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ABSTRACT

Language is constantly changing over time, and the Korean language proves to be no different. Since the English language was introduced to the Korean peninsula in the 19th Century, English has only continued to make notable influences on the Korean language. South Korea, post-WWII, has continually strived towards globalization and internationalism, thus prioritizing English education amongst South Koreans. In promoting the English language with an international perspective, South Korea has been tenacious in integrating English into their education systems, relating economic success to one’s proficiency in English. The combination of English and Korean language in these various forms led to the creation of Konglish, which has garnered mixed attitudes from the South Korean population. The widespread prevalence of Konglish proves that it will remain as a common language used in South Korea. However, the Korean public has expressed dissatisfaction with Konglish for a variety of reasons, mainly because of its misinterpretations when translated to standard English. Given these dissatisfactions and the educational efforts made to alleviate them, it is inevitable that Konglish will evolve from its current form to resemble that of standard English.

INTRODUCTION

The South Korean vocabulary can be broadly dissected into three categories of origin: Sino-Korean, native Korean, and loanwords. Sino–Korean influences account for 65 percent of the current vocabulary, while 30 percent is derived from native Korean, and the remaining 5 percent consists of loanwords from other languages. While 5 percent in itself may seem like an insignificant figure, the driving force behind loanwords found in Korean vocabulary comes from English, which accounts for about 90 percent of loanwords (Rüdiger, 2018). According to McArthur (2002, p. 21), English has also now become South Korea’s “foreign language of choice”, in that South Korea has integrated English language learning into their school systems. The connection between the widespread use of Konglish and formalized English education is evident; I will be using previous studies to describe the history of English education in South Korea. The long-standing and pivotal presence of English in the lives of common South Koreans can be understood as the driving force that popularized English education in modern day South Korea. This study will also rely on literature from experts on the Korean and English languages to provide more clarity in defining Konglish, as there is not a general consensus among literature in determining an acceptable, universal definition of Konglish. While this study will not go in-depth into the lexicography of Konglish, it will provide a brief, basic overview through various examples. In proving the prevalence of Konglish within South Korea, this study will primarily rely on examples provided by literature from McPhail (2006) and Mueller (2010), both of whom have first-hand experience in observing public spaces for Konglish in South Korea. Literature from Willis (2014) will be used to show the reasoning behind Konglish’s widespread use in connection to Korean popular music. Previous studies conducted by Rüdiger (2018) and Hadikin (2006) will primarily be used to survey the attitudes towards Konglish. The predominant limitation of these studies is that the participants are students and professionals with experience in English education. Thus, the perceived attitudes towards Konglish will be supplemented by other literature to provide a broader view of South Koreans. By analyzing both the prevalence of Konglish in South Korea and South Korean attitudes towards Konglish, I have concluded that Konglish will evolve to bear more resemblance to standard English in the future.
WHAT IS KONGLISH?

From the literature analyzed in this research paper, there have been numerous interpretations of Konglish. Some explain Konglish simply as elements of English incorporated into South Korean everyday usage (Kent, 1999). Meanwhile, others describe their view of Konglish as a Korean variant of broken or imperfect English (McPhail, 2018). The varying descriptions of Konglish within literature display diverse perspectives of Konglish and its evolving linguistic usage. Thus, it can be reasonably concluded that a universally-accepted definition of Konglish does not currently exist. Participants in a study conducted by Hadikin (2006) defined Konglish as a part of Korean culture and a way of speaking that should only be used in an informal setting.

Despite the definitional discrepancies of Konglish, literature has broadly categorized the types of Konglish. Kent (1999) was widely cited in literature for his classification of Konglish into five different categories: Direct Loanwords, Hybrid Terms, Truncated Terminology, Substitution, and Pseudo Loanwords.

Direct Loanwords were described as English phonetically translated into the Korean language structure. The example provided was jusu (주스), meaning “juice” in English.

Hybrid Terms referred to vocabulary that incorporated a mixture of both English and Korean words to form one word. For example, bang-ul-tomato (방울토마토), means “cherry tomato,” bang-ul (방울) means “bell” in English, while tomato (토마토) is phonetically translated from English.

Truncated Terminology was vocabulary derived from shortened English terms. An example provided was limokeon (리모콘), which translates as “remote control.” Limo (리모) is derived from shortening the English word “remote” to just remo, while keon (콤) comes from shortening “control” to con.

