МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ГЕРМАНСЬКОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ І ПЕРЕКЛАДУ
Кафедра германської філології

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему: «Емоційне звертання у сучасному англомовному медійному дискурсі»

студента групи МЛа51-23
факультету германської філології і перекладу
освітньо-професійної програми Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та перекладознавство

(назва)
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія

(код, назва)
Водоп'яна Гліба Вікторовича

(ПІБ студента)

Допущено до захисту
«___» _____ року

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент Пініч Ірина Петрівна
(науковий ступінь, вчене звання, ПІБ)

Завідувач кафедри германської філології
доктор філологічних наук, професор Шутова Марія Олександрівна

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

_____
(підпис)   *(ПІБ)*

КИЇВ – 2024

Master's Qualification Paper

EMOTIONAL APPEALS IN MODERN ENGLISH MEDIA DISCOURSE

GLIB VODOPIAN

Group MLa 51-22

Department of Germanic Philology
and Translation

Research Adviser

Associate Professor

IRYNA P. PINICH

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv –2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The **topicality** of the research is determined by a wide scholarly interest to linguistics of emotions as a complex study integrating findings in linguoculturology, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis and other branches of linguistics The study becomes even more relevant in relation to modern media discourse that has become an integral part of everyday life.

The aim of the research is to study the features and role of emotional appeal in modern English media discourse.

In order to achieve this aim, a series of **tasks** should be carried out:

1) to analyse the use of emotional appeal and investigate specific examples of emotional appeal in talk shows.
2) to categorise emotional appeal and determine the forms and types of emotional appeal in Modern English media.
3) to conduct a comparative analysis of media discourse instruments and the effectiveness of different methods for achieving emotional resonance.
4) to investigate the impact on the audience, its reaction to the emotional appeals of the speaker (a host or a guest).
5) to identify and examine the efficiency of conceptual metaphors in conveying emotional messages.

The object of the research is emotional appeal in modern English media discourse (based on talk shows).

The subject of the research is the pragmatic design of emotional appeals in media, their impact on emotional feedback in and their significance in influencing the audience.

Methods. The format of the research materials (videos) allows for an integral examination of the subject at the multimodality level: exploring both verbal and non-verbal behaviour of speakers. The application of discourse analysis, pragmatic analysis and linguocognitive methods is relevant, as they involve the analysis of cognitive and

communicative processes in the construction, perception and negotiation of emotional appeals. Considering the construction of viewpoints allows the study of the impact of emotional appeal on the formation and modification ofbeliefs as the ultimate goal of the speaker in modern media discourse. The method of conceptual metaphor analysis is applied to determine the key role of conceptual metaphors in conveying emotional content.

The novelty of the obtained results lies in the fact that this research contributes to the study of emotional appeal and its pragmatic role in contemporary media discourse.

The practical value lies in the potential use of the research in further studies of the subject.

The paper **consists of** an introduction, two main chapters and conclusions to them, general conclusions, résumé and a list of cited literature.

CHAPTER I. EMOTION EXPRESSION AND EMOTIONAL APPEAL AS OBJECTS OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

1.1 The scope of modern Linguistics of Emotions

Modern linguistics of emotions, sometimes also referred to as *emotiology*, is a broad topic that has been increasingly receiving more and more attention from the scientific community. Such mounting attention is caused by the fact that *emotiveness* (the ability to express one's emotional state) enhances speakers' communicative intention, thusly adding to the pragmatic influence on the interlocutor and being evaluated as an integral part of a language system (Цинтар, 2021, p. 28). In fact, almost every aspect of human language (grammar, semantics, prosody, phonetics etc.) communicates emotions (Majid, 2012). Same thought also resounds with Bulakhovsky, who was sure that people's emotions are "*uniquely expressed at all language levels*" (Slipetska, 2021, p. 105).

According to Herbert (2018), investigations of emotional word processing, in comparison with neutral words, showed that words carrying emotions tend to increase neural activity in the visual processing and object recognition. Although this recognition is usually divided onto two parts, where an initial, subjective appraisal caused by a word's emotionality, may only become available for the reader on the ultimate stages of information processing.

It's worth mentioning that on the lexical level not all of the lexemes are considered by the linguists to be emotive. Bednarek, (2008) distinguishes these main types of emotional vocabulary: 1) words that thematise and describe emotions 2) words that express emotions. The latter here is believed to be truly emotive, whilst thematisation is rather indicative than emotive due to the fact that it does not represent an individual's emotional state, but instead presents a logical idea of a certain emotion. On the other hand,

some researchers tend to deem emotion concept words as potential language means to convey or elicit emotional resonance (Pinich, 2021).

There are many notions regarding the exact definition of *emotiveness* and its differentiation from *emotionality*. Some scientists define it as psychological category that stands for the sensitivity of a distinct individual to emotionally charged situations, which brings the term closer to *emotionality*. Nevertheless, they do have a difference in psychological literature. Thus, *emotiveness* is considered to be an intentional display of emotions, which serves as a part of a certain communicative strategy, it is also used to estimate a situation and influence the behaviour of others who take part in the communicative process (Yemelianova, Yurko, 2014); whereas *emotionality* is defined as a natural, spontaneous and rather subconscious display of emotions (Лелет, 2021, p. 107).

When it comes to linguistic literature, the differentiation of the two terms is even more complicated, as there are many opinions that contradict one another. For instance, some researchers utilise the term *emotionality* in linguistics and tend to view it as an integral property of texts of different types and the linguistic correlate of the psychological category of emotionality, as well as a reflection of one's emotional state that is related to *expressiveness* (Melko, 2019, p. 189-191). *Expressiveness*, according to Melko, is often equated with *emotionality* despite them being two distinct concepts: the author states that *expressiveness* is a wider concept that entails all kinds of expressivity through linguistic means, whereas *emotionality* only covers the emotional aspect (Melko, 2019, p. 191).

Gnezdilova (2007) distinguishes between *emotiveness* and *emotionality* as two different types of communication, where in *emotional* communication the emphasis is on expressing the emotional states of the speakers, whereas in *emotive* communication the focus is on evoking emotional responses in the audience through the use of language. The linguist argues that *emotionality* is spontaneous and unpredictable in speech. In contrast, *emotiveness* is characterised as conscious and related to the intentional attempt at influencing others.

On the other hand, there are those who argue that the differentiation between *emotiveness* and *emotionality* should be determined by its usage in different sciences, namely psychology and linguistics. The key difference here is that the term *emotionality* is linked with psychology (as a psychological trait of a human being) whilst *emotiveness* is mainly associated with the linguistic property of the text. It follows that *emotiveness* is a linguistic analogue of the psychological term, which is *emotionality*, and it encompasses all of the linguistic means of conveying emotions (Лелет, 2021, p. 107).

To sum up, there are different views on whether we should equate emotiveness and emotionality, as well as different definitions attributed to these terms. However, most of the researchers tend to draw a line between the two terms by linking them to specific fields of study.

It's worth bearing in mind that the term *emotiology* isn't fully synonymic to linguistics of emotions either, as it is at times referred to as a distinct interdisciplinary science that analyses the role of emotions in human life, which represents a wider context. In other words, some scientists tend to define *emotiology* as a range of scientific studies on the emotional sphere that are conducted in different fields of science (Филимонова, 2007, p. 7). Whereas its linguistic part is sometimes referred to as *linguo-emotiology*.

This approach is not without a reason, as, due to their complex nature, emotions can be viewed as an object of study of many scientific disciplines, since it is quite challenging to address questions related to them while focusing solely on a limited area of knowledge. Even within the linguistic branch, the modern emotiology is closely related to different fields of studies, such as philosophy of emotions, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, conversational and discourse analyses and rhetoric. These fields of studies are in turn closely associated with other sciences through a shared knowledge base and methodology.

However, in its narrow meaning *emotiology* can be utilised interchangeably with linguistics of emotions as a discipline that explores the relations between a language and emotions formed on the verge of psychology and linguistics. From this perspective,

emotiology covers one of the semiotic systems of emotions elicited through verbalisation, which is verbal language. In its nature the verbal identification of emotions is always subjective, as it is highly dependent on the type of discourse and an individual's emotional state (Herbert, 2018, p. 1-4). There's also another system – body language, which is by far superior over the verbal one in terms of its reliability, straightforwardness, speed and sincerity of emotion expression. It is also more likely to be successfully deciphered and understood by the recipient. Emotiology is a relatively new discipline comparing to other fields of sciences, such as kinesics, which delves into the non-verbal way of expressing emotions. Such long absence of the interest in emotions is due to the fact that linguists have begun viewing emotions as a subject of their studies fairly recently. Among the first people to realise the importance of emotions in interpersonal communication were mostly literary scholars (Шаховский, 2009).

When discussing linguistics of emotions it is necessary to recall Charles Bally, who was among the first linguists who began paying special attention to the role of emotions in a language. Bally highly encouraged the scientific community to study a language in pair with its emotional aspects and their impact on the environment, thusly developing his own conception of stylistics which implied the necessity to research the possibilities of a spoken language, that included words and expressions created and conditioned by daily factors that give them an emotional undertone (Балли, 1955, p. 7). The scholarfocused on revealing affective and emotional tendencies of the speech on every level – phonetical, grammatical, lexical etc (Балли, 1995, p. 8) .

