

Why do Koreans explain a lot when making an apology?*

Jeong Khn Ahn
(Chonbuk National University)

Ahn, Jeong Khn. 2012. Why do Koreans explain a lot when making an apology? *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*. 20(3). 1-15. This study examined why Koreans used explanations a lot when making an apology. In order to find out the major reasons of such a peculiar speech act of Koreans in apology, 175 respondents participated in this study and each was given a questionnaire to fill out their preference of apology options and their reasons for selecting such options. Most of the respondents took apology options with explanations as their preference and the foremost reason they used explanations when making an apology was to make themselves understood to the others in order to avoid misunderstanding. Women were more likely to make themselves understood to the others than men, whereas men thought that giving an explanation when apologizing was more polite and the right thing to do than women. The youngest group of people were most sensitive to have themselves understood to the others when making an apology.

Key Words: speech act of apology, explanation in apology, cross-cultural variations of apology realization

1. Introduction

Apologizing has been studied as an fundamental aspect of the human language behavior, along with other speech acts such as correcting, requesting, expressing thanks, and complaining. In particular, apologizing plays a vital role in its remedial function in human relations. In this regard, the ways people

* This paper was supported by research funds of Chonbuk National University in 2012.

make an apology are much more important than simply making an apology. Apologizing can be different, reflecting the interlocutor's social relations. It occurs not just in a language group but in different language or ethnic groups. As a comparative study, differences in the ways people make an apology were well reported in many cross-cultural studies on apology.

One of the major differences for Korean's apology from other language groups such as English and German is that Koreans explain a lot when making an apology compared with other language groups (Ahn, 2011). Explanation is regarded as one of the eight major apology strategies in apology studies (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983), although some scholars such as Wolfson, et al. (1989, pp. 180-181) interpreted it as an account not an apology in their study in case it occurs without any IFIDs (Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices) such as I'm sorry or excuse me. For the native speakers in their study, offense had to be acknowledged if the response was to be an apology. Following Olshtain & Cohen, explanation is treated as an apology in the present study because it appeared with IFIDs.

Compared with other ethnic group's apology, the frequent use of explanation in Korean's apology was also found in a number of studies (Park, 2005; Jeon, 2006), which demonstrates the fact that an explanation is an essential ingredient in an apology for Koreans.

Understanding such a difference in the ways Koreans make an apology from other language groups, it is necessary for us to study in more details on why Koreans use explanations a lot in an apology as a follow-up study to those previous apology studies indicating the heavy use of explanations for Koreans when making an apology such as Ahn (2011).

2. Review of the literature

In recent years apology studies had been done cross-culturally in an attempt to find out cross-cultural variations in apology strategies in a number of languages. Most of the languages participated in these cross-cultural studies of apology were Indo-European languages such as Hebrew, German, English, and French, since these cross-cultural studies of apology had begun under the

CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) in Europe in 1987. Following the CCSARP, similar studies of apology were done later in other languages such as Korean and Japanese. To do a cross-cultural study, the research methodology of all the comparative studies taken must be the same, with only necessary modifications if needed. The major research model proposed by the CCSARP was the DCT (Discourse Completion Test). Under this project a number of studies published their findings on apology strategies and compared them with other relevant studies (Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Olshtain, 1989; Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989; Bergman & Kasper, 1993). Olshtain & Cohen (1983) proposed the speech act set of apology which included the eight strategies; IFIDs, responsibility, explanation, offer of repair, promise of forbearance, intensifiers, minimizers, and concern for the hearer. Following Olshtain & Cohen (1983)'s proposal, Vollmer & Olshtain (1989), Bergman & Kasper (1993), and others studied apology strategies in a number of different ethnic groups such as Hebrew, English, German, and Americans and reported that there were language group differences in the use of these eight apology strategies when they made an apology.

These comparative studies on apology were done not only between different language groups (Barnlund & Yoshioka, 1990; Bergman & Kasper, 1993) but between different levels of language proficiency groups (Trosborg, 1987; Cohen & Olshtain, 1981). Barnlund & Yoshioka (1990) found out that social status was an important sociopragmatic factor for Japanese apology, but indicated that social power did not play a crucial role in apology for Americans and Thai's. Trosborg (1987) showed that advanced Danish EFL learners made an apology more politely than beginners, and Cohen & Olshtain (1981) stated that Hebrew EFL learners made an apology in a rather clumsy way than native speakers of English.

