

UCLA-ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 1

Elementary Modern Korean I

Hangul, pronunciation, basic sentence structure, particles, polite speech, numbers, time, and daily interaction

How these notes are written. I wrote each chapter the way I wish the material had been explained the first time: the real idea, the point where I usually get stuck, the simplest mental model that still stays honest, and a worked decision instead of a polished answer appearing from nowhere. Every chapter closes with practice and a fully written solution. If a sentence sounds impressive but does not help me solve or explain something, it does not belong here.

Daniel Mastick

Curriculum map, working notes, practice, and solutions

Course map

Week	Core thread	What should be solid by the end
1	Hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Batchim and connected pronunciation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Basic word order and topic or subject particles	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	The copula, existence, and location	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Polite present–tense verbs and adjectives	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Questions, requests, and classroom interaction	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Native and Sino–Korean numbers, counters, dates, and time	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Daily routines, places, and integrated self–introduction	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
9	Integration studio	Combine several chapters in one case, preserve their assumptions, and reconcile the result across representations.
10	Cumulative review	Retrieve the full course map from memory and solve mixed problems without chapter labels.

Scope anchor: <https://catalog.registrar.ucla.edu/course/2025/KOREA1>. The sequence is aligned to the official catalog description and expanded into a practical ten–week study plan.

How I would use this packet

Treat each numbered section as one chapter. Read the formal explanation, pause at the student interpretation, and see whether the easy version still says the same thing. Rework the example without looking, then cover the solution in the chapter practice box. The cumulative set at the end is deliberately mixed: knowledge becomes durable when I have to choose the tool instead of being told which chapter I am in.

Contents

1	Hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks	5
1.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	5
1.2	Details I would refuse to skip	5
1.3	How this chapter connects	6
1.4	The full working model	6
2	Batchim and connected pronunciation	7
2.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	7
2.2	Details I would refuse to skip	8
2.3	How this chapter connects	8
2.4	The full working model	8
3	Basic word order and topic or subject particles	10
3.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	10
3.2	Details I would refuse to skip	10
3.3	How this chapter connects	11
3.4	The full working model	11
4	The copula, existence, and location	12
4.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	12
4.2	Details I would refuse to skip	13
4.3	How this chapter connects	13
4.4	The full working model	13
5	Polite present–tense verbs and adjectives	15
5.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	15
5.2	Details I would refuse to skip	15
5.3	How this chapter connects	16
5.4	The full working model	16
6	Questions, requests, and classroom interaction	17
6.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	18
6.2	Details I would refuse to skip	18
6.3	How this chapter connects	18

6.4	The full working model	19
7	Native and Sino-Korean numbers, counters, dates, and time	20
7.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	20
7.2	Details I would refuse to skip	21
7.3	How this chapter connects	21
7.4	The full working model	21
8	Daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction	23
8.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	23
8.2	Details I would refuse to skip	23
8.3	How this chapter connects	24
8.4	The full working model	24

CHAPTER 1 Hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks

The idea

Hangul combines consonant and vowel letters into square syllable blocks. Stroke order, vowel orientation, initial-null ㅇ, and sound rather than English-letter substitution build accurate decoding.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Hangul combines consonant and vowel letters into square syllable blocks. Stroke order, vowel orientation, initial-null ㅇ, and sound rather than English-letter substitution build accurate decoding. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from the course foundations to batchim and connected pronunciation. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Hangul combines consonant and vowel letters into square syllable blocks.
- **What moves.** Stroke order, vowel orientation, initial-null ㅇ, and sound rather than English-letter substitution build accurate decoding.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I read each block as onset plus vowel plus optional final, then blend it aloud instead of memorizing whole words as pictures.

The easy version

Hangul combines consonant and vowel letters into square syllable blocks.

Worked example

Question. Break 한 into its letters and sound structure.

Walkthrough. 한 contains ㅎ as onset, ㅏ as vowel, and ㄴ as final consonant. Together they form one syllable block pronounced han.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Break 한 into its letters and sound structure.

Solution. 한 contains ㅎ as onset, ㅏ as vowel, and ㄴ as final consonant. Together they form one syllable block pronounced han.

