UCLA–ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 4

Intermediate Modern Korean I

Intermediate syntax, nominalization, quotation, discourse nuance, reading, conversation, and composition

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	Intermediate review through sentence architecture	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Nominalization and abstract expression	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	Background, contrast, and discourse connectors	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Honorific and pragmatic nuance in real interaction	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Reading narratives and personal essays	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Paragraph composition and revision	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency	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/KOREA4. 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

CHAPTER 1 Intermediate review through sentence architecture

The idea

Intermediate Korean consolidates particles, tense, honorifics, modifiers, connectors, and endings into longer predicate-final sentences. Clause boundaries and information structure matter more than isolated grammar recognition.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Intermediate Korean consolidates particles, tense, honorifics, modifiers, connectors, and endings into longer predicate-final sentences. Clause boundaries and information structure matter more than isolated grammar recognition. 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 intermediate review through sentence architecture. 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 intermediate review through sentence architecture 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 nominalization and abstract expression. 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.** Intermediate Korean consolidates particles, tense, honorifics, modifiers, connectors, and endings into longer predicate-final sentences.
- **What moves.** Clause boundaries and information structure matter more than isolated grammar recognition.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply intermediate review through sentence architecture 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 bracket each clause and circle its final predicate; long sentences become several smaller relationships instead of one wall.

The easy version

Intermediate Korean consolidates particles, tense, honorifics, modifiers, connectors, and endings into longer predicate-final sentences.

Worked example

Question. How should I parse a sentence with two modifiers before the final noun?
Walkthrough. Identify the head noun, attach each preceding modifier by its ending and meaning, then place the whole noun phrase into the main clause before interpreting the final predicate.

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 should I parse a sentence with two modifiers before the final noun?
Solution. Identify the head noun, attach each preceding modifier by its ending and meaning, then place the whole noun phrase into the main clause before interpreting the final predicate.

Practice 2. Explain intermediate review through sentence architecture 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 intermediate review through sentence architecture 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 intermediate review through sentence architecture 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 Nominalization and abstract expression

The idea

-기 turns actions into event-like nouns, while -(으)ㅁ often creates formal or fact-like nominalizations. 것 constructions express facts, habits, plans, or emphatic explanations; particles then assign the nominalized clause a role.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -기 turns actions into event-like nouns, while -(으)ㅁ often creates formal or fact-like nominalizations. 것 constructions express facts, habits, plans, or emphatic explanations; particles then assign the nominalized clause a role. 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 nominalization and abstract expression. 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 nominalization and abstract expression 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 intermediate review through sentence architecture to expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint. 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.** -기 turns actions into event-like nouns, while -(으)ㅁ often creates formal or fact-like nominalizations.
- **What moves.** 것 constructions express facts, habits, plans, or emphatic explanations; particles then

assign the nominalized clause a role.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply nominalization and abstract expression 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

Nominalization lets me discuss an action as an idea, subject, or object instead of forcing two separate sentences.

The easy version

-기 turns actions into event-like nouns, while -(으)ㅁ often creates formal or fact-like nominalizations.

Worked example

Question. Translate 'Learning Korean is interesting.'
Walkthrough. 한국어를 배우는 것이 재미있어요. The modifier 배우는 describes 것, which becomes the subject through 이.

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 'Learning Korean is interesting.'
Solution. 한국어를 배우는 것이 재미있어요. The modifier 배우는 describes 것, which becomes the subject through 이.

Practice 2. Explain nominalization and abstract expression 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 nominalization and abstract expression 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 nominalization and abstract

expression 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 Expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint

The idea

Direct and indirect quotation preserve different voices. -다고 들었다 reports hearsay, -다는 marks quoted content modifying a noun, and tense or deictic words shift with the reporting viewpoint.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Direct and indirect quotation preserve different voices. -다고 들었다 reports hearsay, -다는 marks quoted content modifying a noun, and tense or deictic words shift with the reporting viewpoint. 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 expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint. 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 expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint 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 nominalization and abstract expression to background, contrast, and discourse connectors. 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.** Direct and indirect quotation preserve different voices.
- **What moves.** -다고 들었다 reports hearsay, -다는 marks quoted content modifying a noun, and tense or deictic words shift with the reporting viewpoint.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint 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 track whose perspective controls words like here, tomorrow, and I before I convert a quote.

