

UCLA-ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 2

Elementary Modern Korean II

Tense, intention, honorifics, irregular forms, connectors, requests, comparison, and everyday transactions

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	Past events and sequencing a narrative	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Future plans, intention, and probability	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	Irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Comparison, ability, experience, and preference	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving	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/KOREA2>. 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	Past events and sequencing a narrative	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	Future plans, intention, and probability	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	Honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary	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	Irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation	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	Connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence	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	Requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation	17
6.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	17
6.2	Details I would refuse to skip	18
6.3	How this chapter connects	18

6.4	The full working model	18
7	Comparison, ability, experience, and preference	20
7.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	20
7.2	Details I would refuse to skip	20
7.3	How this chapter connects	21
7.4	The full working model	21
8	Shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving	22
8.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	22
8.2	Details I would refuse to skip	23
8.3	How this chapter connects	23
8.4	The full working model	24

CHAPTER 1 Past events and sequencing a narrative

The idea

The polite past uses **았/었/했어요**, with time expressions and connectors organizing events. Korean often omits repeated subjects when context is clear, so tense and sequence carry the narrative.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: The polite past uses **았/었/했어요**, with time expressions and connectors organizing events. Korean often omits repeated subjects when context is clear, so tense and sequence carry the narrative. 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 past events and sequencing a narrative. 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 past events and sequencing a narrative 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 future plans, intention, and probability. 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.** The polite past uses **왔/있/했어요**, with time expressions and connectors organizing events.
- **What moves.** Korean often omits repeated subjects when context is clear, so tense and sequence carry the narrative.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply past events and sequencing a narrative 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 tell yesterday's story as a chain of actions instead of translating every English pronoun.

The easy version

The polite past uses **왔/있/했어요**, with time expressions and connectors organizing events.

Worked example

Question. Change **가요** and **먹어요** to polite past.

Walkthrough. **가요** becomes **갔어요** from **가+았어요**. **먹어요** becomes **먹었어요** from **먹+었어요**.

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. Change 가요 and 먹어요 to polite past.

Solution. 가요 becomes 갔어요 from 가+았어요. 먹어요 becomes 먹었어요 from 먹+었어요.

Practice 2. Explain past events and sequencing a narrative 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 past events and sequencing a narrative 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 past events and sequencing a narrative 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 Future plans, intention, and probability

The idea

-(으)ㄹ 거예요 expresses plans or predictions, while -(으)려고 해요 foregrounds intention and -(으)ㄹ까요 proposes or wonders. Context separates scheduled plans from uncertain forecasts.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -(으)ㄹ 거예요 expresses plans or predictions, while -(으)려고 해요 foregrounds intention and -(으)ㄹ까요 proposes or wonders. Context separates scheduled plans from uncertain forecasts. 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 future plans, intention, and probability. 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 future plans, intention, and probability 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 past events and sequencing a narrative to honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary. 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.** -(으)ㄴ 거예요 expresses plans or predictions, while -(으)려고 해요 foregrounds intention and -(으)ㄴ 까요 proposes or wonders.
- **What moves.** Context separates scheduled plans from uncertain forecasts.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply future plans, intention, and probability 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 choose the ending by what I am doing socially: informing a plan, showing intention, or inviting a decision.

The easy version

-(으)ㄹ 거예요 expresses plans or predictions, while -(으)려고 해요 foregrounds intention and -(으)ㄹ까요 proposes or wonders.

Worked example

Question. Say 'I plan to study this weekend.'

Walkthrough. 이번 주말에 공부할 거예요. 공부하다 takes 할 거예요 because the stem ends in a vowel.

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 'I plan to study this weekend.'

Solution. 이번 주말에 공부할 거예요. 공부하다 takes 할 거예요 because the stem ends in a vowel.

Practice 2. Explain future plans, intention, and probability 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 future plans, intention, and probability 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 future plans, intention, and probability 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 Honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary

The idea

The marker -(으)시- honors the sentence subject, while titles, 님, kinship terms, and special verbs such as 계시다 and 드시다 encode relationships. Humble 저 and 드리다 lower the speaker or action appropriately.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: The marker -(으)시- honors the sentence subject, while titles, 님, kinship terms, and special verbs such as 계시다 and 드시다 encode relationships. Humble 저 and 드리다 lower the speaker or action appropriately. 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 honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary. 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 honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary 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 future plans, intention, and probability to irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation. 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.** The marker -(으)시- honors the sentence subject, while titles, 님, kinship terms, and special verbs such as 계시다 and 드시다 encode relationships.
- **What moves.** Humble 저 and 드리다 lower the speaker or action appropriately.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary 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

Politeness is not one suffix; I check whom the sentence honors, whom I am speaking to, and the setting.

