

UCLA-ALIGNED COURSE FIELD NOTES

KOREAN 3

Elementary Modern Korean III

Relative clauses, quotation, complex connectors, aspect, speech levels, particles, and connected discourse

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	Relative clauses and noun modification	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
2	Reported speech and quotation	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
3	Condition, cause, concession, and contrast	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
4	Aspect, change of state, and completed results	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
5	Speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
6	Expanded particles and information structure	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
7	Paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference	Reconstruct the model, work an application, test its assumptions, and explain the result in ordinary language.
8	Conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing	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/KOREA3>. 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	Relative clauses and noun modification	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	Reported speech and quotation	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	Condition, cause, concession, and contrast	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	Aspect, change of state, and completed results	12
4.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	12
4.2	Details I would refuse to skip	13
4.3	How this chapter connects	13
4.4	The full working model	13
5	Speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone	15
5.1	Rebuild the chapter from first principles	15
5.2	Details I would refuse to skip	15
5.3	How this chapter connects	16
5.4	The full working model	16
6	Expanded particles and information structure	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	Paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference	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	Conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing	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 Relative clauses and noun modification

The idea

Korean places verb and adjective modifiers before nouns. $-(으)ㄴ$, $-는$, and $-(으)ㄹ$ encode completed or descriptive, ongoing or habitual, and prospective relations, with tense interpreted through context.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Korean places verb and adjective modifiers before nouns. $-(으)ㄴ$, $-는$, and $-(으)ㄹ$ encode completed or descriptive, ongoing or habitual, and prospective relations, with tense interpreted through 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 relative clauses and noun modification. 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 relative clauses and noun modification 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 reported speech and quotation. 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 places verb and adjective modifiers before nouns.
- **What moves.** -(으)ㄴ, -는, and -(으)ㄹ encode completed or descriptive, ongoing or habitual, and prospective relations, with tense interpreted through context.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply relative clauses and noun modification to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I build the small sentence first, remove the shared noun, and place the remaining predicate before that noun.

The easy version

Korean places verb and adjective modifiers before nouns.

Worked example

Question. Turn 'I read the book' into 'the book that I read.'

Walkthrough. 제가 읽은 책. 읽다 becomes 읽은 for a completed modifying action, and 책 follows the relative clause.

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. Turn 'I read the book' into 'the book that I read.'

Solution. 제가 읽은 책. 읽다 becomes 읽은 for a completed modifying action, and 책 follows the relative clause.

Practice 2. Explain relative clauses and noun modification 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 relative clauses and noun modification 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 relative clauses and noun modification 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 Reported speech and quotation

The idea

-다고 하다, -(이)라고 하다, -냐고 하다, and -(으)라고 하다 report statements, nouns, questions, and commands. Tense, pronouns, honorifics, and viewpoint shift when speech is embedded.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -다고 하다, -(이)라고 하다, -냐고 하다, and -(으)라고 하다 report statements, nouns, questions, and commands. Tense, pronouns, honorifics, and viewpoint shift when speech is embedded. 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 reported speech and quotation. 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 reported speech and quotation 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 relative clauses and noun modification to condition, cause, concession, and contrast. 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.** -다고 하다, -(이)라고 하다, -냐고 하다, and -(으)라고 하다 report statements, nouns, questions, and commands.
- **What moves.** Tense, pronouns, honorifics, and viewpoint shift when speech is embedded.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply reported speech and quotation to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.

- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

I identify the original sentence type before choosing the quotation ending.

The easy version

-다고 하다, -(이)라고 하다, -냐고 하다, and -(으)라고 하다 report statements, nouns, questions, and commands.

Worked example

Question. Report that Mina said, 'I am busy.'

Walkthrough. 미나 씨가 바쁘다고 했어요. The descriptive predicate 바쁘다 takes -다고, and 했어요 places the report in the past.

Common miss

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

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Report that Mina said, 'I am busy.'

Solution. 미나 씨가 바쁘다고 했어요. The descriptive predicate 바쁘다 takes -다고, and 했어요 places the report in the past.

Practice 2. Explain reported speech and quotation 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 reported speech and quotation 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 reported speech and quotation 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 Condition, cause, concession, and contrast

The idea

-(으)면 marks conditions, -기 때문에 gives explicit cause, -는데 supplies background or contrast, and -아/어도 marks concession. These endings organize the listener's expectations, not only logical truth.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -(으)면 marks conditions, -기 때문에 gives explicit cause, -는데 supplies background or contrast, and -아/어도 marks concession. These endings organize the listener's expectations, not only logical truth. 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 condition, cause, concession, and contrast. 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 condition, cause, concession, and contrast 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 reported speech and quotation to aspect, change of state, and completed results. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** -(으)면 marks conditions, -기 때문에 gives explicit cause, -는데 supplies background or contrast, and -아/어도 marks concession.
- **What moves.** These endings organize the listener's expectations, not only logical truth.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply condition, cause, concession, and contrast 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 listen for whether the first clause is a condition, an explanation, background, or a surprise despite something.

