



THE HISTORY, CAUSES, AND MECHANISMS OF ENGLISH BORROWING IN KOREAN AND KARAKALPAK

Baxbergenova Akerke Shoxan qizi

Karakalpak state university, teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18863419>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 22nd February 2026

Accepted: 27th February 2026

Online: 28th February 2026

KEYWORDS

English loanwords; language contact; lexical borrowing; Korean; Karakalpak; phonological adaptation; morphological integration; semantic shift; Konglish; Russian mediation; globalization; sociolinguistics; comparative linguistics.

ABSTRACT

This article investigates English lexical borrowing in Korean and Karakalpak, examining its historical development, sociolinguistic motivations, and linguistic adaptation mechanisms. Grounded in language contact theory and borrowing typology, the study compares how English loanwords have entered and integrated into two typologically distinct languages under different sociopolitical conditions. In Korean, English borrowing has largely occurred through direct contact, particularly following U.S. influence after 1945, and has intensified in the era of globalization, digital media, and popular culture, giving rise to hybrid formations known as Konglish. In contrast, English-derived vocabulary in Karakalpak historically entered predominantly through Russian mediation during the Soviet period, while the post-independence era has seen increasing direct borrowing associated with market economy reforms and technological advancement.

The analysis demonstrates that nominative necessity, terminological precision, and international integration are key linguistic motivations in both languages. Phonological adaptation, morphological integration, and semantic shift function as principal mechanisms of assimilation. The comparative findings highlight both shared global trends and language-specific strategies shaped by historical and sociolinguistic contexts.

Language contact and lexical borrowing constitute one of the most dynamic and extensively studied areas of linguistics. In the context of globalization, the status of English as a lingua franca has significantly intensified its influence on many languages worldwide, including Korean and Karakalpak, which differ

typologically. This section examines the historical stages of English lexical borrowing in both languages, the extralinguistic and linguistic factors that have stimulated this process, and the mechanisms and pathways through which borrowing has occurred.



Scholars of language contact emphasize that contact between two or more languages results in complex linguistic phenomena, among which lexical borrowing is the most common and natural outcome. As Thomason (1988) argues, borrowing may affect not only the lexicon but also phonetic, morphological, and semantic systems. Borrowed units are typically integrated into the grammatical system of the recipient language and acquire new forms and functions.

Weinreich (1953), in *Languages in Contact*, systematized the phenomena resulting from language contact. His central concept of interference refers to deviations from linguistic norms in the speech of bilinguals caused by language transfer. Interference may occur at all linguistic levels: phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical-semantic.

The following dimensions are particularly relevant to the present study:

Phonological interference: substitution of unfamiliar sounds with the closest equivalents in the recipient language or the insertion of epenthetic vowels to satisfy phonotactic constraints.

Morphological interference: integration of borrowed roots into the word-formation and inflectional system of the recipient language (e.g., addition of Korean -하다 *hada* or Karakalpak derivational suffixes).

Lexical-semantic interference: semantic narrowing, widening, or shift; calquing and semantic borrowing.

Similarly, Haugen (1950) distinguished three major types of borrowing:

1. **Loanwords** (importation of both form and meaning), further subdivided into: Zero substitution (minimal structural change, primarily phonetic adaptation), Partial substitution (hybrid forms combining foreign roots and native affixes), Total substitution (calques).
2. **Hybrid borrowings**, where foreign and native morphemes combine.
3. **Semantic borrowing**, where new meanings are added to existing lexical items.

English Borrowing in Korean: Historical Development, Causes, and Mechanisms. Korean linguists typically analyze English loanwords in relation to Korea's sociohistorical transformations. Following Sohn Ho-Min and Lee Ki-Moon, borrowing processes can be divided into three major stages:

1. Early Contact Period (Late 19th Century – 1945): Initial Western Contact and Japanese Mediation
 2. Active Borrowing Period (1945–1980s): U.S. Influence and Modernization
 3. Globalization Period (1980s–Present): Internet, K-Pop, and Konglish
- Early Contact Period.** This period corresponds to Korea's gradual opening to Western countries after a long era of isolation. English lexical items entered primarily through missionary activity, trade relations, and Japanese mediation during the colonial period (1910–1945). Extralinguistic factors:
- Christian missionary activities introduced religious vocabulary.
 - Diplomatic and trade relations introduced commercial terminology.



– Japanese colonial rule served as a linguistic intermediary, with many English words entering Korean through Japanese phonological patterns.

Linguistic factors:

- Nominative necessity: absence of lexical equivalents for Western concepts.
- Predominantly written transmission via religious texts and translations.

