UCLA-ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 6

Intermediate Modern Korean III

Advanced-intermediate syntax, stance, Sino-Korean vocabulary, genre reading, argument, debate, media, and integrated fluency

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	Complex sentence compression and clause relations	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Sino-Korean vocabulary and word formation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	Genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Argument writing, evidence, and revision	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Debate, negotiation, and formal presentation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Media language, representation, and cultural analysis	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Integrated proficiency and an independent learning system	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/KOREA6. 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 Complex sentence compression and clause relations

The idea

Advanced-intermediate Korean packs attribution, condition, concession, cause, and evaluation into nested clauses. Parsing depends on final predicates, modifier boundaries, nominalization, particles, and scope.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Advanced-intermediate Korean packs attribution, condition, concession, cause, and evaluation into nested clauses. Parsing depends on final predicates, modifier boundaries, nominalization, particles, and scope. 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 complex sentence compression and clause relations. 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 complex sentence compression and clause relations 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment. 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.** Advanced-intermediate Korean packs attribution, condition, concession, cause, and evaluation into nested clauses.
- **What moves.** Parsing depends on final predicates, modifier boundaries, nominalization, particles, and scope.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply complex sentence compression and clause relations 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 reconstruct the sentence as an outline, then read it again as Korean instead of translating left to right.

The easy version

Advanced-intermediate Korean packs attribution, condition, concession, cause, and evaluation into nested clauses.

Worked example

Question. What is the safest first move with a heavily nested sentence?
Walkthrough. Find the final main predicate, identify the noun phrases it governs, bracket each preceding modifier or connective clause, and then determine how those clauses relate.

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 safest first move with a heavily nested sentence?
Solution. Find the final main predicate, identify the noun phrases it governs, bracket each preceding modifier or connective clause, and then determine how those clauses relate.

Practice 2. Explain complex sentence compression and clause relations 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 complex sentence compression and clause relations 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 complex sentence compression and clause relations 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 Stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment

The idea

Endings and constructions such as -나 보다, -(으)ㄴ/는 모양이다, -다고 보다, -기는 하다, and -을 리가 없다 mark inference, assessment, concession, and confidence. Source and commitment are part of the proposition.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Endings and constructions such as -나 보다, -(으)ㄴ/는 모양이다, -다고 보다, -기는 하다, and -을 리가 없다 mark inference, assessment, concession, and confidence. Source and commitment are part of the proposition. 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment. 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment 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 complex sentence compression and clause relations to sino-korean vocabulary and word formation. 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.** Endings and constructions such as -나 보다, -(으)ㄴ/는 모양이다, -다고 보다, -기는 하다, and -을 리가 없다 mark inference, assessment, concession, and confidence.
- **What moves.** Source and commitment are part of the proposition.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment 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 how the speaker knows and how strongly they stand behind the claim.

The easy version

Endings and constructions such as -나 보다, -(으)ㄴ/는 모양이다, -다고 보다, -기는 하다, and -을 리가 없다 mark inference, assessment, concession, and confidence.

Worked example

Question. Contrast 비가 오나 봐요 with 비가 와요.
Walkthrough. The first presents an inference from evidence, such as wet streets; the second directly asserts that it is raining.

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. Contrast 비가 오나 봐요 with 비가 와요.
Solution. The first presents an inference from evidence, such as wet streets; the second directly asserts that it is raining.

Practice 2. Explain stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment 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 Sino-Korean vocabulary and word formation

The idea

Shared roots such as 학, 문, 화, 경, and 사 generate networks across academic, media, and institutional vocabulary. Homophones, register, compounds, and suffixes become manageable through morphological analysis and context.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Shared roots such as 학, 문, 화, 경, and 사 generate networks across academic, media, and institutional vocabulary. Homophones, register, compounds, and suffixes become manageable through morphological analysis 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 sino-korean vocabulary and word formation. 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 sino-korean vocabulary and word formation 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 stance, evidentiality, and speaker commitment to genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature. 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.** Shared roots such as 학, 문, 화, 경, and 사 generate networks across academic, media, and institutional vocabulary.
- **What moves.** Homophones, register, compounds, and suffixes become manageable through morphological analysis and context.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply sino-korean vocabulary and word formation 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 break an unfamiliar formal word into roots and test a meaning against the sentence before opening the dictionary.