The easy version

-(으)면 marks conditions, -기 때문에 gives explicit cause, -는데 supplies background or contrast, and -아/어도 marks concession.

Worked example

Question. Say 'Even if it rains, I will go.'

Walkthrough. 비가 와도 갈 거예요. -아/어도 concedes the rain while preserving the future plan.

Common miss

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

and verify the result independently.

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Say 'Even if it rains, I will go.'

Solution. 비가 와도 갈 거예요. -아/어도 concedes the rain while preserving the future plan.

Practice 2. Explain condition, cause, concession, and contrast 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 condition, cause, concession, and contrast 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 condition, cause, concession, and contrast 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 Aspect, change of state, and completed results

The idea

-고 있다 marks ongoing action or resulting state depending on the verb, -아/어 있다 emphasizes a maintained result, -게 되다 marks a change that came about, and -아/어 버리다 presents completion with stance.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: -고 있다 marks ongoing action or resulting state depending on the verb, -아/어 있다 emphasizes a maintained result, -게 되다 marks a change that came about, and -아/어 버리다 presents completion with stance. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

1. **Translate.** Rewrite the prompt in the language of aspect, change of state, and completed results. 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 aspect, change of state, and completed results 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 condition, cause, concession, and contrast to speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone. The earlier material supplies the language and constraints; this chapter adds a new reasoning move; the later material asks me to use that move without being told its name. That connection matters because exams and real projects mix chapters on purpose.

The full working model

- **Core claim.** -고 있다 marks ongoing action or resulting state depending on the verb, -아/어 있다 emphasizes a maintained result, -게 되다 marks a change that came about, and -아/어 버리다 presents completion with stance.

- **What moves.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply aspect, change of state, and completed results to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply aspect, change of state, and completed results 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 whether the sentence focuses on the action unfolding, the resulting state, or how the change came to happen.

The easy version

-고 있다 marks ongoing action or resulting state depending on the verb, -아/어 있다 emphasizes a maintained result, -게 되다 marks a change that came about, and -아/어 버리다 presents completion with stance.

Worked example

Question. Contrast 문을 열고 있어요 and 문이 열려 있어요.

Walkthrough. The first says someone is opening or holding open the door depending on context; the second emphasizes that the door is in an open resulting state.

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 문을 열고 있어요 and 문이 열려 있어요.

Solution. The first says someone is opening or holding open the door depending on context; the second emphasizes that the door is in an open resulting state.

Practice 2. Explain aspect, change of state, and completed results 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 aspect, change of state, and completed results 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 aspect, change of state, and completed results 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 Speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone

The idea

해요체 is broadly polite, 합니다체 is formal, and 반말 styles require appropriate relationships. Sentence-final endings such as -네요, -군요, -죠, and -잖아요 express discovery, alignment, confirmation, or shared knowledge.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: 해요체 is broadly polite, 합니다체 is formal, and 반말 styles require appropriate relationships. Sentence-final endings such as -네요, -군요, -죠, and -잖아요 express discovery, alignment, confirmation, or shared knowledge. 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 speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone. 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 speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone 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 aspect, change of state, and completed results to expanded particles and information structure. 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.** 해요체 is broadly polite, 합니다체 is formal, and 반말 styles require appropriate relationships.
- **What moves.** Sentence-final endings such as -네요, -군요, -죠, and -잖아요 express discovery, alignment, confirmation, or shared knowledge.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone 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

The ending tells the listener how I position the information, so two grammatically true sentences can feel socially different.

The easy version

해요체 is broadly polite, 합니다체 is formal, and 반말 styles require appropriate relationships.

Worked example

Question. What nuance does 춥네요 add beyond 추워요?

Walkthrough. It presents the cold as a noticed or newly felt reaction, inviting shared attention rather than only making a neutral statement.

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 nuance does 춥네요 add beyond 추워요?

Solution. It presents the cold as a noticed or newly felt reaction, inviting shared attention rather than only making a neutral statement.

Practice 2. Explain speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone 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 speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone 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 speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone 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 Expanded particles and information structure

The idea

밖에 with negation means only, (이)나 offers alternatives or approximate choice, 처럼 marks similarity, 마다 distributes across each, and 에게/한테/께 mark recipients with different formality. Particle placement highlights contrast and focus.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: 밖에 with negation means only, (이)나 offers alternatives or approximate choice, 처럼 marks similarity, 마다 distributes across each, and 에게/한테/께 mark recipients with different formality. Particle placement highlights contrast and focus. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

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

Details I would refuse to skip

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

Sanity check

Closed-note check. Can I teach expanded particles and information structure 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 speech levels, endings, and pragmatic tone to paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference. 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.** 밖에 with negation means only, (이)나 offers alternatives or approximate choice, 처럼 marks similarity, 마다 distributes across each, and 에게/한테/께 mark recipients with different formality.
- **What moves.** Particle placement highlights contrast and focus.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply expanded particles and information structure to an unfamiliar case and defend the assumptions.
- **Mastery standard.** I can define the objects, rebuild the rule, work a fresh case, compare alternatives, and diagnose a broken solution without relying on recognition.