Substitution was described as English terms that have replaced the existing Korean terminology. For example, paiking (파킹) literally translates to “parking” in English. The original Korean term for parking was ju-chai (주차).

Lastly, Pseudo Loanwords were explained as English terms whose original definitions have become modified in translation in the Korean context. The example provided was obaiteu (오바이트), which is derived from the English word overeat. However, in the Korean context, it means “vomit.” Thus, there is a disconnect between how native English speakers and Korean speakers interpret the word “overeat.” In understanding the variants of Konglish, one can thus begin to understand the complex attitudes towards Konglish in South Korea.

HISTORY OF ENGLISH IN KOREA

Korea’s first encounter with English can be dated back to the late 1700s to early 1800s when a few western ships would arrive at the coast of the Korean peninsula to either resupply goods or pressure the Joseon dynasty to open for trade and missionary work with the European nations and the United States. Efforts to open Joseon’s market would come to fruition under the Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce, and Navigation between the Joseon Dynasty and the United States (Paik, 2018). With increased contact between Westerners and Koreans, the necessity for interpreters and diplomats dramatically increased, leading to the opening of the first English language educational institution, Dongmuncho, in 1883 (Nam, 2005). The frequency of English learning by American missionarions, would foster both the relationship between Korea and the United States, as well as between Korean and English, up until the collapse of the Joseon dynasty (Paik, 2018). This relationship would become revitalized once more after World War II under occupation by the United States in South Korea.

English became a permanent fixture in South Korea vocabulary as the United States military personnel occupied South Korea. Despite their significant presence in South Korea, the United States military possessed little to no Korean language skills, thus communication with South Koreans was mostly conducted in English. According to Collins (2006), for many South Koreans, communicating with soldiers became a means of survival as they were the “sine qua non source of cash and consumer goods” (p. 421). During South Korea’s formative years under the United States’ occupancy and Dr. Syngman Rhee’s presidency, South Korean citizens were provided with aid packages that contained higher quality goods from the United States. Since these products were packaged in English, South Koreans began to associate quality goods with English. As a result, a common strategy for South Korean businesses today is to market their products English, in hopes that their goods will be seen as “higher quality” by consumers (Mueller, 2010).

During Park Chung-hee’s presidency, industrialization and globalization as a means for economic development in South Korea became the pillars of his administration. The Ministry of Education at the time, integrated English language communication skills into the South Korean secondary education system in hopes of producing a workforce capable of negotiating export deals abroad. Furthermore, major global events, like the 1986 Asian Games and the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games, required South Korea to further open its market and welcome more visitors to the peninsula (Paik, 2018). As the demand for English grew in order to make business dealings and promote the export of Korean goods, English became synonymous with national economic development (Collins, 2006). This drive for economic development was the catalyst of what literature has labeled as “English Fever” in South Korea.
“ENGLISH FEVER” IN SOUTH KOREA

“English Fever” primarily focuses on the heavy emphasis of English language proficiency as a means of increasing employment opportunities. This idea was first brought on by Park Chung-hee’s economic development initiatives and promoted further by succeeding administrations. The South Korean government further promoted English education in the mid-1990s as their implementation of internationalization and globalization policies required that more Koreans become proficient in the English language. For example, in 1997, the Ministry of Education mandated that English be integrated into middle and high school curricula (Collins, 2006). Since then, authors like Kocken (2014, p. 1), describe this South Korean phenomenon as a costly obsession with English (Kocken, 2014). It has been reported that Koreans are spending $17 billion a year on private education and hire 30,000 native English speakers to fuel their English learning addiction (The Diplomat, 2014). South Korean children are formally introduced to English in the third grade of primary school education, though many have already attended kindergartens with English integrated into the curriculum (Rüdiger, 2018). Parents also enroll their children into hagwon (학원), or private cram schools that run late into the night, often as young as five years old. Some parents take it a step further by sending their children abroad for English education, with approximately 35,000 elementary and secondary school students from Korea studying overseas for English acquisition between 2005 and 2006 (Park, 2009).