These comparative studies on apology were also done in Korea recently. Kim, H. (1997), Yang (2000), Shim (2009), and Whang (2009) indicated lack of frequency and proficiency in English apology for Korean EFL learners. Hong (2003), Jeon (2006), Lee, Y. (2008), Kim, N. (2008), Whang (2009), and Kang (2011) showed that Koreans used IFIDs, responsibility, offer of repair, and explanation as the major apology strategies among the eight apology strategies.

Interestingly, Jeon (2006), Lee, H. (2007), Kim, Y. (1999), Park (2005), and

Ahn (2011) indicated that Koreans used more explanations in apology than other ethnic groups such as German and Hebrew, but Eom (1994) reported that Korean EFL learners used less explanations than the native speakers of English in English apology. In particular, these ethnic differences in the use of explanation in apology were clearly shown in the comparative studies on apology in Ahn (2011, pp. 273-274). For instance, in the case of a person's making an apology to a friend because of his/her late arrival, Koreans used explanations much more (25.1%) than the other groups (14.0% in Olshtain's Hebrew study and 17.0% in Vollmer & Olshtain's German study).

What these findings clearly indicated was that there was a cross-cultural variation in Korean's apology strategies and particularly in their use of explanations when making an apology. Therefore a further study was needed on why and in what ways Koreans use explanations much more than other ethnic groups. As a follow-up study to this inquiry, Ahn made a pilot study in 2012 in which he examined 60 Korean college students' preference to apology options and their reasons for selecting them, using the questionnaire. 87.5% of them selected the apology with explanations which supports the findings of the previous apology studies in Korean. Their reasons for choosing it were diverse but could be grouped into a few categories in the following frequencies. Of the total 84 responses, 1) an explanation when making an apology was used to make the apologizer understood (19 responses, 22.6%), 2) it was the right thing to do (17 responses, 20.2%), 3) it was a polite way of apologizing (15 responses, 17.9%), 4) it was the better way than any other ways (13 responses, 15.5%), 5) it was used not to hurt others' feeling (9 responses, 10.7%), 6) it was used to make an excuse or to ask for forgiveness (7 responses, 8.3%), and 7) it made the apology more truthful (4 responses, 4.8%).

Based on these preliminary findings in the pilot study, Ahn made the present study with some modifications to investigate why Koreans used explanations a lot in apology in more details.

3. Research Method

3.1. Production of the questionnaire

To do the present study, the following questionnaire was delivered to the respondents in the study.

The Questionnaire

male () female () age ()

Which one do you choose when you are in the following situation?
Please check in the blank provided.

1. A student borrowed the professor's book, which she promised to return that day, but forgot to bring it.

Professor: Did you bring the book I lent you?

- () Student 1) I am sorry, professor. I will bring it tomorrow.
() Student 2) Oh, no. I forgot to bring it.

I am sorry, professor. I will bring it tomorrow.

What is the reason you choose it?

2. A friend was late again for a meeting with you.

You: You are late again!

- () Friend 1) I am sorry. It could happen.
() Friend 2) I am really sorry. It could happen.

There was a traffic jam.

What is the reason you choose it?

As shown in the Questionnaire, only gender and age were asked to the

respondents for their demographic factors in this study, because gender and age group differences in the use of explanation when making an apology were only sought in the present study. In each situation two apology options were provided to select. One is the apology with an explanation and the other without an explanation. After choosing one of the two options, respondents were allowed to mention whatever reason they had in mind in choosing it.