Practice 2. Explain hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 2 Batchim and connected pronunciation

The idea

Final consonants collapse to a limited set of sounds and interact with the next syllable through resyllabification, nasalization, tensification, and aspiration. Spelling preserves morphology even when surface pronunciation changes.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Final consonants collapse to a limited set of sounds and interact with the next syllable through resyllabification, nasalization, tensification, and aspiration. Spelling preserves morphology even when surface pronunciation changes. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of batchim and connected pronunciation. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach batchim and connected pronunciation on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from hangul consonants, vowels, and syllable blocks to basic word order and topic or subject particles. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Final consonants collapse to a limited set of sounds and interact with the next syllable through resyllabification, nasalization, tensification, and aspiration.
- **What moves.** Spelling preserves morphology even when surface pronunciation changes.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply batchim and connected pronunciation to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I keep the written form and spoken form side by side; Korean pronunciation becomes logical when I watch the boundary between blocks.

The easy version

Final consonants collapse to a limited set of sounds and interact with the next syllable through resyllabification, nasalization, tensification, and aspiration.

Worked example

Question. Why is 한국어 commonly pronounced close to 한구거?

Walkthrough. The final ㄱ of 국 resyllabifies before the following vowel-initial 어, so it begins the next spoken syllable while the spelling remains 한국어.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Why is 한국어 commonly pronounced close to 한구거?

Solution. The final ㄱ of 국 resyllabifies before the following vowel-initial 어, so it begins the next spoken syllable while the spelling remains 한국어.

Practice 2. Explain batchim and connected pronunciation to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct batchim and connected pronunciation from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a batchim and connected pronunciation problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 3 Basic word order and topic or subject particles

The idea

Korean typically places predicates last and marks noun roles with particles. `은/는` frames a topic or contrast, while `이/가` identifies or focuses a subject; context often permits omitted nouns.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Korean typically places predicates last and marks noun roles with particles. `은/는` frames a topic or contrast, while `이/가` identifies or focuses a subject; context often permits omitted nouns. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of basic word order and topic or subject particles. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.

- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach basic word order and topic or subject particles on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from batchim and connected pronunciation to the copula, existence, and location. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Korean typically places predicates last and marks noun roles with particles.
- **What moves.** 은/는 frames a topic or contrast, while 이/가 identifies or focuses a subject; context often permits omitted nouns.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply basic word order and topic or subject particles to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I build from the predicate backward and use particles as role labels rather than forcing English order onto the sentence.

The easy version

Korean typically places predicates last and marks noun roles with particles.

Worked example

Question. Translate 'I am a student' politely with topic marking.

Walkthrough. 저는 학생이에요. 저는 marks 'as for me,' 학생 is student, and 이에요 is the polite copula after a consonant-final noun.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Translate 'I am a student' politely with topic marking.

Solution. 저는 학생이에요. 저는 marks 'as for me,' 학생 is student, and 이에요 is the polite copula after a consonant-final noun.

Practice 2. Explain basic word order and topic or subject particles to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct basic word order and topic or subject particles from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a basic word order and topic or subject particles problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 4 The copula, existence, and location**The idea**

이에요/예요 identifies nouns, while 있어요 and 없어요 express existence, possession, or presence. Location commonly uses 예 for where something exists and 에서 for where an action happens.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: 이에요/예요 identifies nouns, while 있어요 and 없어요 express existence, possession, or presence. Location commonly uses 예 for where something exists and 에서 for where an action happens. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and

explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of the copula, existence, and location. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach the copula, existence, and location on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from basic word order and topic or subject particles to polite present-tense verbs and adjectives. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** 이에요/예요 identifies nouns, while 있어요 and 없어요 express existence, possession, or presence.

- **What moves.** Location commonly uses **에** for where something exists and **에서** for where an action happens.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply the copula, existence, and location to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I separate being something from something existing somewhere; English uses 'is' for both, but Korean does not.

The easy version

이에요/예요 identifies nouns, while **있어요** and **없어요** express existence, possession, or presence.

Worked example

Question. How do I say 'The book is on the desk'?

Walkthrough. 책이 책상 위에 있어요. 이 marks the book as subject, 위에 gives the location, and 있어요 states existence.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. How do I say 'The book is on the desk'?

Solution. 책이 책상 위에 있어요. 이 marks the book as subject, 위에 gives the location, and 있어요 states existence.