This emphasis on English education stems from societal and governmental pressure for Korean students to perform well on standardized tests that measure English proficiency in order to secure a successful job in a highly competitive market. The first challenge students must overcome in their journey towards English proficiency is to pass the South Korean national college entrance exam (Sununeg), which includes an English section. Students who score high on Sununeg are more likely to be accepted into top-tier universities, such as Seoul National University, Korea University, and Yonsei University. The university that a student attends is seen as one of the most influential determinants of whether or not they will find success in pursuing employment (Diamond, 2016). Furthermore, students must also receive a high score on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), as employers take these scores into careful consideration during the hiring process (McPhail, 2018). South Korean companies have also started to conduct a portion of their applicant interviews in English to assess potential hires’ English competency (Mueller, 2010).

There have been attempts to alleviate “English Fever” under former President Park Geun-hye's administration when the Ministry of Education implemented plans to make the English section of college entrance exams easier (Jung, 2014). However, the policy is far too recent to be able observe any discernible patterns concerning spending on learning the English language. In addition, there have not been any observable attitude changes amongst corporate employers in hiring English proficient employees. As a result, English can still be thought of as a valuable asset in attaining a desirable job or receiving a job promotion in South Korea, and thus, a means of survival.

Given that there is not substantial literature detailing how Konglish emerged from English, only assumptions and speculations can be analyzed. Since governmental institutions and society have promoted standard English education for the past century, the emergence of Konglish was likely an unintended consequence. English language education in Korea has failed to develop effective methods of teaching standard English in Korea.

A point brought up by Hahn (2002), which tackles the grammatical errors often associated with Konglish, is the conflict between translating words from Korean to English in a highly stratified society like Korea. For example, Koreans have a respectful honorific term for teachers and address them as seongsaengnim (선생님). However, in the West, teachers are normally addressed by Mr./Ms./Mrs., followed by their last name — some western teachers even overhaul this system and allow students to call them by their first name. Thus, when directly translating seongsaengnim into English, the only viable translation would be simply Teacher. A Korean student learning English would often say sentences such as 'Teacher, how are you?' as addressing a teacher by their name would be too informal and jarring in Korean society. However, a native English speaker would find addressing teachers in such a fashion as unconventional (Hahn, 2002).

The incredible demand for English language teachers may also outweigh the supply that is available. English education was spurred by the initiatives set forth by Park Chung-hee and the following administrations, thus errors in implementing English education may have occurred during those formative years. One such error is that there were not enough competent native English speakers in Korea to teach the language. In order to fulfill the high demand for English, school systems may have hired teachers who were barely able to speak English and without a well-developed grasp over the language. Thus, many of the errors that would have been made by either the teacher or student would remain uncorrected.

The continued use of misinterpreted English into everyday Korean conversations has only exacerbated the use of Konglish. Kent (2001) makes an observation of native English speakers in South Korea,

“Native English speakers then, soon come to use Konglish when living in Korea and when communicating with each other, as well as with their students, and as such abandon the terms they would...”
use in their home nations in favour of the terms their students use on a daily basis” (p. 1)

Using Konglish in an English language learning environment only perpetuates its inaccuracies. Teachers are meant to be role models to their students, thus, if native English speakers begin to use Konglish in their classrooms, it presents a contradictory force that hinders a student’s learning of standard English.

THE KONGLISH PHENOMENON

Konglish has become prominent within South Korean society over the past few decades. In the subways of Seoul, English audio directions and English maps are available for navigation. More recently developed areas are also named using Konglish. For example, places like Gasan Digital Complex are referred to in Korean as Gasan Dijiteol Danji (가산디지털단지). Konglish is also used by local businesses’ in their window advertisements. For example, corner stores will have sign postings stating won peulleoseu won (원 풋리소 원), which translates to buy one, get one free in English (McPhail, 2006). A study conducted by Lawrence (2012) analyzes the percentage of Konglish signages in different cities and districts throughout South Korea. His research concluded that there was a positive correlation between the frequency of English and Konglish signages, and an inverse correlation between frequency of English and Korean signages. Thus, the blatant use of English and Konglish signage throughout storefronts, buildings, and streets, represents its dominance in many aspects of South Korean life.

While prevalent in consumer culture, Konglish is also frequently used in the media. As mentioned before, South Koreans have linked the use of English to high brand quality and appeal because of the quality goods that South Koreans received from US aid packages in the 1950s. Currently, fashion magazines and television advertisements have shifted to using Konglish as a means of promoting their products. The Konglish used in the media does not need to be intelligible or an accurate representation of the standard English definition, rather it is used for aesthetic purposes, as like graphic icons (Mueller, 2010).