The difference between the terms *affect* and *emotion* is another hot topic in the study of human perception. An *affect* (or *core affect*) is understood as an example of a non-conscious, "raw" experience or state that hasn't been yet been processed by a person, it is a "*simple primitive non-reflective feeling most evident in mood and emotion but always available to consciousness*", such as satisfaction or tranquillity (Ekkekakis, 2012, p. 322; Russell & Feldman Barrett, 2009, p. 104). At the same time an *emotion* is a "*complex set of interrelated sub-events concerned with a specific object*" (Ekkekakis,

2012, p. 322; Russel, 1999, p. 806). In simple terms it's a reflective, conscious state of feeling. Russel provides an example of this differentiation when he breaks down the concept of *pride* – feeling good about yourself, the "feeling good" part is given as a *core affect*, while having such feeling about oneself is a cognitive component that makes *pride* an *emotion* (Ekkekakis, 2012, p. 322; Russel, 2003, p. 148).

Modern linguistics of emotions has a wide range of aspects that are prioritised for researching. For example, Shakhovsky names such aspects as the typology of emotive signs; the impact of an emotional mode of thinking on shaping a language picture of the world; the definition of a language picture of the world; communication of emotions; correlations between emotional lexicons of different pictures of the world; cultural identity in expressing emotions; linguistics and paralinguistics of emotions and their relations; lexicography of emotions and many more (Шаховский, 2008).

Apart from the already listed aspects, one of the primary focuses of the researcher's studies on linguistics of emotions nowadays is to analyse the emotive side of a language, which entails all of the means that allow speakers to express their thoughts, feelings and emotions. The act of influencing someone through those means is called an *emotional appeal*, which is also one of the topics that piques the modern linguists' interest (Corbett, 1999, p. 77-84). In other words, it can be defined as an attempt to persuade someone by eliciting powerful emotions, such as hatred, love, anger, pride, fear or compassion. *Emotional appeal* is one of the three methods of persuading others that were suggested by Aristotle, among which there are also *logical appeal* and *appeal to authority*, otherwise also known as *pathos*, *logos* and *ethos* (where *pathos* stands for emotions, *logos* stands for logic and *ethos* for trust and one's credibility) (Lee, 1939; Sjohnson, 2022). Depending on the ulterior motive and the type of emotions involved (negative or positive) *emotional appeals* might be separated onto relevant, meaning logically reasoned, and fallacious, which implies that an emotional appeal is presented with an ultimate goal of exploiting one's emotions to satisfy an exploiter's personal interests, while having no logical foundation (Hansen, 2002; Bressler, 2015). Aristotle also mentioned persuasive

fallacies in his work "Sophistical Refutations", in which he defined them as errors in reasoning that undermine the logic of an argument, as well as categorised some of the types of *fallacies* (Aristotle, ca. 350 B.C.E./1985). From this perspective, appeal to authority might also be taken for a fallacy or a failure in reasoning.

The way an individual commits an *emotional appeal* may also vary based on one's linguistic or cultural background. It is a popular topic to cover in the studies dedicated to linguistics of emotions. For instance, in the research on methodological triangulation in the study of emotion conducted by Ogarkova, Soriano and Gladkova, the authors present the cross-cultural differences in expressing emotions by exemplifying it with the concept of "anger". It is stated that the difference is often created due to the tendencies of each individual culture towards individualism or collectivism (Ogarkova, 2016 p. 75). The linguists share their understanding of culture dimensions identified by Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980).

These cultural tendencies have a huge impact on the formation of peoples' mindsets and psychological behaviour. For example, obvious irritation is more likely to be seen by the collectivistic society as a threat that disrupts the harmony, whereas individualistic cultures are more tolerant towards public expressions of negative emotions. Freedom of speech together with freedom to make individual choices adds to the intensification of expressing one's feelings and emotions. The members of collectivistic cultures on the other hand are less prone to acknowledging their anger as something they experience due to this type of emotion being publicly condemned and therefore deemed undesirable (Ogarkova, 2016, p. 77).

This approach, however, is criticised by some other scientists for not being broad enough to account for many cultural traits that aren't necessarily resulted from its affinity to collectivism or individualism (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 2019, p. 163). Indeed, while these social leanings are extremely crucial in shaping a societal attitude, they aren't the only factor. Moreover, there are plenty of differences between the cultures that belong to the same collectivist or individualist camp.

Hence it becomes obvious that while there might be general studies on emotiology, they are not always universal, especially when it comes to investigating an *emotional appeal* within a group of people of a certain culture. In fact, it is essential to narrow down the research context to one or a couple of languages (if a comparative analysis is to be done) in order to maximise the accuracy of its results. It especially makes sense considering the fact that every single culture has its own approach to expressing an emotional state, its own set of descriptions of emotional patterns that is spread among the members of the same community and is not necessarily shared with other cultures with similar collectivistic-individualistic tendencies (Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 2019, p. 160).

A personal component should not be overlooked either. As Wierzbicka has argued that the meaning of an emotional term is not just a matter of abstract, universal categories, but also of personal, subjective experience. She emphasises that the range of variation and improvisation of the semantics of linguistic units is the widest and most diverse in the sphere of their personal emotive meanings (Wierzbicka, 1999). Thus, a language is the same for everyone, however, when it comes to its emotiveness, the range of variation in semantics is at its widest, since every linguistic unit tends to have diverse personal emotive meanings (Felix Ameka, 2024).

Which means that any person might have a different view on the same words that exist within a single language, even despite the emotional implications that are already present in them. Linguistic units are the most diverse in this personal context, when people develop their own emotive meanings for each lexeme they use.

There's also a hypothesis that languages themselves can influence our emotions (in opposition to emotiveness, which stands for how a language can become a tool for expressing emotions). Maïa Ponsonnet (2022, p. 5) suggests that something that is well conceptualised in one language (like the French word for "taking pleasure in discovering a new place" – *dépaysement*) might influence the way speakers of that language think. As the very existence of a certain rare concept in a form of one laconic word would

consequently serve as an incentive to think about it and bring it up more often when processing information. In addition, she mentions that following the linguistic relativity hypothesis, it is plausible that the way people conceptualise things happens to influence the experience we have when dealing with the concepts (Ponsonnet, 2022, p. 5).

Although there's clearly some influence on people's behaviour and thoughts, scientists still can't come up with a single view on how exactly it impacts our way of thinking and how intense this impact is. Some linguists prefer an opposing idea (the so-called "*language as a window on emotions*" approach) that suggests that languages mirror emotion categories. The two approaches are often deemed mutually exclusive and contradicting (Ponsonnet, 2022, p. 6-7).

Having analysed the potential that a language has to not only aid in our expressing of emotions, but also in shaping our conceptualisation and experience, it becomes apparent that the symbolic and imaginative aspects can play a crucial role in emotional influence of others. Thus, we might come to a conclusion that emotion metaphors serve as a powerful tool allowing people to share and get a deep sense of complex emotional concepts and experiences, as well as effectively evoke emotional responses.

In this light, we may think of metaphors as of one of the ways of composing *emotional appeals*. This idea is endorsed in linguistic circles in a form of the Cognitive Metaphor Theory. According to this theory, linguistic metaphors are believed to be "*verbal expressions that depict their target figuratively, thanks to an analogy with something else*". They also reflect cognitive metaphors (Ponsonnet, 2022, p. 18).

Some scientists identify as many as seven types of the main methods of emotional influence or manipulation, where alongside epithets, euphemisms, modal verbs or figurative comparative constructions they also include metaphors (Saiko, 2022, p. 21). In Saiko's study linguistic manipulation techniques are all divided into four main levels: graphical, phonetical, lexical and grammatical. Emotion metaphors (grouped together with personification) are defined as lexical methods that "*help to draw attention to a needed concept, whilst concealing or withholding other concepts*" (Saiko, 2022, p. 24).

The role of metaphors had not really been proven or tested out until recently where new research showed that conceptual metaphors indeed have an impact on one's cognitive performance (Ponsonnet, 2022, p. 18). There is an actual example of that, when a series of studies were conducted to analyse the influence of metaphors on people's perceptions it was found out that English speakers, due to metaphoric relation of the world "up" with something powerful and the word "down" with the opposite, would be prone to view something as more worthy or more powerful when its name appeared at the top of a screen or a list rather than at the bottom. This also corresponds with the concept of divinity and the perception of "high" and "lowly" in its relation to religion. It was concluded that "*metaphors shape how people perceive aspects of the social environment that are associated with abstract concepts*" (Landau, Meier, Keefer, 2010, p. 4-5; Ponsonnet, 2022, p. 18). Moreover, the metaphorical nature of our daily conceptual system, according to which we live, is highlighted by Lakoff and Johnson (1981, p. 4-7), who argue that such concepts also "*govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details… Structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people*".

Moreover, same concepts are also thought to be having an impact on people's attitudinal tendencies: it is more likely to imagine a positive concept, like happiness or amusement, as "vertically high" and vice versa for the concepts that have a negative undertone as "vertically low" (Landau, Meier, Keefer, 2010, p. 6). Similar leanings can be traced in physical conceptions of distancing, cleanliness and even brightness. It is said that conceptual mappings in metaphoric relations incorporate "systems of entailments" (meaning all of the relational knowledge regarding a concept), which serve as a knowledge framework for evaluating the target concept (Landau, Meier, Keefer, 2010, p. 2).

To conclude, metaphors can have a large impact on people's attitude and evoke certain emotional reactions, that proves their great emotive role and factually perpetuates

it as one of the main methods of an emotional appeal, which is the primary focus of this research.

Overall, the study of linguistics of emotions highlights the intricate ways in which a language can influence emotional expression and communication dynamics. Emotional appeals serve as a focal point for researchers seeking to understand the persuasive power of a language and its impact on human behaviour.

