(9), 1-30.
- Voorhoeve, J. (1973). Historical and linguistic evidence in favour of the relexification theory in the formation of creoles. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500000099>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Webb, E. R. (2013). Pidgins and creoles. *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*, 301-320.