Furthermore, Konglish has a place in Korean popular culture, especially in the 21st Century as Korean popular music (K-Pop) and entertainment have risen to global recognition. Konglish lyrics are frequently intermixed with Korean lyrics in K-pop. Willis (2014, p. 216) details seven reasons why English is used in K-pop songs:

- Stylistic: Frequently, an English word rhymes better than a Korean word, but still conveys the same meaning.
- Assertion of sensuality: Artists frequently attempt to get around Korean censors by writing sexually suggestive lyrics in English.
- Assertion of unsettled identities: Some songs deliberately mismatch English and Korean lyrics in a single song to represent the battle between two inner selves.
- Assertion of resistance: English can be used to resist mainstream practices.
- Neutral medium: English in pop songs is not limited to South Korea, but is used by many Asian countries as a neutral way to communicate. Since English does not belong to any Asian country, it can be used by all.
- Image of modernity and internationalization: The use of English carries the connotation that the singer is “modern, Western, chic, or sophisticated.”

Since K-Pop idols are often admired by their fans, many Koreans may be imitating the Konglish lyrics from their favorite artists and songs and interweaving them into their daily language. This is because they believe it to be stylish and modern to do so as seen by responses from participants in a study by Rudiger (2018). Since K-Pop is so widespread within Korea, the frequent exposure to popular songs with Konglish in them may also inadvertently cause people to use it in their vocabulary.

ATTITUDES TOWARD KONGLISH

While Konglish has become widely accepted and institutionalized in the daily use of South Koreans today, many have expressed concerns and their disdain towards its popular use. In a study conducted by Rüdiger (2018), participants were asked numerous questions in regard to their opinion of Konglish via an online questionnaire. Participants were primarily university students between 19 and 30 years old, and 10% were graduate students or early professionals above the age of 30. The first question asked was “What do you think about Korean people who use many English loanwords while speaking Korean.” 40% of participants had a mixed response, where the most common reasoning behind their attitude is the belief excessive or unjustified use of Konglish is unflattering; however, the same respondents thought it acceptable if Konglish can give better clarity and expression to the speaker’s message. About 27% of participants had a negative response towards Konglish, expressing a sense of betrayal to Koreans and/or that the speaker using loanwords is just trying to show-off. Only 3% of participants had a positive response, stating that they were comfortable with the use of many English loanwords while speaking Korean. Another question asked was “What do you think about English loanwords which are considered to be Konglish?” 30% of respondents gave a negative response, where many held the belief that Konglish should be converted into authentic Korean words. This negative reaction towards Konglish, as evident by some participants responses, is derived from Konglish’ unclear status as neither English nor Korean. Others have expressed concerns about the
lack of effectiveness in Konglish when communicating with foreigners. 18% of participants who gave neutral responses did not have strong opinions on Konglish, describing it as a natural phenomenon. 16% of participants gave mixed responses. Within the pool of participants who gave mixed responses, many did not hold much resentment towards Konglish, but recognized that inaccuracies when translating to an English equivalent can easily become problematic, especially if used in an international context. Though, it is important to note that certain biases may be in play here as all the participants who responded positively lived abroad at some point in their lives (except for two where study abroad was unavailable in the data).

A study conducted by Hadikin (2006) showed similar results and reasoning behind local attitudes towards Konglish. The participants in the study were students and staff of a university language center. When asked to provide a definition of Konglish, some participants responded negatively by stating that Konglish is “incorrect” or “imperfect” English. Participants with a more positive outlook on Konglish believed it to be a part of Korean culture. The neutral respondents provided situations where Konglish may be used such as “in emergencies,” “when you don’t know enough ‘real’ English,” or “in private or informal conversations.” (p. 14). Hadikin’s study, however, did have a few more positive responses than Rüdiger’s study. There was a wider consensus in Hadikin’s study that Konglish has useful benefits in facilitating intercultural communication between Korean and English. Some respondents also acknowledged that Konglish is useful in the classroom when students are unable to find an alternative to expressing their thoughts.