The easy version

Shared roots such as 학, 문, 화, 경, and 사 generate networks across academic, media, and institutional vocabulary.

Worked example

Question. How can word roots help with 환경학?
Walkthrough. 환경 means environment and 학 marks a field of study, so 환경학 means environmental studies or environmental science; context selects the best English rendering.

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 word roots help with 환경학?
Solution. 환경 means environment and 학 marks a field of study, so 환경학 means environmental studies or environmental science; context selects the best English rendering.

Practice 2. Explain sino-korean vocabulary and word formation 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 sino-korean vocabulary and word formation 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 sino-korean vocabulary and word formation 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 Genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature

The idea

Genre sets expectations for voice, evidence, structure, and ambiguity. Essays develop reflection or argument, reports foreground method and findings, and literature invites attention to image, narration, irony, and unresolved meaning.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Genre sets expectations for voice, evidence, structure, and ambiguity. Essays develop reflection or argument, reports foreground method and findings, and literature invites attention to image, narration, irony, and unresolved meaning. 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 genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature. 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 genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature 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 sino-korean vocabulary and word formation to argument writing, evidence, 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.** Genre sets expectations for voice, evidence, structure, and ambiguity.
- **What moves.** Essays develop reflection or argument, reports foreground method and findings, and literature invites attention to image, narration, irony, and unresolved meaning.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature 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 change reading strategy with the genre instead of demanding one kind of clarity from every text.

The easy version

Genre sets expectations for voice, evidence, structure, and ambiguity.

Worked example

Question. What should be annotated differently in a report and a short story?
Walkthrough. In a report, mark research question, method, evidence, and limitations. In a story, track narrator, focalization, image patterns, temporal shifts, and tensions the text may not resolve.

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 be annotated differently in a report and a short story?
Solution. In a report, mark research question, method, evidence, and limitations. In a story, track narrator, focalization, image patterns, temporal shifts, and tensions the text may not resolve.

Practice 2. Explain genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature 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 genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature 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 genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature 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 Argument writing, evidence, and revision

The idea

An argument states a qualified thesis, defines scope, organizes reasons, integrates sources, addresses counterarguments, and distinguishes evidence from assertion. Revision tests logic, paragraph unity, citation, register, and sentence-level control.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: An argument states a qualified thesis, defines scope, organizes reasons, integrates sources, addresses counterarguments, and distinguishes evidence from assertion. Revision tests logic, paragraph unity, citation, register, and sentence-level control. 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 argument writing, evidence, 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 argument writing, evidence, 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 genre-based reading of essays, reports, and literature to debate, negotiation, and formal presentation. 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 argument states a qualified thesis, defines scope, organizes reasons, integrates sources, addresses counterarguments, and distinguishes evidence from assertion.
- **What moves.** Revision tests logic, paragraph unity, citation, register, and sentence-level control.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply argument writing, evidence, 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 write the counterargument before the conclusion because it forces the thesis to become more precise.

The easy version

An argument states a qualified thesis, defines scope, organizes reasons, integrates sources, addresses counterarguments, and distinguishes evidence from assertion.

Worked example

Question. What makes a thesis appropriately qualified?
Walkthrough. It names the subject, claim, conditions or scope, and degree of certainty, avoiding universal language when the evidence supports only a particular context.

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 makes a thesis appropriately qualified?
Solution. It names the subject, claim, conditions or scope, and degree of certainty, avoiding universal language when the evidence supports only a particular context.