1.2 Methods for Analysing Emotional Appeal

As we delve deeper into the topic of emotional appeals within the context of linguistics of emotions, it becomes imperative to explore the methodologies employed to analyse and comprehend these persuasive linguistic devices.

Linguistics of emotions utilises the knowledge base and a collection of methods from various adjacent fields of study and sciences, such as, for instance, sociology or psychology, which also imply detailed research of the nature of emotions. In fact, conducting a full-fledged, comprehensive, high-quality investigation is practically impossible without resorting to this *multidisciplinary approach* to a certain extent.

Despite the existence of separate studies on the role of emotions in a text or a spoken language, emotional appeals are most likely to be fully disclosed in a case when more contexts are taken into consideration. This *integrated approach* allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how linguistic elements interact with emotional states, shedding light on the intricate mechanisms behind persuasive communication and the power of language to evoke, express, and influence emotions.

Moreover, the format of the materials used in this research, such as talk-shows, allows us to explore another aspect of interpersonal communications and a form of expressing emotional appeals, namely the non-verbal behaviour of speakers. This entails such cues as gestures, posture, body language, facial expressions, eye contact and

intonation, all of which play a crucial role in conveying emotions and enhancing the persuasive impact of language. The non-verbal aspect of communication not only complements verbal expressions but often carries a significant portion of the emotional message. It can convey sincerity, empathy or even dominance, influencing how the audience perceives the speaker's emotional intent. For instance, a speaker leaning forward with open body language and solid eye contact may signal engagement in a conversation and sincerity, while averted gaze and crossed arms may evoke the opposite associations, such as discomfort or excessive defensiveness. The incorporation of the analysis of these non-verbal cues alongside the linguistic research is known as a *multimodality level analysis*. Applying the *method of multimodality* makes it easier to gain deeper insights into the nature of emotional communication and, most of all, emotional appeals.

Apart fromthe multimodality method, the application of a *linguocognitive method* is relevant during the research. It involves the analysis of the cognitive mechanisms involved in the perception and formation of an emotional appeal, such as semantic processing, conclusion drawing and emotional contagion. Employing a linguocognitive approach facilitates the investigation of how people interpret and process linguistic hooks to elicit emotional responses, how emotional appeals are constructed and how they influence the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours of individuals.

Additionally, the impact of emotional appeals on the formation of images and perspectives by a targeted audience is possible through *consideration of the construction of perspectives*, where shaping of imagery and viewpoints of individuals is presented as perlocutionary effect which makes the key objective of the speaker. This method of pragmatic analysis requires the emphasis to be placed on the techniques the speaker utilises when creating a narrative, presenting information or framing an issue that help them to resonate emotionally with the audience.

As we've already concluded before, another way of conveying emotional content is through metaphors. Emotion metaphors serve as a convenient tool that aids speakers in formulating emotional appeals when necessary and allows us to share our feelings and

experiences on the deepest level, effectively, by evoking other's emotional responses. It possesses such power due to the fact that metaphors are more effective in transmitting whole, existing concepts from one person to another, in other words, they bear a bigger emotional charge. Conceptual metaphors involve understanding of abstract or complex ideas by relating them to more familiar or concrete concepts. In the context of emotional communication, conceptual metaphors play a crucial role in how emotions are expressed, understood, and interpreted. Thus, in order to determine the role of these metaphors in the conversations on the talk-shows that we use as a material, it is reasonable to apply *the method of analysing concepts and conceptual metaphors*.

One of the ways to break down conceptual metaphors is by using the *lexical approach* within the Conceptual Metaphor Theory constantly employed by Kövecses. It involves searching for the information about a particular concept in dictionaries and identifying other words and notions usually referred to the chosen concept in order to deepen the understanding and get a grasp on people's perception of it through analysing the possible associations within its thematic cluster (Kövecses, 2019, p. 3-5). It's worth noting that Kövecses advocates for a multilevel approach to analyse conceptual metaphors fully. This approach involves combining lexical, psycholinguistic, corpus linguistic, and even neuroscientific methods (Csatár, 2022). However, since conceptual metaphors are not the main focus of our study, many of these methods may be excessive.

The *lexical approach*, nevertheless, still remains relevant. While it is typically applied in research focusing predominantly on metaphors and the structures of their concepts, it can also be utilised in examining the metaphoric aspects of specific concepts used in emotional appeals and unravelling the underlying messages conveyed through metaphors, especially when the comprehension of certain metaphors may be somewhat obscured.

Another approach that may prove useful in the study is *discourse analysis*, which is defined as a method that includes analysing the structure of texts or speech while considering their linguistic features and sociolinguistic context. *Discourse analysis* might

aid in revealing the dependencies of formulating emotional appeals on media discourse, providing valuable insights into the conditions of the construction of emotional messages.

Since the materials of the research consist of both visual and auditory parts, employing *the method of perceptual phonetics* might benefit the research. The method focuses on sounds in a speech, it involves examining how listeners interpret and process the sounds based on different acoustic cues, such as rhythm, pitch, intensity and duration. By studying how different phonetic features are perceived and categorized by listeners, we can peek into how linguistic elements contribute to the emotional tone and impact of speech. This method might be also combined with the one listed previously – *the consideration of perspectives construction*, by examining how a speaker intentionally applies certain phonetic features to shape his message and enhance the influence they perform.

In addition to that, it's crucial to consider the intensity of emotions when analysing emotional appeals. Since emotions serve as the main driving force of emotional appeals, it is only reasonable to view them as the key aspect to be studied, which includes scrutinising methods that are used to analyse emotions. One way to do this is by referencing the *emotions sorting methodology* and emotion hierarchies or identification systems, such as the one proposed by Plutchik.

Plutchik's model also known as the wheel of emotions provides a framework of eight core emotions, which are all grouped into opposite pairs: *joy*, *sadness*; *anger*, *fear*; *disgust*, *trust*; *anticipation* and *surprise*. They can be combined to form secondary emotions, such as *love*, *awe* or *remorse*, as well as range from the strongest to mildest (from its centre to the outer rim of the wheel), which fully depends on the intensity of their emotional charge (Sixseconds, 2024).

Although it is difficult to encompass the full gradient of emotions and the choice of colours for each emotion branch may not align with the popular associations, Plutchik's wheel of emotions serves as an indispensable basis for analysing emotions, their intensity as well as root causes. Furthermore, due to the special structure of the

hierarchy, it efficiently demonstrates the proximity of different branches and helps in identifying their similarities and the peculiarities of the way they interconnect.

By utilising frameworks like this, we can categorise and evaluate the intensity of emotions expressed in linguistic content. This enables a more nuanced understanding of the emotional impact of an appeal and how it resonates with audiences.

Lastly, it's essential to underline that all of the previously mentioned approaches rely on the fundamental methods employed in the study, such as:

1) *The method of observation and selection*, which is paramount, as it involves watching and selecting suitable materials.
2) *The method of classification*, primarily used to systematise the identified means and forms of emotional appeals. This method includes categorising and organising data based on common themes, patterns or characteristics.
3) *The method of analysis* to study the manifestation of emotional appeals in real-life communication settings of the talk-shows.

If used combinedly, these methods provide a solid foundation for investigating the dynamics of emotional communication and the effectiveness of emotional appeals within various contexts.

1.3 Emotional resonance in modern English media discourse

Emotional resonance is a complex phenomenon that is studied not only in linguistics but also in psychology and sociology. It is often associated and sometimes equated with *empathy*, another term that is more widely recognised by people. However, while *emotional resonance* and *empathy* might be defined very similarly – *the ability to comprehend one another and respond to each other's experience and share the same emotions*, it is essential to highlight their nuanced differences, since in some contexts they are considered to be related, but not identical concepts.

The roots of *emotional resonance* are innate in humans and can be traced back to infancy: when babies react with crying to the crying of other babies. Interestingly enough, the shared experience of the same emotions in infants is observed even before they develop an ability to distinguish between their own self and others, which therefore precedes the development of *empathy* (Decety, 2008, p. 1057). This may already lead us to believe that the terms *emotional resonance* and *empathy* describe slightly different contexts. While both involve understanding and sharing the emotions elicited by others, emotional resonance may deviate more into subconsciously mirroring or responding to emotions, while empathy can imply a deeper understanding of another's perspective or feelings.

Scientists have demonstrated that when observing someone else's pain, the areas of the observer's brain responsible for reacting to their own pain are activated. In other words, the human brain is capable of perceiving another's pain just like if it was their own (Decety, 2008, p. 1060). This might influence people in both positive and negative ways, depending on a message, either way being a powerful tool of persuasion.

A lack, or conversely, an abundance of *emotional resonance* can significantly influence our sense of belonging and social connection, which highlights the profound impact that emotional dynamics cast on our social interactions and well-being. For example, when individuals experience emotional resonance within a group setting, they often feel included, understood and validated, which fosters a sense of cohesion. On the other hand, the absence of emotional resonance can lead to feelings of isolation and alienation.

This phenomenon bears the name of *social induction*, emphasising on the social source of its influence, another property of which is that the more people are hooked by a certain emotion, the less resistance it faces spreading further (Hill, 2010). The concept of people connecting and giving in their personal sense of things for the feelings of a group aligns with the well-established notion in psychology that is a *herd/group instinct*. The intricacies of group psychology and the role of emotions in shaping collective

behaviour were explored by many prominent philosophers and psychologists, including Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung and Gustave Le Bon. Considering the tendency of emotions to override rationality and direct the behavioural impulses and responses, it is safe to compare *emotional resonance* to the engine driving a group, with *emotions* respectively serving as its fuel.

