

UCLA-ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 5

Intermediate Modern Korean II

Cohesion, passive and causative forms, collocation, formal style, longer readings, presentations, and cultural pragmatics

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	Discourse cohesion and paragraph flow	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Passive constructions and affected perspective	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Causative constructions and degrees of control	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	Collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Formal written style and nominal endings	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Longer expository and news reading	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Presentations, discussion, and argument support	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Cultural pragmatics and integrated project work	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/KOREA5>. 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	Discourse cohesion and paragraph flow	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	Passive constructions and affected perspective	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	Causative constructions and degrees of control	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	Collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks	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	14
5	Formal written style and nominal endings	15
5.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	15
5.2	Details I would refuse to skip	16
5.3	How this chapter connects	16
5.4	The full working model	16
6	Longer expository and news reading	18
6.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	18
6.2	Details I would refuse to skip	18
6.3	How this chapter connects	19

6.4	The full working model	19
7	Presentations, discussion, and argument support	20
7.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	20
7.2	Details I would refuse to skip	21
7.3	How this chapter connects	21
7.4	The full working model	21
8	Cultural pragmatics and integrated project work	23
8.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	23
8.2	Details I would refuse to skip	23
8.3	How this chapter connects	24
8.4	The full working model	24

CHAPTER 1 Discourse cohesion and paragraph flow

The idea

Cohesion comes from reference, omission, lexical repetition, substitution, connectors, and topic progression. Coherence comes from the reader's understanding of the larger relationship among claims, evidence, and context.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Cohesion comes from reference, omission, lexical repetition, substitution, connectors, and topic progression. Coherence comes from the reader's understanding of the larger relationship among claims, evidence, and context. 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 discourse cohesion and paragraph flow. 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 discourse cohesion and paragraph flow 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 passive constructions and affected perspective. 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.** Cohesion comes from reference, omission, lexical repetition, substitution, connectors, and topic progression.
- **What moves.** Coherence comes from the reader's understanding of the larger relationship among claims, evidence, and context.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply discourse cohesion and paragraph flow 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 outline the job of each sentence in the margin; if two sentences have no relationship, grammar cannot rescue the paragraph.

The easy version

Cohesion comes from reference, omission, lexical repetition, substitution, connectors, and topic progression.

Worked example

Question. What is the difference between cohesion and coherence?

Walkthrough. Cohesion is the visible linguistic linking across sentences. Coherence is the meaningful organization the reader constructs; a passage can use many connectors yet remain incoherent.

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 the difference between cohesion and coherence?

Solution. Cohesion is the visible linguistic linking across sentences. Coherence is the meaningful organization the reader constructs; a passage can use many connectors yet remain incoherent.

Practice 2. Explain discourse cohesion and paragraph flow 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 discourse cohesion and paragraph flow 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 discourse cohesion and paragraph flow 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 Passive constructions and affected perspective

The idea

Korean passives use lexical pairs or suffixes $-이/히/리/기-$ and sometimes $-아/어지다$. They foreground an affected entity, background an agent, or describe an event without copying every English passive.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Korean passives use lexical pairs or suffixes $-이/히/리/기-$ and sometimes $-아/어지다$. They foreground an affected entity, background an agent, or describe an event without copying every English passive. 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 passive constructions and affected perspective. 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 passive constructions and affected perspective 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 discourse cohesion and paragraph flow to causative constructions and degrees of control. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Korean passives use lexical pairs or suffixes $-이/히/리/기-$ and sometimes $-아/어지다$.
- **What moves.** They foreground an affected entity, background an agent, or describe an event without copying every English passive.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply passive constructions and affected perspective 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 passive voice when the affected thing is the discourse center, not just because English used 'was.'

The easy version

Korean passives use lexical pairs or suffixes -이/히/리/기- and sometimes -아/어지다.

Worked example

Question. Change 경찰이 도둑을 잡았어요 to focus on the thief.

Walkthrough. 도둑이 경찰에게 잡혔어요. The thief becomes subject, 경찰에게 marks the agent, and 잡히다 is the passive 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. Change 경찰이 도둑을 잡았어요 to focus on the thief.

Solution. 도둑이 경찰에게 잡혔어요. The thief becomes subject, 경찰에게 marks the agent, and 잡히다 is the passive form.