Similar to the student and professional participants in studies by both Hadikin (2006) and Rüdiger (2018), many English language teachers and students have expressed skepticism in regards to Konglish because of its misinterpretations and misuse of English. Former English teacher, Brian Deutsch, observed that “[Native Korean speakers] are so accustomed to pronouncing these borrowed words the Korean way that they can’t adjust to English pronunciations and meanings.” (p. 194) Testimony from an intermediate-level Korean-language student also noted that Konglish is often used in place of its Sino-Korean or native Korean equivalent (Min, 2009). This proves to be an issue as native Korean speakers are more frequently exposed to misused English in the form of Konglish, rather than the proper English taught only in English classes. This lack of exposure hinders a student’s capacity to learn how to distinguish Konglish from proper English, as well as their usage in appropriate settings. English teachers in South Korea teaching at English education institutions have tried to develop teaching exercises to combat the misinterpretations created by Konglish. One suggested teaching technique is to create a Picture Word List. Students are given a list of false cognates and asked to draw their visualizations on paper. Then, the teacher will draw the visualizations of a native English speaker. In conducting this exercise, students will be able to see the differences between their interpretations and that of a native English speaker. For example, when the word mansion is given. A Korean may visualize a mansion as a luxury apartment building, but a native English speaker may draw a large house for a single-family (Kent, 2001). This exercise allows students to recognize that there is a disparity between a native Korean’s visualization of certain words in comparison to a native English speaker’s. In the case of the word mansion, it represents a Korean’s different lifestyle and their lack of exposure to what a mansion looks like to a native English speaker. Such exercises demonstrate that there is a push amongst English educators to correct the misuse of Konglish in comparison to its standard English equivalent. For educators, Konglish is a detriment to English language learning, and so it becomes important to distinguish Konglish from standard English.

Those with experience teaching North Korean defectors have also expressed their concerns that Konglish makes it more difficult for defectors to assimilate into South Korean society. While North Korean defectors are still inherently “Korean,” the gap in language between North Korea and South Korea is exacerbated by Konglish. In North Korea, extensive English education was unnecessary and minimal. Lartigue (2018) notes the experiences of Eun-shil, a 2013 North Korean defector, with English in North Korea:

“When I was in North Korea, I hated English. After learning about how terrible Americans were, I would feel disgusted using their language. We were taught to learn English so we could use it to confront Americans, but if we were supposed to kill them, did we really need to speak to them in fluent English?” (p. 1).

Since coming to South Korea, many defectors, especially those seeking proper education, often find themselves lagging behind their South Korean counterparts. Lartigue (2018) also shared a statement by Tae-song, a 2006 North Korean defector:

“Konglish was everywhere. Koreans were speaking Korean to me, but it was Korean Konglish. Not only was I getting used to so many new things, but it seemed that I had to learn them in Korean, Konglish and proper English” (p. 1).

Those who hold pro-unification sentiments see this growing language barrier as a severe obstacle that needs to be overcome, which is only amplified by the daily use of Konglish in South Korean society.

South Korean politicians have also been criticized by the public for their use of Konglish. Former President Park Geun-hye in particular, has received backlash for her poor grasp of English. In one instance noted by Lee
President Park was advocating for the National Assembly to "pass economic bills so that the Korean economy would not lose ‘golden time’" (p. 1). Native English speakers would not use the word "golden time" in this context. Instead, the phrase "precious time" would be more appropriate and accurate. Since the President is a highly public figure who is watched internationally, many find these errors in English to be embarrassing and shameful (Lee, 2014). Thus, Konglish in its current form is highly inappropriate to be used in formal settings, as misinterpretations can be detrimental to the messages politicians are trying to set forth. Even worse, it can be interpreted by the international community as offensive. With high-ranking politicians like Park Geun-hye misusing Konglish in their messages, its consequences are far-reaching and transcend national borders.

While I was unable to find a study that polled foreigners in South Korea, there is literature that demonstrates support of Konglish from English speaking foreigners trying to learn Korean. A foreigner interviewed by KoreaTimes expressed that learning Korean has been significantly easier because he is able to make the connection between Konglish and English, thus making it easier to remember definitions. According to Min (2009), other Konglish enthusiasts see it as "a step toward greater multiculturalism and positive adaptation" (p. 1), in that it gives Koreans greater means to express themselves. Thus, it’s clear that there are both benefits and drawbacks to the usage of Konglish, which explains why many South Koreans have mixed attitudes towards Konglish.