Therefore, *emotional resonance* is considered to be a key force that can affect the most profound aspects of social interactions. It proves to be valuable in many settings and cannot be negated when trying to peek inside of the nature of interpersonal relationships within a scientific investigation nor when attempting to socialise with others.

The phenomenon of *emotional resonance* in modern English media discourse entails the power of an individual to elicit, amplify and manipulate other people's emotions through a language in order to influence their behaviour, shape their attitude and opinions in a favourable way. The media discourse itself requires high level of preparation and profound knowledge that would allow a person to act confidently in social interactions. Therefore, emotional appeals are widely and strategically utilised throughout different media with the final goal of achieving *emotional resonance* within a particular audience and thusly creating the needed responses from the audience.

The use of emotions, however, also demands a speaker to comply with a certain degree of ethical consideration, as the borderline between a successful appeal and an overly intense attempt of manipulation is fairly thin. It is essential to recognise the potential consequences that come with manipulating emotions for personal gain or agenda purposes: the deliberate, excessively aggressive manipulation, like biased reporting or sensationalism, might initially work, but gradually raise suspicions among the audience or exhaust them, and as a result – fully undermine their trust.

There are plenty of instructions or guidelines created to support people in developing their social skills, such as an ability to persuade others, while remaining grounded and courteous towards the audience. It is to no surprise, since the ability to use an *emotional appeal* in line with ethical norms is considered to be a good quality that

metaphorically opens many doors. Such instructions are especially spread within business or media discourse that tend to lay a higher level of complexity and responsibility upon interhuman interactions.

Even Linkedin, a major social media platform primarily known for its business or employment emphasis, presents some of its own guidelines, that are dedicated to utilising *emotional appeals* without exploiting the audience or avoiding risks when resorting to *emotional appeals*. And while the platform itself is focused on business relationships, the guidelines showcased there are universal and also applicable to media discourse. Most of their techniques have such things in common as: knowing your audience and recognising its needs while formulating your own purpose; choosing the correct emotions for a certain context; being able to effectively combine negative and positive emotions; understanding the imperativeness of authenticity and honesty and, most importantly, respecting the audience (Linkedin 2023, 2024).

Another thing of a huge importance is the need to balance *emotion* with *reason*. It means that in order to utilise an *emotional appeal* without risking to be negatively regarded as a manipulative person exploiting the emotions of others, one cannot solely limit themselves to *pathos*, but also has to resort to *logos*. When a speaker invokes *reason* or *logic*, it is a clear token of respect to the audience that shows people that they are not being misled, which establishes credibility and trust. An additional way to foster credibility is to employ such terms, the definitions of which are either widely understood or that have been already explained, leaving out any obscure or ambiguous aspects. This principle that requires an orator or a speaker to build his speech simply and laconically is not new, in fact it was suggested long ago by Aristotle (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2022) and later confirmed by Blaise Pascal, a famous French philosopher (Blaise Pascal, 1658, p. 411).

Thus, clarity and good reasoning in one's *emotional appeal* fosters trust and prevents suspicions about one's motives from arising. As a universal technique, it proves to be effective in any situation that implies social interactions, yet is especially crucial in

the modern media discourse, where the dependence of one's success is highly correlated with their ability to remain listened to and trusted and where psychological aspects of communication thereby receive a great deal of special attention.

Despite the shared primary goal of persuading the crowd and swaying it into believing someone as well as developing an affection or respect for that person, the likelihood of resorting to unethical manipulative methods is different for every context. Although it is important to notice that the perception of something being unethical or ethical is also very dynamic, depending on various circumstances (like place or style of a communication) and consequently people's expectations. For instance, politicians are more likely to be seen as overusing *emotional appeals* in their speeches, driven by the necessity of raising the numbers of their potential constituents and conditioned by the overall aggressive nature of politics (Issa, 2018), while famous actors might use similar methods to ensure their visibility among other celebrities and enthral their audience. Nevertheless, their use of *emotional appeals* is hardly as often criticised as that of the politicians. All due to them having distinct social roles that require less strictness in both forms of speech and attitude to the general public.

The talk show genre has been chosen as a material source for this study on emotional appeals in modern English media discourse for a reason. It is a relatively young genre on television closely related to other genres of TV programs, such as information (information-analytical) or entertainment programs. Formed in 1960, it has been established as a genre of a rather scandalous matter, comparing to other adjacent types of shows and broadcasts. Its main task is to tackle burning issues and candid topics through having discussions with prominent, influential guests and by means of the frequent use of sensationalism. Despite often addressing informational topics, talk shows remain largely of an entertaining nature, which again explains its high level of emotionality.

In order to attract the attention of potential viewers, talk show hosts, who play the role of an interlink between the invited celebrities and their audience, constantly resort to psychological techniques and attempt in every way possible to keep the viewer engaged

by incorporating humour and scandalous elements into the discussions. A good host should be able to listen to their guest, whilst also being attentive to the audience. Being able to "read the room" and consider the intricacies of an emotional talk are one of the most prized values a host might possess. Furthermore, the non-verbal aspect (the tone of voice, diction and gestures and the overall appearance) receives plenty of attention too, as it is required from hosts to comply with the standards of their show, depending on its type.

There are talk shows of different forms and variations: they stretch from less serious evening chats and discussions to more formal televised debates, the latter often relying on the political events such as upcoming elections. Another format of talk shows is a teleconference, which implies the opposition of two distinct audiences that are connected through a broadcast with each host representing the opinions and values of their own viewers and engaging in a lively discussion with the opposite side.

The types of talk shows predominantly determine the forms of emotional expressions in them: with the participants of the less formal meetings naturally tending to be not as restricted in expressing personal feelings as those who take part in formal debates or teleconferences. Nevertheless, talk shows remain highly emotional all the same, as all of its types share a primary goal of showing or, if none yet exists, creating a sensation or an ardently discussed precedent, which will cause a certain resonance in the society.

Given all the qualities listed above, talk shows serve as an ideal source material for studying the emotional component of communication.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER I

The overall scope of linguistics of emotion is immense, as it is related to one of the fundamental functions of a language called emotive function, yet not as well researched

as some other fields of linguistics. In the theoretical part of the study, we've established some key definitions and analysed the differences between them:

Emotiology is a field that exists in psychology, sociology, linguistics, and other related disciplines. It seeks to comprehend the source, nature of expression, as well as impact of emotions on human behaviour and interhuman communication. Within the context of linguistic research, the term sometimes is interchangeably used with *linguistics of emotions*, which examines how linguistic elements interact with emotional states, shedding light on the intricate mechanisms behind persuasive communication and the power of language to evoke, express, and influence emotions. However, *emotiology* can also describe a wider, multidisciplinary context that implies a combined study of emotions instead of specifically investigating the role of language in expressing and evoking emotions. It's necessary to mention that despite the differentiation, it is not completely wrong to use the term *emotiology* in the narrower context when referring to its linguistic aspect, as even linguistic research on emotions demands the incorporation of a multidisciplinary approach and cannot be limited to one single field of science.

Emotiveness and *emotionality* are sometimes also equated, however, most of the scientists agree upon the idea of differentiating them either by their relation to different sciences, respectively linguistics and psychology, or by the intention factor, where *emotiveness* is a conscious display of emotions and a communicative strategy intentionally applied by individuals, whereas *emotionality* is of a spontaneous, subconscious nature. The concept often appears in the linguistic literature in relation to *expressiveness*, which also covers the emotional display, yet isn't solely limited to emotions, thus earning itself a wider definition of the combination of all linguistic expressions within a language.

In order to avoid the possible confusion related to the use of terminology in this study, it is worth pointing out that the term *emotiveness* will be henceforth used referring to the capacity to express and evoke emotions, while *emotionality* will mostly describe the intensity of an expressed emotion within a given context.

The most important term that describes the main object of the study is *emotional appeal*. An *emotional appeal* is a persuasive technique used during communication to elicit specific emotions in the audience with the aim of influencing their attitudes, beliefs, or behaviours. These appeals rely on language (verbal) and non-verbal devices to create a connection with the audience on an emotional level.

Another key term is *emotional resonance*, which is a complex phenomenon referred to the ability of an individual to fully comprehend and share the emotions expressed by others. It involves sympathising with the experiences of other people and responding to them emotionally, often leading to a sense of connection and cohesion within social groups. The term also has a better-known substitution word, which is *empathy*. Despite the popular equation of these lexemes, they once again have a very nuanced difference: *emotional resonance* is a subconscious response to the emotions of others, while *empathy* implicates a well-informed, deep comprehension of one's emotional state and consequent conscious reactions to it.

With regard to the methodologies employed in analysing emotional appeals within the context of linguistics of emotions, there's a list of important methods that will benefit the research and aid in revealing the role of emotional appeals in creating emotional resonance in modern English media discourse. Among these methods the most fundamental ones are *the method of observation*, which is applicable during the selection of suitable materials and analysing the emotional appeals in communication; and *the method of classification*, that includes classifying and organising the sourced data based on common patterns and features. Apart from these basic methods, a multidisciplinary approach is necessary. It integrates knowledge base from sociology, psychology, linguistics and other related fields, recognising the interconnected nature of emotions with various aspects of human experience.