Practice 2. Explain passive constructions and affected perspective 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 passive constructions and affected perspective 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 passive constructions and affected perspective 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 Causative constructions and degrees of control

The idea

Lexical causatives, suffixes $-이/히/리/기/우/추-$, and $-게 하다$ express making, letting, or causing. Case marking and context show whether the causee acts intentionally and how direct the causer's control is.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Lexical causatives, suffixes $-이/히/리/기/우/추-$, and $-게 하다$ express making, letting, or causing. Case marking and context show whether the causee acts intentionally and how direct the causer's control is. 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 causative constructions and degrees of control. 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 causative constructions and degrees of control 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 passive constructions and affected perspective to collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks. 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.** Lexical causatives, suffixes -이/히/리/기/우/추-, and -게 하다 express making, letting, or causing.
- **What moves.** Case marking and context show whether the causee acts intentionally and how direct the causer's control is.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply causative constructions and degrees of control 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 who actually performs the action and whether the causer forces, permits, or merely brings it about.

The easy version

Lexical causatives, suffixes -이/히/리/기/우/추-, and -게 하다 express making, letting, or causing.

Worked example

Question. Translate 'The teacher made the students read the book.'

Walkthrough. 선생님이 학생들에게 책을 읽게 했어요. -게 하다 makes the students the causees who perform reading.

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 'The teacher made the students read the book.'

Solution. 선생님이 학생들에게 책을 읽게 했어요. -게 하다 makes the students the causees who perform reading.

Practice 2. Explain causative constructions and degrees of control 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 causative constructions and degrees of control 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 causative constructions and degrees of control 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 Collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks

The idea

Intermediate vocabulary grows through Sino-Korean roots, collocations, register, semantic fields, and idioms rather than isolated translations. Corpus examples reveal which nouns and verbs naturally combine and which choices sound translated.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Intermediate vocabulary grows through Sino-Korean roots, collocations, register, semantic fields, and idioms rather than isolated translations. Corpus examples reveal which nouns and verbs naturally combine and which choices sound translated. 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 collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks. 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 collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks 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 causative constructions and degrees of control to formal written style and nominal endings. 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 vocabulary grows through Sino–Korean roots, collocations, register, semantic fields, and idioms rather than isolated translations.
- **What moves.** Corpus examples reveal which nouns and verbs naturally combine and which choices sound translated.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks 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 save a new word with its usual partner, particle, register, and one sentence from context.

The easy version

Intermediate vocabulary grows through Sino–Korean roots, collocations, register, semantic fields, and idioms rather than isolated translations.

Worked example

Question. Why learn 관심을 가지다 as a chunk?

Walkthrough. Korean conventionally combines 관심 with 가지다 to express having interest. Knowing the collocation avoids grammatically possible but unnatural word selection.

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 learn 관심을 가지다 as a chunk?

Solution. Korean conventionally combines 관심 with 가지다 to express having interest. Knowing the collocation avoids grammatically possible but unnatural word selection.

Practice 2. Explain collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks 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 collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks 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 collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks 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 Formal written style and nominal endings

The idea

Written reports and news often use 합니다체 or plain written endings -다, compressed quotation, Sino-Korean vocabulary, and nominalized headings. Register consistency and explicit logical structure distinguish formal writing from casual speech.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Written reports and news often use 합니다체 or plain written endings -다, compressed quotation, Sino-Korean vocabulary, and nominalized headings. Register consistency and explicit logical structure distinguish formal writing from casual speech. 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 formal written style and nominal endings. 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 formal written style and nominal endings 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 collocation, idioms, and vocabulary networks to longer expository and news reading. 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.** Written reports and news often use 합니다체 or plain written endings -다, compressed quotation, Sino-Korean vocabulary, and nominalized headings.
- **What moves.** Register consistency and explicit logical structure distinguish formal writing from casual speech.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply formal written style and nominal endings 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 rewrite for audience instead of sprinkling formal words into a conversational paragraph.

The easy version

Written reports and news often use **합니다체** or plain written endings **-다**, compressed quotation, Sino-Korean vocabulary, and nominalized headings.

Worked example

Question. Convert 문제가 있어요 to plain written style.

Walkthrough. 문제가 있다. The predicate uses the written declarative **-다** form, with vocabulary and surrounding sentences adjusted to the same register.

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. Convert 문제가 있어요 to plain written style.

Solution. 문제가 있다. The predicate uses the written declarative **-다** form, with vocabulary and surrounding sentences adjusted to the same register.