The easy version

The marker -(으)시- honors the sentence subject, while titles, 님, kinship terms, and special verbs such as 계시다 and 드시다 encode relationships.

Worked example

Question. Ask politely and honorifically whether a professor is present.

Walkthrough. 교수님이 계세요? 교수님 names the respected person and 계세요 is the honorific existence verb.

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. Ask politely and honorifically whether a professor is present.

Solution. 교수님이 계세요? 교수님 names the respected person and 계세요 is the honorific existence verb.

Practice 2. Explain honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary 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 honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary 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 honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary 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 Irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation

The idea

Common ㄷ, ㅂ, ㄹ, ㅅ, ㅇ, and ㅎ irregulars change stems before vowel-initial endings. The pattern is morphological rather than random, but not every verb with the letter is irregular.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Common ㄷ, ㅂ, ㄹ, ㅅ, ㅇ, and ㅎ irregulars change stems before vowel-initial endings. The pattern is morphological rather than random, but not every verb with the letter is irregular. 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 irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation.

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 irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation 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 honorific subjects and respectful vocabulary to connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence. 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.** Common ㄷ, ㅂ, ㄹ, ㅅ, ㅇ, and ㅎ irregulars change stems before vowel-initial endings.
- **What moves.** The pattern is morphological rather than random, but not every verb with the letter is irregular.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation 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 group irregulars by the change they make and keep a regular counterexample nearby.

The easy version

Common ㄷ, ㅂ, ㄹ, ㅅ, ㅇ, and ㅎ irregulars change stems before vowel-initial endings.

Worked example

Question. Conjugate 듣다 and 돕다 with 아요/어요.

Walkthrough. 듣다 becomes 들어요 as ㄷ changes to ㄹ before the vowel. 돕다 becomes 도와요 as ㅂ changes and combines with 아요.

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 듣다 and 돕다 with 아요/어요.

Solution. 듣다 becomes 들어요 as ㄷ changes to ㄹ before the vowel. 돕다 becomes 도와요 as ㅂ changes and combines with 아요.

Practice 2. Explain irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation 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 irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation 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 irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation 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 Connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence

The idea

–고 joins events or properties, –아/어서 gives sequence or reason, –(으)니까 presents a reason often supporting a command, and –지만 marks contrast. Connector choice communicates logic and discourse stance.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: –고 joins events or properties, –아/어서 gives sequence or reason, –(으)니까 presents a reason often supporting a command, and –지만 marks contrast. Connector choice communicates logic and discourse stance. 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 connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence. 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 connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence 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 irregular verbs and sound-driven conjugation to requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation. 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.** -고 joins events or properties, -아/어서 gives sequence or reason, -(으)니까 presents a reason often supporting a command, and -지만 marks contrast.
- **What moves.** Connector choice communicates logic and discourse stance.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence 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 ask what relationship the listener needs between clauses instead of using 그리고 for everything.

The easy version

-고 joins events or properties, -아/어서 gives sequence or reason, -(으)니까 presents a reason often supporting a command, and -지만 marks contrast.

Worked example

Question. Combine 'It is raining' and 'I will take an umbrella' with a reason.

Walkthrough. 비가 오니까 우산을 가져갈 거예요. -(으)니까 makes the rain the reason for the planned action.

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. Combine 'It is raining' and 'I will take an umbrella' with a reason.

Solution. 비가 오니까 우산을 가져갈 거예요. -(으)니까 makes the rain the reason for the planned action.