Similarly, *the method of multimodality* allows us to investigate both verbal and non-verbal behaviour of people participating in a talk show and effectively identify the contribution of linguistic devices, body language, facial expressions and intonations to

conveying emotions and enhancing their persuasive impact. The phonetical part could be scrutinised by means of *the method of perceptual phonetics*, that focuses on the acoustic cues and their perception by people.

Another focus of interest is on the metaphors, which play a huge part in expressing emotional content and allow people to exchange their feelings and experiences on the deepest level, which involves effectively sharing whole conceptual images and quickly evoking emotional responses. Therefore, *the method of analysing concepts and conceptual metaphors* could be applied to conduct a detailed study on the role of metaphors among other things in the context of formulating emotional appeals. One of the ways to analyse them is by employing the lexical approach, which suggests identifying referred notions and concepts which could help in further identification of the possible associations that pop up in the minds of the audience as a response to the use of conceptual metaphors.

Besides, *linguocognitive methods* could be utilised together with *the consideration of perspectives* to get a grasp on how a speaker attempts to achieve his key goal of casting an impact on his viewers or listeners. Since the ultimate goals of one's speech are closely related to the discourse and the context, *the discourse analysis* will aid in explaining the dependency of forming emotional appeals on the conditions in which the communication occurs.

Lastly, in order to categorise the emotions utilised by speakers as well as understand their intensity, roots and possible interactions with other emotions, we may resort to the method of emotion categorisation suggested by Plutchik (namely his framework of emotions/"the wheel of emotions"), which succeeds in showing the most key characteristics of basic emotions both independently and in their interrelation.

Overall, the use of the previously discussed methodologies will provide a foundation for a broad and deep analysis of the dynamics of emotional communication within various contexts, specifically the pragmatic design of emotional appeals used in the media.

CHAPTER II. STRATEGISING EMOTIONAL FEEDBACK IN MODERN ENGLISH TALK SHOWS

2.1. Emotional Appeal in Modern English Talk Shows

The role of emotions in daily communication is incomparable. They serve as a device that deepens the interpersonal connection, adds nuance and authenticity to the speech, aids in inspiring, persuading and generally allows for influencing others in a way that corresponds to our expectations from conversations that we carry. If we deprive our language of any emotional component, we will most likely appear artificial to other people, which may cause a certain tension in their responses to what we attempt to convey. And even though the role of emotionality in different discourses might vary in its significance, in case of live communication, the lack of emotions might present us as less human and can easily undermine the feeling of reliance and favourable perception of us.

Thus, emotional appeals are an indispensable tool that enables people to effectively transmit their thoughts and feelings by evoking empathy. The most notable and obvious way of constructing such appeals, which has been widely studied, is by employing specific lexemes that carry an emotional baggage deeply rooted into the mere concept of a word. Which is not surprising by any chance, since a little action of switching up one word for another has a potential of adjusting the intensity of the whole statement it is included in, and thus, influencing other's perception (Dandrea, 2011).

That is where the emotion sorting methodology comes into play with hierarchies such as the Plutchik's emotion wheel. Such systems of identification provide a comparative outlook on the intensity and interconnectedness of certain "branches" of emotions. By positioning emotions along the spectrum from "primary" to "secondary" the model additionally allows researchers to assess how the selection of certain words can escalate or diminish the emotional impact. For instance, when speakers verbally label

their emotional state as "pensive" rather than "in grief" or "in despair", it suggests a less overwhelming emotional experience, which can defuse the tension and convey the correct emotional nuance to the audience.

An opposite effect can be traced in Graham Norton's interview with Keanu Reeves, where the actor is being asked about his experience of practicing ballroom dances:

G: "But why did you decide you wanted to learn ballroom?"

*K: "Uhm, it sounded like **fun**".*

G: "I'm sensing it wasn't".

*K: "It was! It was **thrilling**. Actually, I remember one of the first lessons I had, when I did the waltz with a partner and… oh my gosh, I mean **I got high**! It was **amazing**. That first time, and she led… And just, **fucking**… Oh, excuse my language. Just like, it was **amazing**, **thrilling** to be moving through space like that!"* (BBC, 2019, 0:15-0:47).

As we can see, Keanu first utilises simple labelling by describing ballroom dances as "*fun*", which, due to the word being relatively neutral, gives Graham an incentive to assume that the reason behind such choice of lexemes is that the actor didn't enjoy this experience – *"I'm sensing it wasn't"*. Keanu then has to provide a more emotionally charged word to eliminate the misunderstanding and establish the correct perception of his story. Instead of "*fun*" he now utilises "*thrilling*", which is more emotionally intense, and later diversifies his remark with "*amazing*". Despite of it being a little less intense on the scale, compared to "*thrilling*", it helps the speaker to refute a false opinion, additionally underlining his excitement. Note that Keanu in the same manner also applies a figurative description of his feelings – "*I got high*" and a profanity as an intensifier in the form of an adjective "*fucking*", for which he later apologises. Ultimately, the actor anchors his emotional state by repeating the already used labelling "*amazing*, *thrilling*", this time putting it into an order based on its intensity from lowest to the highest and ending his statement at the peak of exhilaration.

The overall rapid spike of emotionally marked vocabulary hence is a responsive measure to the misunderstanding caused by the initial lack of emotionality, the primary purpose of which is to establish the image of positivity in opposition to the actor's alleged disappointment.

One of the largest downsides of focusing mainly on the lexical aspect is that it does not account for the role of intonation and vocal delivery in conveying emotions. The same word or phrase can take on a drastically different emotional resonance, depending on how it is spoken: the volume, pitch, rhythm, and emphasis used by the speaker. This paralinguistic dimension of communication is undoubtedly crucial for creating an emotional impact, however, it is not captured when emphasising purely on the lexical aspects.

While it might prove very effective when studying a text, in the context of media, where both verbal and nonverbal cues become central to how hosts and guests express themselves, the omission of intonation poses a major limitation. The way a statement is voiced, whether it is said emphatically, hesitantly, or with a touch of sarcasm, can dramatically alter its emotional weight and significance to the audience. Moreover, depending on the specific intonation, a word that is generally positioned in the highest circles of the hierarchy, and is hence considered to be more intense, may fall behind a one that is usually less emotionally charged, due to the emphasis given to the latter by the speaker.

When it comes to media, there is a significantly wider set of factors that contribute to an emotional appeal. Namely, the incorporation of visual cues: videoclips, photographs and graphics as well as body language all participate in improving the emotional resonance within an audience. Modern equipment allows for providing an effective footage right in the middle of a show without pausing it. Close-up camera angles and audience reactions shown in live involve viewers into the conversation by creating a sense of immediacy and intimacy.

An excellent example of the visuals playing a key role can be observed in an episode of "*The One Show*" featuring Will Poulter. During the episode, Poulter and other guests share their memories of youth and adolescence (BBC, 2022). Initially, these recollections are conveyed primarily through verbal aspects of communication. However, the dynamic shifts when the hosts reveal that they have found and invited Will's former math teacher to the show. At this point, Poulter's emotional expression becomes predominantly carried through his body language. The main guest of the show undergoes a whole spectrum of emotions, from pure confusion and doubt on whether it is true or not, marked by his hesitant smile, to sheer astonishment when he understands that it is not a joke.

His emotional state is particularly emphasised to the viewer through the inclusion of a videoclip of his teacher, alongside Poulter's real-time reaction shown in a small frame next to the video, which helps the audience to feel present and genuinely share the emotional weight as though they were a part of that conversation.

The reaction is then followed with expressions: "***oh my gosh***, *that's **amazing**. I didn't expect that, wow. That's **so nice**, thank you! That's **amazing** ...*"; "*oh, that's **very sweet**, she's **amazing***" (BBC, 2022, 4:05-4:24).

Note that the speaker's use of expressive language is fairly diverse, however, the neutrality of his intonation does not fully align with it, thus the emotional weight of the words is not wholly represented when spoken by Will. Although the repetition of the same words, such as "*amazing*" might be taken for an attempt to intensify the message and make up for the lack of the vocal emphasis.

When it comes to analysing the voice pitch, his intonation is characterised by its simplicity. Will Poulter tends to express himself in a very calm, sedate manner, hence, the lack of vocal variety is largely compensated with his body language and facial expressions, which proves to be true in the case of this particular reaction.

Will is overjoyed with the kind gesture, yet cannot fully convey his emotional state through intonation due to his temper, for which his body and face fully make up. The obvious fidgeting on one place and his teary eyes serve as a brightly expressed cue allowing others to comprehend the exact emotions he is experiencing despite the limited verbal response.

Therefore, both verbal and non-verbal behaviour play an equal role in illustrating and amplifying the emotional appeal presented by speakers, thus developing a stronger emotional connection to the topic, which depend on the pragmatic interest of a speaker, drawing the audience in and indulging their engagement.

2.2. Pragmatic design of Emotional Engagement in Modern Talk Shows

The pragmatic design of emotional engagement itself is a crucial aspect of speakers' appeal and ultimate success in modern English talk shows. Talk show hosts and producers carefully craft their programs to elicit emotional responses from an audience through a variety of techniques, such as the strategic use of emotionally charged language. Hosts and guests often employ emotive vocabulary, rhetorical questions and vivid descriptions to create a sense of connection and shared experience with the audience. They may also use vocal inflections, dramatic pauses and body language to further enhance the emotional impact of their words.

In addition, the selection of guests and topics is never a simple coincidence, since it is meticulously curated in order to tap into the audience's emotions and interests. Such things as controversial or personal issues, heartwarming stories and celebrity gossips commonly find themselves as main topics of talk shows, as they are designed to provoke strong emotional reactions from viewers. Hosts might adopt distinct methods of interviewing depending on their personal attitudes and the format of the show. Material

analysis provided further shows that we can broadly categorise them on the range between the two opposite approaches.