Two apology situations in the questionnaire were taken from the previous studies of apology including the CCSARP and the recent Ahn's (2011) study of Korean apology, adding the options to each apology situation. Under the CCSARP, the following seven apology situations were given to the respondents; paper, book, manager, waiter, meeting, driver, and insult (Olshtain, 1989). In order to compare Korean's apology behavior with other ethnic groups such as German, English, and Hebrew under the CCSARP, Ahn (2011) used the same apology situations as the CCSARP's except the last one, insult, because Vollmer & Olshtain's German study did not use it (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1993, p. 88). From the six apology situations these studies used in common in their studies, only two situations (i.e., book and meeting) were taken in this study, because the purpose of the present study was to find out why Koreans used explanations much more than other ethnic groups, not to compare apology strategies between these different ethnic groups. Although new apology situations could be used easily, but the reason that the two apology situations were used again in the present study was that the group difference in the use of explanations in apology in these two situations was clearly shown in Ahn's study (2011, pp. 273-274). For instance, in the book situation, Koreans used explanations 4.5%, but Hebrew 0.0% (Olshtain, 1989), German 1.5% (Vollmer & Olshtain, 1989), and Americans 0.0% (Bergman & Kasper, 1993). These two situations were also used in the pilot study.

3.2. Respondents and data collection

The questionnaire was delivered to 175 respondents in Korean in spring 2012 in Korea. The respondents were individually participated in this study to indicate their apology preference and their reasons for selecting the apology options. Among them, men were 84 (48.0%) and women 91 (52.0%). 49 (28.0%)

were 20s (23 men and 26 women), 45 (25.7%) were 30s (21 men and 24 women), 41 (24.4%) were 40s (20 men and 21 women), and 40 (22.9%) were 50s (20 men and 20 women). Respondents in the study filled out the Questionnaire individually on a street, on campus, at a restaurant, at a bus station, and at other places in Jeonju, Korea. All of the respondents were the native speakers of Korean.

4. Data Analysis

Each respondent was asked to fill out the questionnaire, so that the total apology options examined in the study were 350 (i.e., 175 respondents x 2 options). Out of the 350 options, 286 apology options with an explanation were chosen by the respondents, which was 81.7%. The rest 18.3% (64 apology options) were those with non-explanation.

Crosstabs were used in the study to analyze the data obtained by the questionnaire because variables used in the study such as gender, age group, and reason were all nominal scales. Coding and crosstabs were made using SPSS 12.0K.

5. Results and Discussion

Most of the respondents in the study selected the apology options with explanations as their preference as shown in Table 1. This is a little bit lower than the pilot study in which 87.5% of the respondents selected the apology with explanations.

Table 1. Respondent's choice of apology options

| | Apology option | Number of choice |
|---------|----------------------|------------------|
| Options | with non-explanation | 64 (18.3%) |
| Options | with explanation | 286 (81.7%) |
| Total | | 350 (100.0%) |

The result was as expected since a number of previous studies of apology in Koreans (Kim, Y., 1999; Park, 2005; Jeon, 2006; Lee, H., 2007; Ahn, 2011) had already indicated the similar findings that Koreans used explanations quite often in their apology, which was not shown in other ethnic groups under the CCSARP.

As shown in Table 1, only 64 apology options with non-explanation (18.3%) were chosen by the respondents as their preference. Interestingly, gender differences were found in the choice of these apology options. Of the total 64 options with non-explanation, men preferred this option more than women (57.8% vs. 42.2%), as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Crosstabs of gender and non-explanation reason

| Non-explanation | | | Reason | | | Total |
|-----------------|-------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | | Explanation seems excuse | The other is likely to understand | There is no need to explain | |
| gender | Men | Frequency | 22 | 14 | 1 | 37 |
| | | % of gender | 59.5% | 37.8% | 2.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 66.7% | 48.3% | 50.0% | 57.8% |
| | Women | Frequency | 11 | 15 | 1 | 27 |
| | | % of gender | 40.7% | 55.6% | 3.7% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 33.3% | 51.7% | 50.0% | 42.2% |
| Total | | Frequency | 33 | 29 | 2 | 64 |
| | | % of gender | 51.6% | 45.3% | 3.1% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

In Table 2, the major reasons why the respondents selected the explanation apology options rather than non-explanation options were indicated in the following. The foremost reason was that an explanation seemed like an excuse so that they didn't use it when making an apology (51.6%). The other reason was that the other person (i.e., an apologizee) was likely to understand their apology without any explanation (45.3%) and there was no need to explain in apology at all (only 3.1%). Interestingly, men related their no use of explanations in apology more to excuse than women (59.5% vs. 40.7%), whereas women more to understanding without explanations than men (55.6% vs. 37.8%). The

tendency of men was also revealed in their scant use of making an excuse in apology with explanations (only 2.3%), compared with women’s 3.8%, as shown in Table 4.