Practice 2. Explain connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence 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 connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence 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 connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence 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 Requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation

The idea

-아/어 주세요 requests an action, -아/어도 돼요 asks or grants permission, -(으)면 안 돼요 prohibits, and -아/어야 해요 marks necessity. Softening and context determine how forceful a sentence feels.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -아/어 주세요 requests an action, -아/어도 돼요 asks or grants permission, -(으)면 안 돼요 prohibits, and -아/어야 해요 marks necessity. Softening and context determine how forceful a sentence feels. 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 requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation. 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 requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation 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 connecting reasons, contrast, and sequence to comparison, ability, experience, and preference. 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.** -아/어 주세요 requests an action, -아/어도 돼요 asks or grants permission, -(으)면 안 돼요 prohibits, and -아/어야 해요 marks necessity.
- **What moves.** Softening and context determine how forceful a sentence feels.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation 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 these as social moves with tone and context, not just grammar substitutions.

The easy version

-아/어 주세요 requests an action, -아/어도 돼요 asks or grants permission, -(으)면 안 돼요 prohibits, and -아/어야 해요 marks necessity.

Worked example

Question. How do I ask 'May I sit here?'

Walkthrough. 여기 앉아도 돼요? The -아/어도 돼요 pattern asks whether the action is acceptable.

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 'May I sit here?'

Solution. 여기 앉아도 돼요? The -아/어도 돼요 pattern asks whether the action is acceptable.

Practice 2. Explain requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation 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 requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation 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 requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation 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 Comparison, ability, experience, and preference

The idea

보다 and 더 compare, 제일 marks a superlative, -(으)ㄴ 수 있다 expresses ability or possibility, and -아/어 본 적이 있다 expresses experience. 좋아하다 takes an object, while 좋다 describes something as good or liked.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: 보다 and 더 compare, 제일 marks a superlative, -(으)ㄴ 수 있다 expresses ability or possibility, and -아/어 본 적이 있다 expresses experience. 좋아하다 takes an object, while 좋다 describes something as good or liked. 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 comparison, ability, experience, and preference. 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 comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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 requests, permission, prohibition, and obligation to shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving. 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.** 보다 and 더 compare, 제일 marks a superlative, -(으)ㄴ 수 있다 expresses ability or possibility, and -아/어 본 적이 있다 expresses experience.
- **What moves.** 좋아하다 takes an object, while 좋다 describes something as good or liked.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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 comparisons from real preferences so the particles and word order have a reason to stick.

The easy version

보다 and 더 compare, 제일 marks a superlative, -(으)ㄴ 수 있다 expresses ability or possibility, and -아/어 본 적이 있다 expresses experience.

Worked example

Question. Say 'I have eaten Korean food before.'

Walkthrough. 한국 음식을 먹어 본 적이 있어요. 먹어 보다 expresses trying the action, and 본 적이 있어요 states prior experience.

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 'I have eaten Korean food before.'

Solution. 한국 음식을 먹어 본 적이 있어요. 먹어 보다 expresses trying the action, and 본 적이 있어요 states prior experience.

Practice 2. Explain comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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 comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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 comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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 Shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving

The idea

Counters, prices, quantities, destinations, directions, requests, and service vocabulary combine in practical exchanges. Clarification, alternatives, and repair strategies matter as much as the ideal scripted sentence.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Counters, prices, quantities, destinations, directions, requests, and service vocabulary combine in practical exchanges. Clarification, alternatives, and repair strategies matter as much as the ideal scripted sentence. 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 shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving. 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 shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving 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 comparison, ability, experience, and preference 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.** Counters, prices, quantities, destinations, directions, requests, and service vocabulary combine in practical exchanges.
- **What moves.** Clarification, alternatives, and repair strategies matter as much as the ideal scripted sentence.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving 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

My goal is to finish the interaction even when I forget one word, so I practice pointing, describing, and asking again.

The easy version

Counters, prices, quantities, destinations, directions, requests, and service vocabulary combine in practical exchanges.

Worked example

Question. Ask for two coffees and say one should be decaf.

Walkthrough. 커피 두 잔 주세요. 한 잔은 디카페인으로 주세요. 잔 counts cups, 은 contrasts one of them, and 으로 marks the requested form.

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. Ask for two coffees and say one should be decaf.

Solution. 커피 두 잔 주세요. 한 잔은 디카페인으로 주세요. 잔 counts cups, 은 contrasts one of them, and 으로 marks the requested form.

Practice 2. Explain shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving 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 shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving 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 shopping, dining, transportation, and problem solving 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.