The easy version

Direct and indirect quotation preserve different voices.

Worked example

Question. Report 'I heard that the exam was postponed.'
Walkthrough. 시험이 연기되었다고 들었어요. The past passive content is embedded with -다고 and 들었어요 marks hearsay.

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. Report 'I heard that the exam was postponed.'
Solution. 시험이 연기되었다고 들었어요. The past passive content is embedded with -다고 and 들었어요 marks hearsay.

Practice 2. Explain expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint 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 expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint 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 expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint 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 Background, contrast, and discourse connectors

The idea

-는데/-(으)ㄴ데 frames background, contrast, or a softened lead-in; -더라도 concedes strongly; 반면에 and 한편 organize formal comparison. Connector choice controls emphasis across paragraphs.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -는데/-(으)ㄴ데 frames background, contrast, or a softened lead-in; -더라도 concedes strongly; 반면에 and 한편 organize formal comparison. Connector choice controls emphasis across paragraphs. 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 background, contrast, and discourse connectors. 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 background, contrast, and discourse connectors 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 expanded quotation, hearsay, and viewpoint to honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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.** -는데/-(으)ㄴ데 frames background, contrast, or a softened lead-in; -더라도 concedes strongly; 반면에 and 한편 organize formal comparison.
- **What moves.** Connector choice controls emphasis across paragraphs.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply background, contrast, and discourse connectors 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 connectors for the relationship I want the reader to infer, not because several English translations all say 'but.'

The easy version

-는데/-(으)ㄴ데 frames background, contrast, or a softened lead-in; -더라도 concedes strongly; 반면에 and 한편 organize formal comparison.

Worked example

Question. How can -는데 soften a request?
Walkthrough. It supplies relevant background and leaves space for the listener to respond, as in 질문이 있는데요, 'I have a question...' rather than issuing the request abruptly.

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 can -는데 soften a request?
Solution. It supplies relevant background and leaves space for the listener to respond, as in 질문이 있는데요, 'I have a question...' rather than issuing the request abruptly.

Practice 2. Explain background, contrast, and discourse connectors 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 background, contrast, and discourse connectors 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 background, contrast, and discourse connectors 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 Honorific and pragmatic nuance in real interaction

The idea

Honorific agreement, titles, indirect requests, sentence endings, turn-taking, and institutional roles shape Korean interaction. Overusing honorific forms can sound distant or structurally wrong when the honored person is not the subject.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Honorific agreement, titles, indirect requests, sentence endings, turn-taking, and institutional roles shape Korean interaction. Overusing honorific forms can sound distant or structurally wrong when the honored person is not the subject. 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 and pragmatic nuance in real 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 honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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 background, contrast, and discourse connectors to reading narratives and personal essays. 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.** Honorific agreement, titles, indirect requests, sentence endings, turn-taking, and institutional roles shape Korean interaction.
- **What moves.** Overusing honorific forms can sound distant or structurally wrong when the honored person is not the subject.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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 identify the honored participant and the listener separately, then choose vocabulary and ending.

The easy version

Honorific agreement, titles, indirect requests, sentence endings, turn-taking, and institutional roles shape Korean interaction.

Worked example

Question. Why is 선생님께서 책을 드렸어요 potentially odd if the teacher gave a book to me?
Walkthrough. 드리다 humbles the giver toward a respected recipient, but the honored teacher is the giver. 주셨어요 better honors the teacher as subject.

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 선생님께서 책을 드렸어요 potentially odd if the teacher gave a book to me?
Solution. 드리다 humbles the giver toward a respected recipient, but the honored teacher is the giver. 주셨어요 better honors the teacher as subject.