There are those that prefer focusing their attention primarily on a guest, asking questions and steering the conversation in the right direction (whom we might figuratively address as "*umpires*" or „*overseers*"). Their approach is driven by a necessity to find and share sensational content. The sensationalism then manifests as a defining trait of their show that satisfies their target audience. Many modern popular talk shows with grand studios and large viewer bases, such as *The Tonight Show* starring *Jimmy Fallon*, *The Late Show with Stephen Colbert* and most notably *Jimmy Kimmel´s Live Show* fall into this category.

In contrast, other hosts (we may call them "*insiders*") prioritise making their show as comfortable and pleasant to their guests and audience as possible by embracing authenticity as a trait that brings a unique touch to their show. Instead of grand, airy halls, they mostly use small rooms with cosy setups as their filming location, since it tends to soothe the nervousness caused by the filming and, when it comes to the audience, provides a more familiar, homely ambience, which adds in its immersion and engagement with the show. Unlike the „overseers", they may opt out of utilising background noise, such as studio laughter or applause, as something that can be perceived as disrupting in terms of the overall atmosphere than effective emotive tools.

Despite the obvious fact that the main goal of any show is to satisfy its viewers' desire for sensations or fun, the methods of achieving this vary from host to host. In this case, the two categories mentioned above represent a certain labelling of the two extremes, with most of the talk shows landing somewhere on the spectrum either closer to one end or the other.

Alison Hammond is a bright representative of the latter, having developed her own style of interviewing that resembles spending time in a circle of friends, she is widely known for her eccentric attitude to hosting.

The most evident detail that sets her show apart from others has to do with the visual aspect of the show and the positioning of her and her guests. Alison prefers smaller spaces, as a rule, sitting within arm's reach of her guests next to a window, which instantly sets the atmosphere to be more intimate, aiming at making her guests feel comfortable to incentivise their future active participation in a conversation and create a genuine image for her viewer. She mainly relies on her own involvement in a conversation and prefers her personal reactions to the audience laughter at the studio.

Another way to replace the studio laughter permeating her interviews are real time reactions of her camera crew, who are free to manifest their sincere emotions when they find something hilarious or shocking, thus partially taking over the functions of an active audience. The fact that the crew is presumably not obliged to react to anything happening on the set also enhances the feeling of authenticity in opposition to the large studio sounds, the effect of which is fairly ambiguous, since it can trigger people's empathy and urge them to repeat the same emotions, or it might as well just turn viewers off.

Let's take a closer look at the introductory part of one of her episodes featuring Ryan Gosling and Harrison Ford on their movie "Blade Runner 2049" and see what makes it different:

Alison: "Got these glasses in, because these were from the original Blade Runner, this is what they used".

*Ryan: "**Beautiful**!"*

A: "So, I thought, you know, attention to details, for fans will probably like that"

*R: "That's so **cool** that you did that. Are you a fan of the originals?"*

A: "I've never seen it"

With Alison instantly bursting with laughter as she replies to that question (This Morning, 2017, 0:01-0:20).

It's very indicative that she is not afraid to take the spotlight when it comes to her showing an emotion. Moreover, the interviewer fully understands the impact of a genuine laugh in a conversation, therefore, emphasising the feeling by not restricting herself in time or volume, and making an effort in "contaminating" the people around her with her emotions as we can observe in the beginning of the episode.

Her approach later proves to be fairly effective when we analyse the dynamics at the beginning of the interview: judging from their body language, facial expressions and manner of speech, both guests initially appear to be somewhat tense and not fully immersed into the environment. Ryan Gosling is attempting to establish a connection by having a neutral small-talk, in which he doesn't seem too invested, given his neutral body language and tonality when utilising emotion talk ("*beautiful, cool*"), whilst Harrison Ford is absent-minded, focusing more on the camera crewmen adjusting his microphone than on the talk. However, the further development of the dialogue exhibits a light, playful style of communication that is going to dominate throughout the interviewing session and helps Ryan to resonate with the host's attitude:

R: "That's so cool that you did that. Are you a fan of the originals?"

A: "I've never seen it" (This Morning, 2017).

This unexpected spurt of emotions and laughter, along with Ryan clapping hands as a manifestation of strong positive emotions, also attracts Harrison Ford and incentivises him to instantly tap into the conversation. He's hence more committed to paying attention and giving his responses to what is being said or whatever happens next in his proximity.

The host then follows up with another emotional appeal, this time mainly utilising verbal techniques, in order to introduce the main topic of this show:

*A: "**Bleak, dystopian**, an **absolute nightmare**, to be honest with you… That's just my interviewing techniques. But let's talk about the movie – Blade Runner 2049"* (This Morning, 2017, 0:23-0:33).

Alison includes a set of words with negative, depressive connotations, the main point in using which is to evoke a strong emotional state, related to confusion or even a short surge of bitterness caused by an intentionally designed misunderstanding. It demonstrates that she is not afraid to toy with her guests, knowing that it might potentially underline the informal shape of the interview and enhance their involvement in it. The interviewer introduces a dramatic pause before finally revealing the real idea behind her words, which anchors the effect given by the means of expression used previously.

When the negative emotions eventually intertwine with a feeling of relief and understanding that comes with the final words after the pause, it then provides an unexpected solution to the puzzled state of the guests and causes a rapid switch of moods (a *mood swing*), which is a powerful tool for producing intense emotional weight that can either be negative or positive. In the case of this interview, it drives the guests to respond with an affirmative smile or chuckling.

Besides, by inserting a bright contrast between her and the guests, she motivates them to accept the positive role that she has designated for them in opposition to her allegedly "*bleak*" and "*nightmarish*" state and creates such a switch in the dynamic, where it is the guests who are now compelled to appease the host. And in an attempt of doing so, they urge themselves to become more relaxed and optimistic, which otherwise is typically the responsibility of a host.

Such attempt at creating an emotional appeal proves to be successful, as it reinforces the emotional engagement of the participants and, more specifically, encourages Harrison Ford, who is rather passive at first, to take the initiative and show his active side.

*Harrison: "**Cheer up…** **Cheer up***!"

*A: "Oh, you know. It's a little bit of a **bleak** day…"*

*H: "Yeah. No, it's not! It's a **lovely** day in London. Let's keep it that way!"*

*A: "I'm **just so sorry**".*

*H: "This is not the introduction we were promised. Bring me on with a little... **a little happier** music"* (This Morning, 2017, 0:33-0:53).

As we can see, the actor tries to smooth the negative aspects of the interviewer's self-deprecating joke by installing a positive image and promoting a cheerful outlook on everything around. Thus, Alison's emotional appeal may be viewed as a multilayered, strategic way of fostering a greater sense of emotional connection with her guests, which is conditioned by the host's pragmatic need of narrowing the gap between her and her guests, securing a successful interview.

There's also an interesting mashup of the two styles of talk show hosting - the "*overseer*" style focused on sensationalism and the "*insider*" style focused on authenticity and comfort, which can be traced in *James Corden's* show called "*The Late Late Show*", specifically when studying the section of it known as "*Carpool Karaoke*".

The idea behind it is simple – James invites a celebrity guest to join him for a casual ride, where they sing along to music and engage in more intimate discussions regarding their biography or personal attitudes. It significantly differs from the typical talk show setup, with its grand studio and formal interviewing style.

The cosy setting and informal communication that he provides instead allow Corden and his guests to connect on a more personal level. This creates a sense of authenticity and comfort that can resonate emotionally with the audience in a way that a traditional talk show format may not be capable of installing. By getting celebrities out of the studio into a more natural and relatable environment, his show "*Carpool Karaoke*" additionally aligns with people's desire for something fresh and slightly more realistic, making them more invested and responsive to the emotional dynamics.

If we take the first official episode of "*Carpool Karaoke*" featuring *Mariah Carey* as an example, we might see that it begins with an obviously pre-planned little dialogue, where James thanks the guest for "helping him" to get to work, since he is too anxious when driving alone in a traffic. Though simulated, the introduction of this feeling of

anxiousness serves as a bridge that connects the initial part with the main body of the show, as he suggests turning the radio on as a way for them to switch to something fun and shake the stress off. Despite Mariah's initial unwillingness to sing along, she is later swayed to do it by the host's amusing and lively attitude (The Late Late Show with James Corden, 2015).

Additionally, from what we can observe between the songs, James does not intend to use music as a manipulative instrument with the ulterior purpose of relaxing the guest and retrieving a sensational piece of information. Instead, the two simply have fun, discussing random topics, for instance, sharing their opinion on different English accents.

With this information in mind, it becomes apparent that the pragmatic design of "*Carpool Karaoke*" seems to be oriented towards creating an entertaining and amusing viewing experience for the audience. The format, with its unique blend of singing, chatter and celebrity anecdotes, is sufficiently compelling and sensational in itself without the need to actively search for scandalous content. The fact that the host does not try to extract exclusive information or guests' opinions regarding sensitive topics during his interviews, but instead prefers to keep the casual manner of a conversation, indicates his gravitation towards being *viewer-oriented*, as by mixing different styles of hosting "*Carpool Karaoke*" is able to offer a unique and engaging viewing experience that satisfies the audience's desire for both entertainment and relatable interactions.