Practice 2. Explain argument writing, evidence, 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 argument writing, evidence, 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 argument writing, evidence, 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 6 Debate, negotiation, and formal presentation

The idea

Debate and negotiation require framing, turn management, evidence, rebuttal, concession, proposals, and summaries. Formal speech uses stable register and signposting while adapting to questions and relational dynamics.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Debate and negotiation require framing, turn management, evidence, rebuttal, concession, proposals, and summaries. Formal speech uses stable register and signposting while adapting to questions and relational dynamics. 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 debate, negotiation, and formal presentation. 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 debate, negotiation, and formal presentation 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 argument writing, evidence, and revision to media language, representation, and cultural analysis. 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.** Debate and negotiation require framing, turn management, evidence, rebuttal, concession, proposals, and summaries.
- **What moves.** Formal speech uses stable register and signposting while adapting to questions and relational dynamics.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply debate, negotiation, and formal presentation 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 prepare claim-evidence-response blocks so I can listen instead of waiting to deliver a script.

The easy version

Debate and negotiation require framing, turn management, evidence, rebuttal, concession, proposals, and summaries.

Worked example

Question. How should a rebuttal begin without dismissing the other speaker?
Walkthrough. Restate the point fairly, acknowledge any valid part, identify the exact disagreement, and answer it with evidence or a competing principle.

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 a rebuttal begin without dismissing the other speaker?
Solution. Restate the point fairly, acknowledge any valid part, identify the exact disagreement, and answer it with evidence or a competing principle.

Practice 2. Explain debate, negotiation, and formal presentation 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 debate, negotiation, and formal presentation 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 debate, negotiation, and formal presentation 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 Media language, representation, and cultural analysis

The idea

News, advertising, film, television, social media, and online comments use compression, framing, intertextuality, slang, politeness shifts, and platform conventions. Analysis separates literal content from implied audience and institutional purpose.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: News, advertising, film, television, social media, and online comments use compression, framing, intertextuality, slang, politeness shifts, and platform conventions. Analysis separates literal content from implied audience and institutional purpose. 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 media language, representation, and cultural analysis. 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 media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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 debate, negotiation, and formal presentation to integrated proficiency and an independent learning system. 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.** News, advertising, film, television, social media, and online comments use compression, framing, intertextuality, slang, politeness shifts, and platform conventions.
- **What moves.** Analysis separates literal content from implied audience and institutional purpose.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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 is being imagined as the audience and what reaction the medium makes easy.

The easy version

News, advertising, film, television, social media, and online comments use compression, framing, intertextuality, slang, politeness shifts, and platform conventions.

Worked example

Question. How can headline grammar shape interpretation?
Walkthrough. Omitted particles, compressed nouns, active or passive framing, and quoted labels foreground some actors while backgrounding agency or uncertainty.

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 headline grammar shape interpretation?
Solution. Omitted particles, compressed nouns, active or passive framing, and quoted labels foreground some actors while backgrounding agency or uncertainty.

Practice 2. Explain media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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 media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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 media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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 Integrated proficiency and an independent learning system

The idea

Sustained proficiency joins listening, speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, cultural interpretation, and repair. An independent system uses extensive input, focused retrieval, feedback, recording, error logs, and purposeful interaction.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Sustained proficiency joins listening, speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, cultural interpretation, and repair. An independent system uses extensive input, focused retrieval, feedback, recording, error logs, and purposeful interaction. 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 integrated proficiency and an independent learning system. 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 integrated proficiency and an independent learning system 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 media language, representation, and cultural analysis 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.** Sustained proficiency joins listening, speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, cultural interpretation, and repair.
- **What moves.** An independent system uses extensive input, focused retrieval, feedback, recording, error logs, and purposeful interaction.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply integrated proficiency and an independent learning system to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I keep a small error corpus from my own Korean and turn repeated mistakes into the next week's drills.

The easy version

Sustained proficiency joins listening, speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, cultural interpretation, and repair.

Worked example

Question. Design a weekly plan that balances input and output.
Walkthrough. Use daily extensive listening or reading, three focused vocabulary-retrieval sessions, two recorded speaking or writing tasks, one feedback review, and one live interaction, then select

recurring errors for targeted practice.

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. Design a weekly plan that balances input and output.
Solution. Use daily extensive listening or reading, three focused vocabulary-retrieval sessions, two recorded speaking or writing tasks, one feedback review, and one live interaction, then select recurring errors for targeted practice.

Practice 2. Explain integrated proficiency and an independent learning system 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 integrated proficiency and an independent learning system 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 integrated proficiency and an independent learning system 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.