Respondents in the study were divided into four age groups; 20s, 30s, 40s, and 50s. Among the 64 apology options with non-explanation the respondents selected, 18 (28.2%) were taken by 20s, 16 (25.0%) by 30s, 15 (23.4%) by 40s, and 15 (23.4%) by 50s, which was well distributed in age groups, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Crosstabs of age group and non-explanation reason

| Non-explanation | | | Reason | | | Total |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| | | | Explanation seems excuse | The other is likely to understand | There is no need to explain | |
| Age group | 20s | Frequency | 14 | 3 | 1 | 18 |
| | | % of age group | 77.8% | 16.7% | 5.5% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 42.4% | 10.4% | 50.0% | 28.2% |
| | 30s | Frequency | 8 | 7 | 1 | 16 |
| | | % of age group | 50.0% | 43.7% | 6.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 24.2% | 24.1% | 50.0% | 25.0% |
| | 40s | Frequency | 6 | 9 | 0 | 15 |
| | | % of age group | 40.0% | 60.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 18.2% | 31.0% | 0.0% | 23.4% |
| | 50s | Frequency | 5 | 10 | 0 | 15 |
| | | % of age group | 33.3% | 66.7% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 15.2% | 34.5% | 0.0% | 23.4% |
| Total | Frequency | 33 | 29 | 2 | 64 | |
| | % of age group | 51.6% | 45.3% | 3.1% | 100.0% | |
| | % of reason | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

Age group differences in the major reasons of taking apology options without an explanation were also shown in Table 3. The younger the age group the more they selected the reason that an explanation seemed like an excuse; 77.8% by 20s, 50.0% by 30s, 40.0% by 40s, and 33.3% by 50s. That is, compared with the elders, the younger people didn’t like explaining in apology.

Interestingly, another age group difference was found in the opposite direction. The younger the age group the less they thought the others were likely to understand the apology with non-explanation; 16.7% by 20s, 43.7% by 30s, 60.0% by 40s, and 66.7% by 50s. In other words, the elder people were more likely to think the others understood them although there was no explanation in apology.

As expected, most of the respondents in the study selected the apology options with explanations as their preference (81.7%), as indicated in Table 1. Gender differences were also found in their choice of the options. Of the total 286 apology options with explanations, 156 options (54.5%) were taken by women, which is higher than men’s (130 options, 45.5%), as shown in Table 4. This means that women were more prone to explain when making an apology than men.

Table 4. Crosstabs of gender and explanation reason

| Explanation | | | Reason | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------|------------------------|
| | | | Make oneself understood | Polite | Right thing | Make apology truthful | Express sorriness | Not hurt other’s feeling | Make excuse | | Better than other ways |
| gender | Men | Frequency | 52 | 25 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 130 |
| | | % of gender | 40.0% | 19.2% | 15.4% | 9.2% | 3.9% | 5.4% | 2.3% | 4.6% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 38.2% | 61.0% | 57.1% | 46.2% | 27.8% | 53.8% | 33.3% | 75.0% | 45.5% |
| | Women | Frequency | 84 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 156 |
| | | % of gender | 53.9% | 10.3% | 9.6% | 9.0% | 8.3% | 3.8% | 3.8% | 1.3% | 100.0% |
| | | % of reason | 61.8% | 39.0% | 42.9% | 53.8% | 72.2% | 46.2% | 66.7% | 25.0% | 54.5% |
| Total | Frequency | 136 | 41 | 35 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 286 | |
| | % of gender | 47.6% | 14.3% | 12.2% | 9.1% | 6.3% | 4.5% | 3.2% | 2.8% | 100.0% | |
| | % of reason | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | |

The major reasons they used explanations when making an apology were diverse but could be grouped into a few categories like those in the pilot study, as shown in Table 4. The only difference from the pilot study was the addition of the category of "express sorriness" to the reasons in using explanations. This new category was seldomly found in 20s as shown in Table 5, which explains why this category was not found in the pilot study since the subjects in the pilot study were college students. Like the pilot study, with some modifications, the major reasons respondents used an explanation when making an apology were

in the following: 1) it made them understood to the others (47.6%), 2) it was a polite way (14.3%), 3) it was the right thing to do (12.2%), 4) it made the apology more truthful (9.1%), 5) it expressed sorriness to the others (6.3%), 6) it was used not to hurt the other's feeling (4.5%), 7) it was a way to making an excuse (3.2%), and 8) it was a better way than any other ways when making an apology (2.8%), as indicated in Table 4. The foremost reason they mentioned, which occupied almost half percent (47.6%) in the options, was that the explanation helped themselves to be understood to the others. It means that Koreans used explanations in apology in order to make things clear and avoid misunderstanding. Interestingly, the four major reasons (i.e., make oneself understood, polite, the right thing, and make the apology truthful) are the apologizer centered, while other remaining reasons such as express sorriness and not hurt other's feeling are the apologizee centered. It means that Koreans mostly made an apology in the ways that they expressed themselves to the others to their advantage. They did not explain much in apology to consider other's situation fully.

Sex differences were also found in the apology options with explanations, as shown in Table 4. Women were more active to make themselves understood (53.9% vs. 40.0%) and express their sorriness to the others than men (8.3% vs. 3.9%). Whereas men thought explaining in apology more polite (19.2% vs. 10.3%), the right thing to do (15.4% vs. 9.6%), and a better way than other ways than women (4.6% vs. 1.3%).

Among the 286 apology options with explanations the respondents selected, 80 (28.0%) were taken by 20s, 74 (25.9%) by 30s, 69 (24.1%) by 40s, and 63 (22.0%) by 50s, which was well distributed in age groups, as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5. Crosstabs of age group and explanation reason

| Explanation | | | Reason | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------|------------------------|
| | | | Make oneself understood | Polite | Right thing | Make apology truthful | Express sorriness | Not hurt other's feeling | Make excuse | | Better than other ways |
| Age group | 20s | Frequency | 43 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 80 |
| | | % of age group | 53.7% | 16.2% | 8.8% | 8.8% | 2.5% | 5.0% | 3.7% | 1.3% | 100.0% |
| | 30s | Frequency | 25 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 74 |
| | | % of age group | 33.8% | 13.5% | 27.0% | 9.5% | 4.0% | 6.8% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 100.0% |
| | 40s | Frequency | 35 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 69 |
| | | % of age group | 50.7% | 13.1% | 7.3% | 5.8% | 11.6% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 2.9% | 100.0% |
| | 50s | Frequency | 33 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 63 |
| | | % of age group | 52.4% | 14.3% | 4.8% | 12.7% | 7.9% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 4.7% | 100.0% |
| | Total | Frequency | 136 | 41 | 35 | 26 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 286 |
| | | % of age group | 47.6% | 14.3% | 12.2% | 9.1% | 6.3% | 4.5% | 3.2% | 2.8% | 100.0% |
| | | | % of reason | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Like sex differences in Table 4, age group differences in the major reasons of the respondent's taking apology options with explanations were clearly shown in Table 5. Compared with other age groups, the age group of 30s behaved quite differently. They made themselves understood to the others least (33.8%) but they thought explaining in apology the right thing to do most (27.0%) and they did it in order not to hurt the other's feeling most (6.8%). This age group's peculiarity might be attributed to their cautiousness towards the others as the beginners of social life, so that they would lower their voice and follow a certain social norm. Expressing sorriness to the others was found to be the most in the age group of 40s (11.6%) and explaining made the apology more truthful in the age group of 50s (12.7%). The older the age group the more they thought explaining in apology a better way than others (1.3% in 20s, 2.7% in 30s, 2.9% in 40s, and 4.7% in 50s).