Practice 2. Explain the copula, existence, and location to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct the copula, existence, and location from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a the copula, existence, and

location problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 5 Polite present–tense verbs and adjectives

The idea

Dictionary stems combine with 아요/어요/해요 according to the stem vowel and 하다 pattern. Korean descriptive verbs conjugate as predicates without an extra word meaning 'to be'; negation uses 안 or -지 않아요.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Dictionary stems combine with 아요/어요/해요 according to the stem vowel and 하다 pattern. Korean descriptive verbs conjugate as predicates without an extra word meaning 'to be'; negation uses 안 or -지 않아요. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of polite present–tense verbs and adjectives. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.

- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach polite present-tense verbs and adjectives on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from the copula, existence, and location to questions, requests, and classroom interaction. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Dictionary stems combine with 아요/어요/해요 according to the stem vowel and 하다 pattern.
- **What moves.** Korean descriptive verbs conjugate as predicates without an extra word meaning 'to be'; negation uses 안 or -지 않아요.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply polite present-tense verbs and adjectives to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I learn the dictionary form, stem, and one polite form together so conjugation stays connected to meaning.

The easy version

Dictionary stems combine with 아요/어요/해요 according to the stem vowel and 하다 pattern.

Worked example

Question. Conjugate 먹다 and 공부하다 in polite present style.

Walkthrough. 먹다 becomes 먹어요 because the stem vowel is not ㅏ or ㅑ. 공부하다 becomes

공부해요 through 하여요 contraction.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Conjugate 먹다 and 공부하다 in polite present style.

Solution. 먹다 becomes 먹어요 because the stem vowel is not ㅏ or ㅑ. 공부하다 becomes 공부해요 through 하여요 contraction.

Practice 2. Explain polite present-tense verbs and adjectives to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct polite present-tense verbs and adjectives from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a polite present-tense verbs and adjectives problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 6 Questions, requests, and classroom interaction

The idea

Polite questions often share statement word order and use intonation or question words such as 뭐, 어디, 누구, 언제, and 왜. 주세요 requests a noun or action; repetition and clarification phrases keep interaction moving.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Polite questions often share statement word order and use intonation or question words such as **뭐**, **어디**, **누구**, **언제**, and **왜**. **주세요** requests a noun or action; repetition and clarification phrases keep interaction moving. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of questions, requests, and classroom interaction. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach questions, requests, and classroom interaction on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from polite present-tense verbs and adjectives to native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its

name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Polite questions often share statement word order and use intonation or question words such as 뭐, 어디, 누구, 언제, and 왜.
- **What moves.** 주세요 requests a noun or action; repetition and clarification phrases keep interaction moving.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply questions, requests, and classroom interaction to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I practice the rescue phrases early because real conversation depends on recovering when I miss something.

The easy version

Polite questions often share statement word order and use intonation or question words such as 뭐, 어디, 누구, 언제, and 왜.

Worked example

Question. How do I ask 'What is this?' politely?

Walkthrough. 이게 뭐예요? 이게 is a conversational contraction of 이것이, 뭐 is what, and 예요 is the polite copula.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. How do I ask 'What is this?' politely?

Solution. 이게 뭐예요? 이게 is a conversational contraction of 이것이, 뭐 is what, and 예요 is the polite copula.

Practice 2. Explain questions, requests, and classroom interaction to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct questions, requests, and classroom interaction from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.
Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a questions, requests, and classroom interaction problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 7 Native and Sino-Korean numbers, counters, dates, and time

The idea

Korean uses native numbers with many counters and hours, while Sino-Korean numbers commonly express dates, minutes, prices, phone numbers, and mathematics. Several native forms contract before counters.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Korean uses native numbers with many counters and hours, while Sino-Korean numbers commonly express dates, minutes, prices, phone numbers, and mathematics. Several native forms contract before counters. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from questions, requests, and classroom interaction to daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Korean uses native numbers with many counters and hours, while Sino-Korean numbers commonly express dates, minutes, prices, phone numbers, and mathematics.
- **What moves.** Several native forms contract before counters.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I attach numbers to the thing they count; isolated number lists do not teach me which system the sentence needs.

The easy version

Korean uses native numbers with many counters and hours, while Sino-Korean numbers commonly express dates, minutes, prices, phone numbers, and mathematics.

Worked example

Question. Say 'three people' and '3:20'.