How I actually think about it

My shorthand for this chapter is: particles are tiny instructions for how the listener should organize the sentence.

The easy version

밖에 with negation means only, (이)나 offers alternatives or approximate choice, 처럼 marks similarity, 마다 distributes across each, and 에게/한테/께 mark recipients with different formality.

Worked example

Question. Translate 'I only have five dollars.'

Walkthrough. 오 달러밖에 없어요. 밖에 pairs with the negative existence verb 없어요 to mean there is nothing beyond five dollars.

Common miss

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

Solved chapter practice

Practice 1. Translate 'I only have five dollars.'

Solution. 오 달러밖에 없어요. 밖에 pairs with the negative existence verb 없어요 to mean there is nothing beyond five dollars.

Practice 2. Explain expanded particles and information structure to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

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

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct expanded particles and information structure from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

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

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

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

CHAPTER 7 Paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference

The idea

Connected reading requires reference tracking, omitted subjects, connectors, lexical chains, paragraph roles, and inference from context. Topic sentences may be implicit, and Korean discourse often delays the predicate or central stance.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Connected reading requires reference tracking, omitted subjects, connectors, lexical chains, paragraph roles, and inference from context. Topic sentences may be implicit, and Korean discourse often delays the predicate or central stance. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

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

Details I would refuse to skip

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

Sanity check

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

How this chapter connects

I read this chapter as the bridge from expanded particles and information structure to conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing. 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.** Connected reading requires reference tracking, omitted subjects, connectors, lexical chains, paragraph roles, and inference from context.
- **What moves.** Topic sentences may be implicit, and Korean discourse often delays the predicate or

central stance.

- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference 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 mark connectors and repeated ideas before reaching for a dictionary; structure often solves what one unknown word cannot.

The easy version

Connected reading requires reference tracking, omitted subjects, connectors, lexical chains, paragraph roles, and inference from context.

Worked example

Question. What should I do when a paragraph repeatedly omits its subject?

Walkthrough. Use topic continuity, particles, honorific agreement, and semantic plausibility to track the referent, while remaining open to a shift signaled by a new noun or contrast.

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 I do when a paragraph repeatedly omits its subject?

Solution. Use topic continuity, particles, honorific agreement, and semantic plausibility to track the referent, while remaining open to a shift signaled by a new noun or contrast.

Practice 2. Explain paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

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

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct paragraph reading, cohesion, and inference from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

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

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a paragraph reading, cohesion,

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

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

CHAPTER 8 Conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing

The idea

Intermediate–beginner performance combines turn taking, backchannels, repair, pronunciation, relative clauses, quotation, and paragraph cohesion. Planning ideas in Korean chunks produces more natural speech and writing than sentence–by–sentence translation.

Rebuild the chapter from first principles

The claim I need to own is this: Intermediate–beginner performance combines turn taking, backchannels, repair, pronunciation, relative clauses, quotation, and paragraph cohesion. Planning ideas in Korean chunks produces more natural speech and writing than sentence–by–sentence translation. I do not count that as learned just because the sentence looks familiar. I should be able to name the objects, state what changes and what stays fixed, recover the rule from the definitions, and explain why the result is allowed.

The move

My working sequence

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

Details I would refuse to skip

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

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

Sanity check

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

How this chapter connects

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

The full working model

- **Core claim.** Intermediate–beginner performance combines turn taking, backchannels, repair, pronunciation, relative clauses, quotation, and paragraph cohesion.
- **What moves.** Planning ideas in Korean chunks produces more natural speech and writing than sentence–by–sentence translation.
- **What keeps the answer honest.** The model becomes useful only when I can apply conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing 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 a few flexible story frames, then listen and respond instead of reciting a memorized monologue.

The easy version

Intermediate–beginner performance combines turn taking, backchannels, repair, pronunciation, relative clauses, quotation, and paragraph cohesion.

Worked example

Question. How can I make a short account of a trip cohesive?

Walkthrough. Set the time and place, sequence events with connectors, use relative clauses for people or places, add a reaction ending, and close with what changed or what you recommend.

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 make a short account of a trip cohesive?

Solution. Set the time and place, sequence events with connectors, use relative clauses for people or places, add a reaction ending, and close with what changed or what you recommend.

Practice 2. Explain conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing to a classmate using one definition, one concrete example, one assumption, and one failure mode.

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

Mastery practice A. Reconstruct conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing from a blank page. Include the central definition, the governing rule, one required assumption, and one boundary case.

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

Mastery practice B. A classmate gets a polished-looking answer to a conversation, listening, and sustained personal writing 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.