Module/ Course Title: Japanese Linguistics II					
Module /Course code SBJ61133	**Student Workload** 5 hours 40 minutes per week	**Credits (Sks/Ects)** 2 CU × 1,5 = 3 ECTS	**Semester** Even	**Frequency** 2 CU x 16 = 32	**Duration** 16 meetings
1	**Types of courses** Mandatory Interest Study Program Course	**Contact Hours** 2 CU x 50 minutes = 100 = 1 hour 40 minutes per week	**Independent Study** 2 CU x 120 minutes = 240 minutes = 4 hours		**Class Size** 30 students
2	**Prerequisites for participation** -				
3	**Course Description** This course contains materials related to (advanced) pragmatic theory, sociolinguistics, language teaching and learning, (advanced) translation, and critical discourse analysis. These materials are provided with the aim that students are equipped with various linguistic theories which can be beneficial in writing scientific papers (thesis). **Learning outcomes** After completing this course, students are able to: 1. Understand the concepts or theories of applied and interdisciplinary linguistics 2. Understand (advanced) pragmatic theory, sociolinguistics, language teaching and learning, (advanced) translation, and critical discourse analysis **Intended Learning Outcome (ILO):** 1. ILO 4 Able to apply, examine, compile, and communicate the results of study on Japanese language, literature, and culture to the public both spoken and written in Indonesian and in Japanese. 2. ILO 7 Able to communicate ideas in a team consisting of people with various cultural and scientific backgrounds.				
4	**Subject aims/Content** 1. Being able to understand materials related to (advanced) pragmatics 2. Being able to understand materials related to sociolinguistics 3. Being able to understand materials related to language learning 4. Being able to understand materials related to (advanced) translation 5. Being able to understand materials related to critical discourse analysis **Course content** 1. Week 1: understanding the course plans and concepts of applied and interdisciplinary linguistics 2. Week 2: understanding pragmatic theories (1) 3. Week 3: understanding pragmatic theories (2) 4. Week 4: understanding pragmatic theories (3) 5. Week 5: understanding sociolinguistic theories (1) 6. Week 6: understanding sociolinguistic theories (2)				

		7. Week 7: understanding sociolinguistic theories (3) 8. Mid-term Examination 9. Week 8: understanding translation theories for research (1) 10. Week 9: understanding translation theories for research (2) 11. Week 10: understanding translation theories for research (3) 12. Week 11: understanding critical discourse analysis (1) 13. Week 12: understanding critical discourse analysis (2) 14. Week 13: understanding critical discourse analysis (3) 15. Week 14: understanding and being able to analyze cases represented in daily life 16. Final Examination
4	**Teaching methods** The learning method refers to an active learning strategy carried out with active student involvement and inquiry-based collaboration. Students actively seek for various relevant reference sources, lecturers as facilitators providing stimulus and act as facilitators during the lectures. Lectures are carried out by providing several study themes such as: 1) Explanatory lectures 2) Group presentations as well as 3) Discussions	
5	**Assessment methods** The test/evaluation method is carried out through case based method, quiz, mid-semester examination, final semester examination, as well as class participation. The final score in this lecture is obtained through the formula or calculation below. **FS = 0,50 CBL + 0,10 Q + 0,20 ME + 0,20 FE** Notes: FS = Final Score CBL = Case Based Learning Q = Quiz ME = Midterm Exams FE = Final Exams	
6	**This module is used in the following degree programmes as well: (No)**	
7	**Module/Course Coordinator**: Dewi Puspitasari, M.Hum	
8	**Other information:** Lectures use primary references such as journals, books and learning resources as follows: 1. Yule, George. 2006. *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar 2. Wijana, I Dewa Putu. 2019. *Sosiolinguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press 3. Hoed, Benny Hoendoro. 2006. *Penerjemahan dan Kebudayaan*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya 4. Fairclough, Norman. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge	

Linkage Matrix of CLO and LLO of Japanese Linguistics II Course

	LLO 4	LLO 7
CLO 1	√	√
CLO 2	√	√

Assessment Scheme

	Presentation 1	Presentation 2	Project-based Assignment 1	Project-based Assignment 2
CLO 1	√		√	√
CLO 2		√	√	√

Assessment Scheme

	LLO 4	LLO 7
CLO 1	Presentation 1, Project-based Assignment 1, Project-based Assignment 2	Presentation 1, Presentation 2, Project-based Assignment 1, Project-based Assignment 2
CLO 2	Presentation 2, Project-based Assignment 1, Project-based Assignment 2	Presentation 1, Presentation 2, Project-based Assignment 1, Project-based Assignment 2

Linkage Matrix of Sub CLO and CLO

	Sub CLO 1	Sub CLO 2	Sub CLO 3	Sub CLO 4	Sub CLO 5
CLO 1		√	√	√	
CLO 2	√				√

PROBLEM EXAMPLE

KEMENTERIAN RISET, TEKNOLOGI DAN PENDIDIKAN TINGGI
UNIVERSITAS BRAWIJAYA
PROGRAM S-1 SASTRA JEPANG
UJIAN TENGAH SEMESTER GANJIL TAHUN AJARAN 2019/2020

Mata Kuliah	:	Pengetahuan Linguistik Jepang 2	Pelaksanaan	: sesuai jadwal
Dosen Pembina	:	Agus Budi Cahyono	Waktu	: 90 menit
Sifat Ujian	:	Open	Bentuk Ujian :	Project

Make a thesis resume and review from undergraduates' theses or a minimum of 5 articles from SINTA journals with the following themes:

1. Deletion of subject/predicate/object/adverb
2. Aspect
3. Active or passive sentence
4. Honorifics

Writing systematics:

1. Times New Roman, 1,5 spaces.
2. A minimum of 2 pages, and a maximum of 3 pages including the following details:
   a. background
   b. literature review
   c. personal review on the undergraduate's thesis
3. Individual writing

Evaluation:

1. The accuracy of theme selection
2. The accuracy of writing literature review
3. Coherence and cohesive writing

Mata Kuliah	:	Pengetahuan Linguistik Jepang 2	Pelaksanaan	: sesuai jadwal
Dosen Pembina	:	Agus Budi Cahyono	Waktu	: 90 menit
Sifat Ujian	:	Open	Bentuk Ujian : Project	

Buatlah Resume dan Review Skripsi mahasiswa atau jurnal yang berSINTA minimal 5 dengan tema sebagai berikut :

1. Pelesapan subyek atau predikat atau obyek atau keterangan

2. Aspek

3. kalimat aktif atau pasif

4. Honorifik

Aturan penulisan :

1. Spasi 1,5

2. Minimal 2 , Max 3 halaman dengan rincian :

    a. latar belakang

    b. Kajian pustaka

    c. Review pribadi pada skripsi mahasiswa tersebut

3. menulis Perorangan

Penilaian :

1. Ketepatan Pemilihan tema

2. Ketepatan penulisan kajian pustaka

2. Kerunutan dan keruntutan review

PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

CRITERIA	Score				Score
	4	**3**	**2**	**1**	
Content (Introduction, Body, Closing)	Explanations are given in detail, and the content comprises of introduction, body, and conclusion. In addition, the material can be understood easily, as it is interesting and memorable.	Explanations are given in detail and the content comprises of introduction, body, and conclusion. The material can be understood by the audience.	The explanation is less detailed and there are parts that are not explained.	The explanation is less detailed and there are parts that are not explained. Most of the explanations are not well understood and raise questions.	
Eye Contact	Making eye contact with the entire audience	Making eye contact with almost the entire audience	Making eye contact with only a few people	Rarely/no eye contact at all with the audience	
Intonation (Clarity and Articulation)	The whole audience can hear the whole presentation clearly	Presenters mumble sometimes, but most of the presentation can be heard clearly	Presenters often mumble, so that only a small part of the presentation can be heard clearly	Presenters convey the explanation in a low voice, where it cannot be heard clearly by the entire audience	

Flow/Fluency	The presentation is delivered smoothly, there are no parts where the presenters need to pause suddenly when explaining. In addition, no fillers are found.	Presenters pause at a certain part 1-2 times. In addition, presenters use fillers.	Presenters pause several times at certain parts and use annoying fillers.	Presenters often stop at certain parts and use a lot of fillers.	
Confidence and Attitude	Presenters are enthusiastic, not nervous and are confident when explaining.	Presenters are still quite enthusiastic, not nervous and are confident when explaining.	Presenters are not always enthusiastic, sometimes they are nervous/lack of confidence when explaining certain parts.	Presenters are not very enthusiastic, nervous and lack confidence when explaining.	
Visual Media (PPT)	Any visual tool that presenters use to help the explanation is prepared neatly, creatively, and attractively. In addition, it relates to the content of the explanation.	Any visual tool that presenters use to help the explanation is prepared neatly and attractively. In addition, it relates to the content of the explanation.	Any visual tool used by the presenter to assist the explanation is neatly prepared, but sometimes they are not related to the explanation.	Any visual tool used by the presenter to assist in explaining is not neat and mostly unrelated to the explanation given.	
Time Allocation	The presentation is delivered according to the allotted time.	The presentation is delivered 10% shorter than the allotted time.	The presentation is delivered 20% shorter than the allotted time.	The presentation is delivered 30% shorter than the allotted time.	
Total Score (N)					

Project-based Assignment Assessment Rubric (Proposal)

No	Category	Weights	1 (Unsatisfactory)	2 (Satisfactory)	3 (Good)	4 (Excellent)

1.	Writing Format	10%	• Information is not organised by headings, • Paragraphs are not in accordance with the predetermined rules, • Writing does not meet the standard format.	• Information is organised through headings, • Paragraphs are not in accordance with the predetermined rules, • Writing does not meet the standard format.	• Information is organised through headings, • Paragraphs in accordance with the predetermined rules, • Writing does not meet the standard format.	• Information is organised through headings, • Paragraphs in accordance with the predetermined rules, • Writing meets the standard format.
2.	Introduction	25%	• The background is not comprehensively disclosed • The formulation of the problem is not sharp, • The research objective is not in accordance with the research problem	• The background is not disclosed comprehensively, • The formulation of the problem is not sharp, • The research objective does not match the research theme	• The background disclosed comprehensively • Sharper problem formulation, • The research objective is not in accordance with the research problem	• The background disclosed comprehensively • Sharper problem formulation, • The research objective is in accordance with the research problem

No.	Criteria	Weight				
3.	Literature Review	20%	• The theory review is not relevant to the research problem, • Non-standard theoretical review citations	• The theory review is less relevant to the research problem, • The theory review citation is not up to standard	• The review of theory relevant to the research problem, • The theory review citation is not up to standard	• The review of theory relevant to the research problem, • Standardized theoretical review citations
4.	Methodology	25%	• The design is not in accordance with the research problem, • Inappropriate selection of research instruments, • The analytical method used is not appropriate	• The design is in accordance to the research problem, • Inappropriate selection of research instruments, • The analytical method used is not appropriate	• The design according to the research problem, • Appropriate selection of appropriate research instruments, • The analytical method used is not appropriate	• The design according to the research problem, • Appropriate selection of appropriate research instruments, • The analytical method used is correct
5.	Proposal Eligibility	20%	The proposal idea does not meet the rules of plagiarism,	The proposal idea does not meet the rules of plagiarism	The proposal idea meets the rules of plagiarism	The proposal idea meets the rules of plagiarism