Walkthrough. Three people is 세 명 using native Korean and the person counter. 3:20 is 세 시 이십 분: native Korean for the hour and Sino-Korean for minutes.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Say 'three people' and '3:20'.

Solution. Three people is 세 명 using native Korean and the person counter. 3:20 is 세 시 이십 분: native Korean for the hour and Sino-Korean for minutes.

Practice 2. Explain native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

CHAPTER 8 Daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction

The idea

Vocabulary for family, school, food, transportation, places, and routines becomes usable through particles 예, 에서, 을/를, 도, 와/과, and 하고. A complete beginner exchange combines greeting, identity, possession, time, destination, and action.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Vocabulary for family, school, food, transportation, places, and routines becomes usable through particles 예, 에서, 을/를, 도, 와/과, and 하고. A complete beginner exchange combines greeting, identity, possession, time, destination, and action. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction. List the known quantities, the unknown, the units or types, and any hidden constraint.
2. **Choose.** State the theorem, model, algorithm, accounting rule, or physical law before substituting values. This is where I make the assumption visible.
3. **Execute.** Work one justified step at a time and keep intermediate state readable enough that I can audit it later.
4. **Verify.** Check a boundary case, sign, unit, invariant, order of magnitude, or alternative derivation. Then translate the result back into an ordinary sentence.

Details I would refuse to skip

- **Definitions:** I should be able to define every technical noun in the chapter without using that same noun in the definition.
- **Assumptions:** I write the condition that makes the method legal beside the method itself. A correct procedure under the wrong assumptions is still a wrong answer.
- **Representation:** I move freely among words, equations or code, a diagram, and a small numerical example. If one representation disagrees with another, that disagreement is useful evidence.
- **Failure modes:** I keep the nearest counterexample in mind: the boundary where the rule changes, the invariant breaks, or the model stops matching reality.
- **Communication:** My final answer names what the result means and what it does not establish. I do not let notation do the explanatory work for me.

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction on a blank page, derive or reconstruct its main rule, work a fresh example, and diagnose a deliberately broken solution? If I can only recognize the finished work, I am not done.

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from native and sino-korean numbers, counters, dates, and time to the cumulative course model. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Vocabulary for family, school, food, transportation, places, and routines becomes usable through particles 에, 에서, 을/를, 도, 와/과, and 하고.
- **What moves.** A complete beginner exchange combines greeting, identity, possession, time, destination, and action.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I build one small truthful story about my own day and recycle its grammar until it comes out without translation.

The easy version

Vocabulary for family, school, food, transportation, places, and routines becomes usable through particles 에, 에서, 을/를, 도, 와/과, and 하고.

Worked example

Question. Write 'I study Korean at school too.'

Walkthrough. 저도 학교에서 한국어를 공부해요. 도 adds 'also' to the subject, 에서 marks the action location, 를 marks the object, and 공부해요 closes the sentence.

Common miss

The fastest way to get this chapter wrong is to use the visible procedure without naming its assumption, units, time period, reference group, or boundary. I put that condition beside the work and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Write 'I study Korean at school too.'

Solution. 저도 학교에서 한국어를 공부해요. 도 adds 'also' to the subject, 에서 marks the action location, 를 marks the object, and 공부해요 closes the sentence.

Practice 2. Explain daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

Solution. Begin with the core claim above, use the worked case as the concrete example, state the condition highlighted by the warning, and choose a failure where that condition does not hold. A complete explanation connects all four pieces instead of listing them.

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

Solution. Start from the blue idea box, but rewrite it in my own words. Identify the objects and state, name the rule before using it, copy the relevant assumption from the details audit, and choose a boundary where that assumption becomes equality or fails. A complete solution explains why each part belongs; a list of vocabulary is not enough.

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a daily routines, places, and integrated self-introduction problem but never states a model or checks the result. Write the shortest useful review of that solution.

Solution. I would ask four concrete questions: What exactly are the inputs and desired output? Which rule licenses the main step? Which assumption could invalidate it? Which independent check supports the conclusion? If the answer cannot survive those four questions, I treat the numerical or verbal result as unverified.

Cumulative study plan

I use this packet in three passes. First I reconstruct each model and work its examples without looking. Second I mix chapters so the tool is no longer named for me. Third I explain a complete case aloud, including assumptions, units, uncertainty, failure modes, and what evidence would change my conclusion.