5. Conclusion

A number of apology studies on Koreans demonstrated that they used explanations much more than other ethnic groups when making an apology. This seemingly unique feature of Korean's apology was confirmed by the findings in the present study because most of the subjects selected the apology options with explanations. For some scholars like Wolfson, et al. (1989), explanations are not an apology but an account if no offense was acknowledged. They were treated as an apology, however, in the present study because they were structured as such in the questionnaire, occurring with IFIDs. Thus it is an empirical question that explanations would also occur with IFIDs in Korean's apology in natural settings.

The foremost reason that Koreans used explanations in apology was found in the present study to make themselves understood to the others in order to make things clear and women and the youngest group of people were most sensitive to it. It is not enough for us to generalize these findings as an authentic apology behavior of Koreans, too, because of some methodological limitations on the study. Using only two apology situations in the questionnaire wouldn't suffice to make the findings generalized, so that adding more apology situations to the apology studies would be desirable for further studies. It is also evident and preferred that speech act studies must be done in natural settings if possible, not using questionnaire or survey, so that observations on explanations when making an apology in a natural speech context will be needed. Other sociopragmatic factors such as the subjects' job, income, resident area, social status, and educational levels would be included in further studies which might reveal other relations with their use of explanations in apology. To do a cross-cultural study, KFL (Korean as a foreign language) learners in Korea would be participated in further studies, too.

In sum, the present study contributes to the understanding on a Korean way of apologizing in examining and focusing on explanations in their apology in more details and comparing them with those of other ethnic groups as a cross-cultural study. It is expected that the present study may stimulate other areas of speech act studies such as requests, complaining, expressing gratitude, and corrections to elicit various cross-cultural studies in Koreans.

References

- Ahn, J. (2011). Cross-cultural variations of apology realization in Korean. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 19(2), 261-285.
- Barnlund, C., & Yoshioka, M. (1990). Apologies: Japanese and American styles. *Intercultural Relations*, 14, 193-206.
- Bergman, L., & Kasper, G. (1993). Perception and performance in native and nonnative apology. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 82-107). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: The case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113-134.
- Eom, K. (1994). *A comparative analysis of speech acts of English native speakers and Korean natives*. Unpublished master's thesis, Korea National University of Education, Cheongwon, Korea.
- Hong, S. (2003). *A study of teaching on Korean apology speech act*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kyung Hee University, Seoul, Korea.
- Jeon, J. (2006). A study on aspects of apologizing speech act. *Discourse and Cognition*, 13(3), 167-187.
- Kang, H. (2011). An analysis on politeness in Koreans' request realization. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 17(1), 53-80.
- Kim, H. (1997). Sociocultural competence and language transfer: The case of apology in Korean and English. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 5(2), 191-219.
- Kim, N. (2008). An assessment of the speech act of apology of Korean EFL learners. *The Jungang Journal of English Language and Literature*, 50(2), 45-73.
- Kim, Y. (1999). *A study on the speech acts of apology of Korean high school English learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea.
- Lee, H. (2007). *Research of apology speech acts through protocol analysis - with Japanese who learned to speak Korean language*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea.
- Lee, Y. (2008). *A study on apology speech act in Korean*. Unpublished master's thesis. Inje University, Busan, Korea.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, &

- G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 155-173). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. D. (1983). Apology: A speech act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 18-36). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Park, E. (2005). *A comparison of apologetic speech acts between Korean and American speakers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chonnam University, Gwangju, Korea.
- Shim, J. (2009). A study of apology strategies between genders in EFL college students. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 15(2), 225-243.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in native/non-native. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 147-167.
- Vollmer, H., & Olshtain, E. (1989). The language of apologies in German. In S. Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 197-218). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Whang, H. (2009). *A study of Korean high school students' on English apology speech acts*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kangwon National University, Chuncheon, Korea.
- Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, H. Juliane, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Yang, T. (2000). *A Study of the speech acts of apology of Korean EFL learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, Korea University, Seoul, Korea.

Jeong Khn Ahn

Department of English

Chonbuk National University

Jeonju, Korea 561-756

Phone: 82-63-270-3213

Email: jkahn@jbnu.ac.kr

Received on July 10, 2012

Revised version received on August 30, 2012

Accepted on August 30, 2012