In this way, the target of the host's pragmatic design is not necessarily the celebrity guest, who already appears to willingly participate in the staged elements of the show. Instead, the focus is on captivating the viewer through a strategic combination of emotional appeals, interactive elements, and a sense of intimacy and authenticity, even if certain aspects of the production are manually curated, which can be seen by the active use of instruments typical of "*overseers*", such as the studio laughter sounding continuously throughout the ride or the special staged mini-scenes that take place at the beginning and sometimes during the episodes.

When it comes to the pragmatic design of emotional appeals created by guests, it usually comes down to a simple necessity to boost or keep their relevance to the audience, as well as to increase their likeability and thus popularity among people in order to leverage that for their personal career advancement. Famous actors and other celebrities use media platforms to remind the public of their presence. They can also utilise emotional appeals for swaying audience attention towards newly announced projects, such as movies or personal products. For example, shortly before or right after the release of a movie, the main cast members might appear on popular talk shows to discuss their roles and experiences. It allows the actors to reach a wider audience, as fans tune in to see their favourite stars, while there is also a possibility to attract people who have hitherto had no interest in them.

Additionally, the movie rating also grows. Actors use it as an opportunity to widen their fan base and raise the overall level of interest in their product by providing some curious insights into the process of filmmaking and discussing situations behind the curtains. The idea of giving a peek inside a filming set is to lure viewers with an information that's usually considered to be sensational and create a feeling of something sacred and personal being shared. And since people have a tendency to love secrets, it naturally affects the individual attitude.

Let's take one of the episodes of "*The Graham Norton Show*" as an example, specifically the one where *Henry Cavill* was invited to discuss some interesting details about his new role in "*The Witcher*" series. Knowing for a fact that Henry is quite passionate about the original book and game series, the host does a good job of readdressing the introductory part to the actor, giving him an opportunity to explain everything that he deems worthy to mention. Despite having researched the topic beforehand, since it is his primary responsibility, Graham Norton through his body language and inquisitive intonation represents the confusion of the viewers, who may not know much about the universe:

G: "So, The Witcher… Like people might know that name. But explain who is the Witcher? What's he getting up to? What's occurring?" (QuenAxii, 2020, 0:07-0:18).

Although the line is devoid of evident emotional carriers in forms of words, their lack is compensated mostly with the use of question intonation and body language of the host demonstrating the potential bafflement of the viewers. A clear sign of that is that Graham physically turns to the audience to resonate with them while voicing his question to the guest.

By imposing that question, the host does two essential things. Firstly, he gives Henry a green light to share and explain what he loves the most, thus setting him up for a productive interview by triggering some positive emotions related to his personal hobbies. Secondly, he makes sure to lure the category of people unacquainted with "*The Witcher*" into paying closer attention. While he poses the question in a way that acknowledges their potential lack of familiarity with the franchise, the host makes them feel included and invites them to learn more. Furthermore, it enhances the feeling of connection the viewers have with the host by creating a sense of shared discovery. In brief, Graham realises that attracting viewers unfamiliar with the source material is just as important, if not more important, than appealing to the already existing fan base, therefore, in order to maximise the emotional impact of the interview, he allows Henry to speak freely about the topic he is clearly enthusiastic about, embracing the role of a mediator between the actor and the audience.

Upon giving Henry a chance to broadly explain the story and share his opinion on it, the host further indulges his interests by steering the conversation towards the topic of gaming, of which the actor is very fond of:

G: "The books… they were popular! 15 million copies or something sold. But what really drove it then were the video games…"

H: "Yes, lots and lots of games. This is one of the highest selling games ever! And I was a big fan of the game and that's how I discovered it. That's why I discovered "The Witcher".

G: "See, I... It's a bit of the world that has passed me by. I have never played a video game. But you get into it, don't you? Didn't you nearly lose quite an important job?"

*H:"**Absolutely**, yeah. I was... I was playing a game called «World of Warcraft»".*

...

H: "And I've missed a call from Zack Snyder's telling me I got «Superman»".

G: "But like, did you hear the phone ringing?"

H: "I did".

G: "And you chose to ignore it?"

*H: "**Absolutely!**"*

The audience bursts with laughter as well as the guests and the host.

G: "Did you win the video game?"

*H: "**Sadly**, no... But I did call Zack back off..."* (QuenAxii, 2020, 0:48-1:42).

By admitting his personal lack of experience with video games, the host once again establishes a foundation that encourages Henry Cavill to take a more dominant role in the conversation. Instead of just representing the potential ignorance of the viewers, the host positions himself as the clueless interlocutor, inviting Cavill to adopt a more knowledgeable and explanatory stance. The pragmatic intent behind it is the same – to create a more emotionally resonant dynamic in the conversation by giving Cavill an opportunity to introduce new information and share his passion.

At the same time the guest constructs his reply in a manner that would be comprehensible to others, trying to balance between providing enough information and

making it more accessible. Cavill then proceeds by recalling his own story of nearly missing out on the role of Superman due to his gaming habits.

The fact that even a high-profile actor like Cavill can be irresponsible or single-mindedly focused on a video game to the point of nearly jeopardizing his major career opportunity humanises him. Moreover, he admits to his irresponsibility in an unusually optimistic way, without any self-judgement, potentially demonstrating others that there is nothing shameful in it, thus refuting the stereotypical idealistic perception of celebrities. Henry answers the questions in a very calm and even proud manner:

G: *"And you chose to ignore it?"*

H: ***"Absolutely!"***

Which contradicts with the seriousness of the career risk he was going through. The host picks up the jokingly manner and develops it by asking him *"Did you win the video game?"* as of something that represents more significance than the job. In turn, Henry marks his attitude with an emotional expression of disappointment, maintaining the similar order of priorities, with the game being on top of the list: ***"Sadly**, no… But I did call Zack back off…"*

This interaction between the celebrity and the host succeeds in cutting the distance between Cavill and his viewers, portraying him as someone who can be just as distracted or lazy as the average person.

However, the image of an average person later becomes a point of disagreement between the two in another episode with Henry Cavill of "*The Graham Norton Show*":

G: *"You do fly your **nerd** flag with pride. What… Now, one of your hobbies, and he's got a lot of them, ladies and gentlemen, one of your hobbies is you paint…"*

H: *"You're making me sound weird…"*

G: *"Well, you do have more hobbies than the average man I'd say"* (QuenAxii, 2021, 0:30-0:45).

In this example, by using a socially marked vocabulary, the host makes an attempt at classifying Cavill into one of the categories based on his hobbies and interests, which deepens his connection with those who identify themselves among the representatives of the same group.

However, what we can observe here is that in just a moment Graham does the opposite and emphasises Cavill as someone unique comparing to an average person, to which the celebrity responds disapprovingly. While he evades direct confrontation, he uses his face expression, an obvious frown and head wiggling, to show the dissatisfaction with the host trying to single him out and interrupts the interviewer by stating *"You're making me sound weird…"* to publicly claim his objection to that opinion. In this instant it becomes apparent that the pragmatic interest of the host and the guest diverges, since Graham proves to be *guest-focused*, aiming to curry his favour by making him feel exclusive, whereas the guest himself appeals mainly to the audience.

The two interests are thusly clashed together, incentivising Henry to act in order not to lose his connection with the public. In the end, by signalising his disagreement with the host's words, the actor manages to keep the perception of him as „equal among equals" rather than being viewed as an outsider, which the host almost causes by trying to establish the image of his superiority.

Even though the pragmatic interest of most talk show guests is predominantly centred around promoting their current career, business projects and public image, there are some who strategically leverage media for paving their way into politics. As long as their pragmatic interest drives them to extend their appeals onto an even wider public, the means of them achieving this might take far more pronounced forms, which is beneficial for studying emotional appeals in media. One notable example of such strategising is Donald Trump.

Prior to starting his political career, Donald Trump had already established a solid media presence and cultivated a distinct public image through his frequent appearances on a variety of talk shows and reality television programs. By frequently participating in

these media programs, Trump was able to construct an image of himself as a successful, outspoken, and candid businessman. A key element of Trump's media strategy was his employment of emotional appeals to sway the audience. Through his talk show appearances, Trump would often deploy emotionally charged language, vivid descriptions, and rhetorical techniques designed to elicit strong responses from his viewers.

For instance, Trump's role as the host and producer of "*The Apprentice*" reality show allowed him to cement the image of a tough, disciplinarian-style business executive. Trump was known for using bold, provocative statements that played to people's fears and frustrations. His famous catchphrase "*You're fired!*" conveyed a sense of authority and decisiveness that resonated with viewers and contributed to his overall fame (Bryant, 2022).

The phrase "*You're fired!*" became a central part of Trump's public persona, and he later leveraged it in his political rhetoric as well. For example, in his official speeches to his supporters, the politician used the phrase as a way of addressing the ending of Obama's mandate and, more recently, applying it to Biden in a similar way:

1) "*Basically, how to fix the problems? Elect Trump as president! Okay? We can cut it short. You know what we can do? That's right, president Obama, **you're fired**!*" (Politico, 2016).

2) "*November 5th, we're gonna look at Joe Biden, and we're gonna look him right in the eye – he's destroying our country. And we're gonna say: «Joe, **you're fired**. Get out! Get out, Joe! **You're fired!**»*" (ABC News 4, 2024).

Despite the fact that Trump had no legal authority to actually dismiss presidents, he used the phrase as a way of taking a more superior stance and establishing his dominance. Though fictitious, it granted his constituents a sense of empowerment, making them feel that he could hold those in charge accountable, which can also be concluded from the reactions of the crowd during his speech.