**FUTURE OF KONGLISH**

The primary conclusion of this study is to determine how Konglish will develop in South Korea in the future. The frequently mentioned benefits of Konglish is that it helps facilitate more meaningful and expressive conversations when Sino-Korean or native Korean vocabulary would not be sufficient. Many also saw it as a useful, temporary tool for English language learners when they have not yet acquired enough mastery of standard English to properly express and communicate their thoughts and ideas. However, the drawbacks have also been clearly expressed. It is widely accepted by the South Korean populace that some varieties of Konglish are comprised of improper English, which is detrimental to both South Koreans and North Korean defectors who are trying to learn standard English. Furthermore, Konglish’s narrow sphere of effectiveness has also been a topic of concern, in particular, due to its inappropriateness in formal or international settings.

The prevalence of Konglish within the South Korean society should also be considered when evaluating the future of Konglish. Konglish is heavily integrated into visible domains that people often frequent—public spaces, local businesses, and the media. The younger generation also relies on Konglish and popular culture to express progressive, liberal ideologies that fight back against traditional customs and conservatism. South Korean society is already accustomed to Konglish in their everyday lives, which contributes to my opinion that Konglish will continue to be firmly rooted in Korean society. Unless there is a push for a complete ban of Konglish, which is unlikely as literature has spent little to no time entertaining that idea, it is safe to say that Konglish will continue to be present in the daily communication of Korean speakers.

Despite analyzing various pieces of literature, the future of Konglish is not clearly identifiable. While it is almost certain that Konglish will remain a part of South Korean society due to its wide and growing prevalence today, the drawback of its current stage is too great to be ignored. Teachers at English teaching facilities have already started developing new methods of teaching English to South Korean students who possess a background in Konglish, which may be a source of confusion and detriment to their learning. There are also pro-`pure’ Konglish sentiments in its ability to diversify expressions that should not be overlooked when considering the future of Konglish. Thus, there are three possible ways that Konglish may evolve, based on the studies of this study.

Firstly, Konglish may continue to use a combination of misinterpreted English and Korean. While the vast majority of sentiments support changes in Konglish, the polling population in these studies are primarily from students and professionals with experience in English education. The rest of society, primarily those who may not have extensive English education or are in occupations where they do not use English frequently, may not harbor strong will to change their current form of communicating in Konglish. However, this may be the case for only the older generations in South Korea. However, the current generation’s recognition that Konglish consists of misinterpreted English, and with many demonstrating a willingness to change their current form of speaking to either be more like native Korean or standard Korean, it is unlikely that Konglish will remain in its current form in the future. With that being said, it is highly unlikely for Konglish to disappear. Konglish has been in the Korean vocabulary for decades and is only growing in popularity as more South Koreans are being raised in a society where Konglish is prevalent in daily use.

Secondly, Konglish may evolve to resemble that of authentic Korean vocabulary. For many South Koreans, they perceive that the Korean language should aim towards becoming purer and more authentic, if not already. However, this is less likely to occur as the studies evaluated in this research paper have demonstrated that respondents holding this perspective are in the minority.

Thirdly, Konglish may evolve to resemble more like English, which would entail greater accuracy
in interpretations between Konglish and standard English. The consequences of using Konglish in its current form far outweighs its benefits. However, its widespread popularity in South Korea would prevent it from eradication. The best course of action that would balance its popularity with South Korea’s “English Fever” phenomenon is for it to evolve to resemble the English lexicon. This would bolster the education of English language learners, rather than hinder them—especially since the occupational success of a South Korean is predicated on their English proficiency. By improving Konglish in ways that do not violate the lexical rules of English, it can become beneficial for both South Koreans and foreigners. South Koreans can be exposed to proper English in their daily life and not only in their English courses. Foreigners can also better relate to Konglish words if they are formatted more closely to standardized English. Thus, the most likely future of Konglish is that it will evolve to more accurately resemble standard English.

CONCLUSION

Konglish was produced from the rich history that South Koreans have with Western countries, and in particular, the United States. The influences that the United States military had on the South Korean population from repeated interactions in their daily lives fostered its creation. However, it was the link between English and Korea’s economic development that spurred the mainstream use of Konglish amongst South Koreans. Konglish, despite its popularity, is problematic because it misrepresents standard English, making it difficult for students of English to learn the language. These issues are widely known amongst South Koreans, and many are looking forward to changing the way that Konglish is used. Thus, given its popularity, we can expect Konglish to still be a part of Korean culture in the future. But because of its misinterpretations to standard English and misuse, Konglish will evolve to bear more resemblance to standard English. The developments of Konglish shows the historical past that Korea has with the Western world, as well as the increased interconnectedness of these two nations overtime.
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