

## Project 4 for Unit 4 (Argumentation and Persuasion): Sound Argument

**Due Date:** by class time Friday, December 9<sup>th</sup> (our final class)

**How to Submit:** on Sakai under Assignments

**What to Submit:**

1. The file for your sound argument (.mp4)
2. The file for your written assessment (.doc, .docx, or .pdf). See page 3-4 below.

### Overview

In this unit, you will read an essay by Dr. Justin Eckstein (a professor here in Communication at PLU) that argues that *sounds* can be *arguments*. He uses a number of terms to build his case, arguing that sound arguments have both *sound ontology* (embodiment, immediacy, immersion), and *sound reasonableness* (force, velocity, masking).

For this assignment, each student is asked to *make a sound argument*, in other words, an argument in the form of sound. Your goal should be to persuade people in our classroom.

Each student is asked to write an assessment of why your sound argument is persuasive and how it meets the standards for a good sound argument (as elaborated in Eckstein's article).

Your sound argument should be **no longer than 60 seconds**.

### Assignment Goals

This assignment teaches us the following:

- ✓ Expand our conception of what an argument can be
- ✓ Discern how sound influences us in everyday life
- ✓ Media production: Sound curation
- ✓ Argument hermeneutics: What makes a *sound* argument? (pun intended)

### Software

We will use WeVideo (PLU licenses this software). More info to follow.

### Citations

If you cite the Eckstein reading in your written portion, please use APA citational format. This requires both in-text citations and a separate "References" page. See [Purdue OWL](#) online for updated instructions on how to complete APA citations.

### Assessment of Sound Argument

Point value: 100 points.

The sound arguments will be assessed on the following:

- *Novelty of argument* 25 points – showed creativity and instrumentalization of sound to make something new and interesting
- *Written component* 50 points – showed understanding and fluency with aim of sound and sound categories; writing voice
- *Failure* 25 freebie points – let it rip

## Project 4 Presentations

### Overview

You will be asked to present your argument to the class. Please present from between 5-6 minutes, to ensure everyone has the opportunity to present.

If you cannot make your presentation date due to an excused absence, please tell me ASAP so we can make other arrangements.

### Structure of presentation

Please tell us:

- What your argument is. Play it in full.
- How it meets Dr. Eckstein's criteria or not.
- How you think it persuades the audience in the class.

### Schedule of presentations

<b>Monday Dec 5</b>	<b>Wednesday Dec 7</b>	<b>Friday Dec 9</b>
1. Names removed	1. Names removed	1. Names removed

### Assessment of Presentation

Value: 50

Project 4 Presentation will be assessed on the basis of the following:

- The rubric we made together at the start of class after reading Vanessa Beasley's essay on disability, public speaking, and rhetorical histories

Project 4 Written Component

Please answer the following prompt and fill in the table. Please type your responses.

**1. What is the argument of your sound argument? (200 words)**

**2. Why is your argument effective? How does it persuade those in our classroom? (200 words)**

**3. Assess how your sound argument meets each standard (3-4 full sentences per category):**

<b>Ontology</b>	
<b>Embodiment:</b> viscerally drawing from memory of past contexts, aka <i>anamnesis</i>	
<b>Immediacy:</b> the acceleration or deceleration of sounds, aka tempo	
<b>Immersion:</b> how the sound envelops you in a nexus of place, time, and feeling	
<b>Reasonableness</b>	
<b>Force:</b> the strength or weakness of the inference one can make from the sound (the leap between a premise and a conclusion)	

<p><b>Velocity:</b> whether the sound forces an immediate choice on the part of the intended audience</p>	
<p><b>Masking:</b> the extent to which the sound allows arguments to interact</p>	