Active Borrowing Period (1945–1980s). After World War II and particularly following the Korean War (1950–1953), South Korea fell within the sphere of U.S. political and cultural influence. American military presence, economic aid, and modernization policies accelerated lexical borrowing.

Extralinguistic factors:

- U.S. military presence introduced military terminology.
- Industrialization and modernization expanded scientific and technological vocabulary.
- Popular culture (music, film, sports) facilitated the spread of English terms.
- Educational reforms strengthened English instruction.

Linguistic factors:

- Nominative need for technological and administrative terms.
- Preference for shorter English loanwords over longer native expressions.

Both oral contact (through military and economic cooperation) and written transmission (textbooks, media, technical manuals) played crucial roles.

Globalization Period (1980s–Present)

Since the 1980s, South Korea's integration into the global economy and digital communication networks has intensified borrowing. Internet technology, global media, and K-Pop

culture have significantly influenced lexical innovation.

Extralinguistic factors:

- Digital technologies and social media accelerated real-time borrowing.
- The Korean Wave (*Hallyu*) globalized hybrid lexical forms.
- English became a marker of social mobility and symbolic capital (Park & Wee).

Linguistic factors:

- Emergence of Konglish, hybrid formations combining English elements with Korean phonology and semantics.
- Semantic reinterpretation and pragmatic adaptation.
- Productive morphological integration (e.g., adding *-하다* to borrowed bases).

Thus, modern Korean exhibits a multilayered borrowing system characterized by direct borrowing, hybridization, and semantic transformation.

English Borrowing in Karakalpak: Historical Development, Causes, and Mechanisms.

Unlike Korean, Karakalpak borrowing developed under distinct sociohistorical conditions shaped by Soviet language policy and Russian linguistic mediation. Two primary stages can be identified:

1. Indirect Borrowing Period (1920–1991): Russian Mediation during the Soviet Era
 2. Post-Independence Period (1991–Present): Direct Global Contact
- Soviet Period (Indirect Borrowing).**

During the Soviet era, Russian functioned as the primary language of science, administration, and education. Consequently, English-origin terms



entered Karakalpak mainly through Russian.

Scholars such as Baskakov emphasize that centralized terminology policies standardized new lexical items in Russian before they were adapted into Turkic languages.

Extralinguistic factors:

- Soviet ideological promotion of “international” terminology.
- Scientific and technological development.
- Sports, culture, and education systems conducted largely in Russian.

Linguistic factors:

- Nominative need for scientific and technological vocabulary.
- Terminological precision aligned with international standards.
- Phonetic and morphological adaptation following Russian models.

As a result, many English-origin terms entered Karakalpak via secondary adaptation, reflecting Russian phonetic patterns.

Post-Independence Period (1991–Present). Following Uzbekistan’s independence, Karakalpakstan gained increased access to global communication networks. English began to influence the language both directly and indirectly.

Extralinguistic factors:

- Transition to a market economy.
- Expansion of information technologies.
- International diplomacy.
- Youth culture and global media.

Linguistic factors:

- Nominative necessity for new economic and technological realities.
- Alignment with international terminology.
- Parallel operation of direct English borrowing and continued Russian mediation.

Borrowing channels include digital media, education programs, business communication, and social networks. This has produced a multilayered lexical system combining direct English forms with Russian-influenced variants.

The analysis demonstrates that English lexical borrowing in both Korean and Karakalpak reflects global modernization, technological advancement, and cultural exchange. However, historical and sociopolitical conditions have shaped distinct borrowing mechanisms:

1. Korean has experienced predominantly direct borrowing reinforced by media and global culture.
2. Karakalpak historically relied on Russian mediation, though direct borrowing has intensified post-independence.
3. In both languages, nominative necessity, terminological precision, and international integration function as primary linguistic motivations.
4. Borrowings serve not only as lexical enrichment but also as indicators of global cultural transformation.

Thus, the comparative analysis of English loanwords in Korean and Karakalpak provides valuable empirical data for language contact theory and typological studies of borrowing.



References:

1. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Kenstowicz, M. (2005). The phonetics and phonology of Korean loanword adaptation. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
5. Lee, H. (2001). *English Loanword Phonology in Korean*. Seoul National University.
6. Davis, S. (2006). English word-final /s/ in Korean loanword phonology. *Journal of Linguistics*, 42(1).
7. Kang, Y. (2010). The emergence of phonological adaptation from phonetic adaptation: English loanwords in Korean. *Phonology*, 27(3).
8. Jumaniyazova, F.I. (2025). The Phenomenon of English Loanwords in the Karakalpak Language: Causes and Consequences. *ORIENS Journal*, 13.04.2025.