Practice 2. Explain honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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 honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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 honorific and pragmatic nuance in real 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 6 Reading narratives and personal essays

The idea

Narratives organize orientation, complication, evaluation, and resolution through tense, viewpoint, ellipsis, imagery, and connective rhythm. Personal essays move between concrete experience and reflection rather than listing events.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Narratives organize orientation, complication, evaluation, and resolution through tense, viewpoint, ellipsis, imagery, and connective rhythm. Personal essays move between concrete experience and reflection rather than listing events. 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 reading narratives and personal essays. 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 reading narratives and personal essays 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 and pragmatic nuance in real interaction to paragraph composition and revision. 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.** Narratives organize orientation, complication, evaluation, and resolution through tense, viewpoint, ellipsis, imagery, and connective rhythm.
- **What moves.** Personal essays move between concrete experience and reflection rather than listing events.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply reading narratives and personal essays 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 underline the sentence where the writer tells me why the event mattered; that is often the essay's real center.

The easy version

Narratives organize orientation, complication, evaluation, and resolution through tense, viewpoint, ellipsis, imagery, and connective rhythm.

Worked example

Question. What is an evaluative sentence in a narrative?
Walkthrough. It explains significance, emotion, or stance, showing why the events are tellable rather than merely placing them in chronological order.

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. What is an evaluative sentence in a narrative?
Solution. It explains significance, emotion, or stance, showing why the events are tellable rather than merely placing them in chronological order.

Practice 2. Explain reading narratives and personal essays 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 reading narratives and personal essays 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 reading narratives and personal essays 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 Paragraph composition and revision

The idea

A Korean paragraph needs a controlling idea, coherent support, appropriate connectors, reference clarity, register consistency, and a purposeful final sentence. Revision separates content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and proofreading passes.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: A Korean paragraph needs a controlling idea, coherent support, appropriate connectors, reference clarity, register consistency, and a purposeful final sentence. Revision separates content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and proofreading passes. 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 paragraph composition and revision. 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 paragraph composition and revision 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 reading narratives and personal essays to conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency. 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.** A Korean paragraph needs a controlling idea, coherent support, appropriate connectors, reference clarity, register consistency, and a purposeful final sentence.
- **What moves.** Revision separates content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and proofreading

passes.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply paragraph composition and revision 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 revise once for the story and once for the Korean; trying to repair both at the same moment hides bigger problems.

The easy version

A Korean paragraph needs a controlling idea, coherent support, appropriate connectors, reference clarity, register consistency, and a purposeful final sentence.

Worked example

Question. How can a writer reduce repetitive 저는 at every sentence start?
Walkthrough. Maintain a clear topic and omit recoverable subjects, vary sentence openings with time or location phrases, and restate the noun only when reference could become ambiguous.

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 can a writer reduce repetitive 저는 at every sentence start?
Solution. Maintain a clear topic and omit recoverable subjects, vary sentence openings with time or location phrases, and restate the noun only when reference could become ambiguous.

Practice 2. Explain paragraph composition and revision 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 paragraph composition and revision 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 paragraph composition and

revision 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 Conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency

The idea

Intermediate performance combines listening for stance, asking follow-ups, paraphrasing unknown words, narrating, comparing, and presenting organized information. Fluency is controlled connection of known language, not maximal speed.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Intermediate performance combines listening for stance, asking follow-ups, paraphrasing unknown words, narrating, comparing, and presenting organized information. Fluency is controlled connection of known language, not maximal speed. 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 conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency. 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 conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency 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 paragraph composition and revision 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.** Intermediate performance combines listening for stance, asking follow-ups, paraphrasing unknown words, narrating, comparing, and presenting organized information.
- **What moves.** Fluency is controlled connection of known language, not maximal speed.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency 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 measure success by whether I can keep meaning moving and repair trouble, not by whether every ending was perfect.

The easy version

Intermediate performance combines listening for stance, asking follow-ups, paraphrasing unknown words, narrating, comparing, and presenting organized information.

Worked example

Question. What should a three-minute presentation include?
Walkthrough. A clear opening claim, two or three signposted points with examples, consistent polite register, a concise closing, and prepared language for clarification questions.

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. What should a three-minute presentation include?
Solution. A clear opening claim, two or three signposted points with examples, consistent polite register, a concise closing, and prepared language for clarification questions.

Practice 2. Explain conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency 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 conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency 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 conversation, presentation, and integrated proficiency 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.