Practice 2. Explain formal written style and nominal endings 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 formal written style and nominal endings 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 formal written style and nominal endings 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 Longer expository and news reading

The idea

Expository texts organize definitions, cause, comparison, evidence, and qualification; news leads foreground who, what, when, where, why, and how. Headline compression, omitted particles, quotation, and source attribution require genre-specific reading.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Expository texts organize definitions, cause, comparison, evidence, and qualification; news leads foreground who, what, when, where, why, and how. Headline compression, omitted particles, quotation, and source attribution require genre-specific reading. 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 longer expository and news reading. 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 longer expository and news reading 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 formal written style and nominal endings to presentations, discussion, and argument support. 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.** Expository texts organize definitions, cause, comparison, evidence, and qualification; news leads foreground who, what, when, where, why, and how.
- **What moves.** Headline compression, omitted particles, quotation, and source attribution require genre-specific reading.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply longer expository and news reading 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 predict each paragraph's role and separate reported claims from the writer's own assertion.

The easy version

Expository texts organize definitions, cause, comparison, evidence, and qualification; news leads foreground who, what, when, where, why, and how.

Worked example

Question. Why identify the source of every **다고 밝혔다** phrase?

Walkthrough. It distinguishes who is responsible for the claim, prevents hearsay from becoming fact, and clarifies how the article constructs authority.

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 identify the source of every 다고 밝혔다 phrase?

Solution. It distinguishes who is responsible for the claim, prevents hearsay from becoming fact, and clarifies how the article constructs authority.

Practice 2. Explain longer expository and news reading 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 longer expository and news reading 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 longer expository and news reading 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 Presentations, discussion, and argument support

The idea

An effective presentation states a claim, previews structure, defines terms, supports points with examples or evidence, marks transitions, and handles questions. Discussion requires agreement, respectful disagreement, clarification, and building on another speaker.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: An effective presentation states a claim, previews structure, defines terms, supports points with examples or evidence, marks transitions, and handles questions. Discussion requires agreement, respectful disagreement, clarification, and building on another speaker. 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 presentations, discussion, and argument support. 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 presentations, discussion, and argument support 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 longer expository and news reading to cultural pragmatics and integrated project work. 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.** An effective presentation states a claim, previews structure, defines terms, supports points with examples or evidence, marks transitions, and handles questions.
- **What moves.** Discussion requires agreement, respectful disagreement, clarification, and building on

another speaker.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply presentations, discussion, and argument support 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 memorize signposts and evidence, not every sentence; that leaves enough attention to listen to the room.

The easy version

An effective presentation states a claim, previews structure, defines terms, supports points with examples or evidence, marks transitions, and handles questions.

Worked example

Question. How can I disagree politely in an academic discussion?

Walkthrough. Acknowledge the point, mark a limited contrast, and give a reason: 말씀하신 점은 이해하지만, 이 경우에는 다른 요인도 고려해야 한다고 생각합니다.

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 I disagree politely in an academic discussion?

Solution. Acknowledge the point, mark a limited contrast, and give a reason: 말씀하신 점은 이해하지만, 이 경우에는 다른 요인도 고려해야 한다고 생각합니다.

Practice 2. Explain presentations, discussion, and argument support 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 presentations, discussion, and argument support 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 presentations, discussion, and argument support 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 Cultural pragmatics and integrated project work

The idea

Apology, refusal, gratitude, requests, hierarchy, indirectness, silence, and relational expectations vary by setting and person. Integrated projects combine research, interviews, reading, writing, presentation, and reflection without reducing culture to one rule.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Apology, refusal, gratitude, requests, hierarchy, indirectness, silence, and relational expectations vary by setting and person. Integrated projects combine research, interviews, reading, writing, presentation, and reflection without reducing culture to one rule. 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 cultural pragmatics and integrated project work. 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 cultural pragmatics and integrated project work 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 presentations, discussion, and argument support 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.** Apology, refusal, gratitude, requests, hierarchy, indirectness, silence, and relational expectations vary by setting and person.
- **What moves.** Integrated projects combine research, interviews, reading, writing, presentation, and reflection without reducing culture to one rule.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply cultural pragmatics and integrated project work 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 treat pragmatic patterns as hypotheses to observe, not stereotypes to apply to every Korean speaker.

The easy version

Apology, refusal, gratitude, requests, hierarchy, indirectness, silence, and relational expectations vary by setting and person.

Worked example

Question. Why can a direct 'no' be softened in some contexts?

Walkthrough. Maintaining relationship and face may favor explanation, hesitation, or an alternative. The appropriate choice still depends on closeness, authority, urgency, and individual style.

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 can a direct 'no' be softened in some contexts?

Solution. Maintaining relationship and face may favor explanation, hesitation, or an alternative. The appropriate choice still depends on closeness, authority, urgency, and individual style.

Practice 2. Explain cultural pragmatics and integrated project work 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 cultural pragmatics and integrated project work 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 cultural pragmatics and integrated project work 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.