The potential reason of this phrase generating such strong responses from the public could be the people directly relating the phrase to "*The Apprentice*" show where Trump positioned himself as the boss who decided the fates of the participants. As typical as it is for such reality shows, participants experienced immense stress, they would often even sob or cry when fired by their mentor, which would be openly broadcast on television. This might reinforce the automatic association of the phrase with great disappointment and complete failure. Additionally, this attitude could be influenced by an already existing mental set of the American nation that is significantly based on their work ethic and "grinding" culture, which adds even more fatality to the issue of losing a job (Wheeler, 2023).

Another example of Trump using catchy phrases was in a form of his often-repeated promise to "build the wall" on the Mexican border, which he also mentions during his participation in "*The Late Show with Stephen Colbert*":

S: "I know that you believe that illegal immigrants should all be deported… True?"

*D: "That's true. We have to bring people… <u>Look, we have a country – we have borders, we have no border right now – we don't have a country</u>. We have to create: **number one, we're going to build a wall**, number two…"*

The audience begins to laugh and even applaud.

S: "Okay".

D: "Oh, listen to this, even with your crowd I hear that".

S: "No, they love… they love the wall! People love the wall" (The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, 2015, 0:39-1:01).

Once again, the appeal addresses people's fears about lack of security, cultural wars, economic displacement and a possible loss of control over their own country caused by the rapid inflow of immigrants. Among the evident techniques Trump uses to emphasise his message is the use of vivid and concrete imagery, such as "*building a wall*", which presents a clear picture easily envisioned by the audience. It makes the statement

seem more actionable than abstract policy suggestions and thus turns out to be more impactful and emotive.

Such effect is further proven with Trump resorting to the use of vivid imagery once again:

*D: "We have to have a wall. We have to have a border. And in that wall, we're going to have a **beautiful, big, fat door**, where people can… They come into the country"*

The guest is interrupted by crowd's laughter.

S: "Beautiful, big, fat door?"

D: "Now, listen to me".

S: "Okay"

*D: "A **beautiful door**, where people can come into the country, but they have to come in legally"* (The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, 2015, 1:01-1:17).

Here the speaker introduces another bright image of a "*beautiful, big, fat door"* to present his ideas. The unusual choice of epithets by Trump confuses people and forces them to respond with laughter. However, in spite of the initial ridicule from the host and the audience, the goal is partially achieved, as he produced a vibrant imagery to draw more attention to his statement. He then proceeds explaining his position with all seriousness and repeats the already established image of a door (or rather a gate): *"Now, listen to me. A **beautiful door**, where people can come into the country, but they have to come in legally".*

Additionally, Donald Trump's statements have a tendency to take a rather simple, declarative form. It is important to note that often when beginning to sound too complex, he purposely halts and tries to rebuild his sentence in such a way that it fits this particular style of speech, like "*We have to bring people… Look, we have a country – we have borders, we have no border right now – we don't have a country"* or "*Where people can… They come into the country"*, which allows them to turn into and effectively

function as slogans. Even when constructing conditional sentences Trump attempts to exclude basic conjunctions, such as "if" in order to give his words a sense of strictness and formality, and thus making the information more credible, as though it were a set of rules well-known to the society.

Such concise phrasing reminding of aphorisms by its structure, facilitates the memorisation and further transmission of the implied ideas. Additionally, in some cases the active use of modal verbs of obligation, necessity or prohibition urges people to take actions and feel compelled to support the proposed policies. Thus, the slogan-like, repetitive structure combined with evocative imagery creates a potent emotional resonance which aids Trump in building an effective political rhetoric by providing catchy "soundbites" that are easily recalled. To his target audience, this approach stands out sharply from the more complex rhetoric of other politicians, shaping Trump's statements as common-sense solutions, thus making it more appealing, even if the underlying policy should ideally be approached in a more nuanced and less radical way.

What we are also able to define with certainty is that strong emotional responses from the audience have a potential of swaying others to sympathise with them, that's why in his interview, even before the host has a chance to interpret the reaction of the studio as ironic, Trump resorts to a persuasive fallacy, which falls into the category originally proposed by Aristotle as one of the seven fallacies – "stating as cause what is not the cause" (Aristotle, ca. 350 B.C.E./1985).

In such way he attempts to solidify the possible positive connotations by denoting that even within the audience that he deems to be of the opposite political outlook, there are those who support his ideas. The initial reason of such reaction of the studio crowd now becomes insignificant, since the speaker manages to establish his own perspective of the situation, which might help him to succeed in swaying a wider audience, even though the underlying context of the emotion used by him might be somewhat controversial.

Thereby, an active employment of emotionality and emotive techniques in forming appeals played a huge role in influencing Trump's target audience, helping to position him in the eyes of many constituents as a strong, no-nonsense leader who is unafraid to take controversial stances. Nevertheless, the politician does not solely rely on evoking people's emotions with specific words and phrases, in fact, his techniques exceed the classic use of *pathos*.

If we take a look at some of his other interviews, such as the one with Jimmy Fallon, which took place shortly before the elections where Trump would later become president, his speech appears to be rather neutral than emotionally spiked:

J: "But do you… you don't have notes. You just go out with no notes. I mean, do you know, do you just make up stuff? How do you remember? How do you remember numbers? How do you remember stats?"

*T: "You know, I just. **I am blessed with a great memory**, but it's very interesting". The studio responds with chuckles and laughs.*

T: "When I speak… when I speak in front of large crowds. If you are reading a speech, it's much easier, but you don't get the reaction" (The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon, 2015, 2:06-2:30).

As we can see, the reaction of the audience is somewhat disproportionate to the emotiveness of Trump's words, since he does not mark his words expressing how blessed he is with a great memory with any special intonations or other signs that could give a cue to him being self-ironic. Meanwhile the public still responds to his phrase as though it was a joke.

The issue of identifying real jokes and the words that had no humorous implication will be solved once we search for the actual jokes he made during the interview:

J: "I have to ask this. Cause I was thinking about this the other day: have you ever apologised? Ever? In your lifetime…"

T: …

J: "Think back, close your eyes. Think back to baby Donald, when you were a little Donny Trump. Did you ever… Did you ever apologise?"

T: "This was not supposed to be one of the questions!"

J: "None of this".

T: "Yeah, actually none of this was…! We have a very nice little sequence of questions".

Jimmy Fallon throws away a piece of paper where he had previously noted his questions.

T: "Yeah, throw them"

J: "Yeah, I don't care about this. I wanna talk to you. I'm like you now, I don't use teleprompters. I'm like you".

T: "Much better!" (The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon, 2015, 3:33-4:10).

In this example, the host attempts to ask Trump a question about whether he had ever apologised. He evidently sees Trump's dissatisfaction, as he turns the head away, looking at the camera with his face expressing annoyance. Having realised that, Jimmy then tries to reshape his question in a softer, more playful manner by resorting to Trump's childhood, utilising an image of him as a little kid – "*baby Donald*" or "*little Donny Trump*", which is supposed to defuse the tension. The guest understands it and plays along by mirroring the jokingly manner of the host: first giving non-verbal signs, such as slightly shaking his head and flashing a grin and then responding with "*This was not supposed to be one of the questions!*" The audience as well as the interviewer start laughing, and even though Trump himself does not, there are again a few non-verbal factors that might confirm his quote as an intended joke. Firstly, his body language changes when pronouncing these words: he turns towards the viewers, making sure they

understand he is now appealing to them. Secondly, he reinforces his appeal with squinted eyes and a subtle smile, encouraging the viewers to react to his joke.

The emotional context of the joke becomes even more apparent as it continues – *"Yeah, actually none of this was…! We have a very nice little sequence of questions"*, and reaches its climax – *"Much better"*, with Trump now intonating his responses positively and using hand gestures to show his approval to Jimmy's decision to throw away the notes, the guest then takes a small pause to secure it with a handshake.

However, shortly after this, Trump begins answering the question:

T: *"I, I fully think apologising is a great thing, but you have to be wrong. If you're not wrong, like, for instance…"*

The crowd and interviewer interrupt his words with another emotional response.

T: *"**No, it's true!** They wanted me to apologise when I first announced for president, they wanted me to apologise because I brought up illegal immigration"*.

J: *"Yeah"*.

T: *"It turned out, I took such heat… Oh, for the first two weeks did I take heat. But ultimately it turned out that I was right. And now people that reported on me are saying "thank you very much". I mean, hard to believe, actually reporters… And I was right on it. But I will absolutely apologise some time, in the hopefully distant future, if I'm ever wrong"* (The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon, 2015, 4:10-4:52).

His demeanour switches as he does not seem to use smiling or eye squinting to appeal to others anymore, which implies his seriousness. He is later interrupted by the crowd and the host mistakenly taking his words for the continuation of the joke, yet Trump is visibly confused and unpleased by that, stating *"No, it's true!"* with an assertive intonation. This time the guest simply shares an idea that he genuinely believes, whilst the audience views it as another example of self-irony.

Such disproportionate responses to Trump's seemingly neutral statement reveal an interesting dynamic, where the image that he had previously established of himself affects the perception of his words and even in spite of their evident form or implication the audience still reacts with laughter and amusement, as if interpreting his remarks as intentionally humorous.

Clearly, in this case the use of emotionally charged words and phrases is not the cause of the viewers resonating with Trump. If that is so, then there must be another factor that drives them to react in such an emotional way, but what could possibly influence them to do so? The answer is *ethos* – the already established authority of the speaker in form of his public image and stereotypes.

Donald Trump's meticulously cultivated public image had become so ingrained in the minds of the audience that they interpret even his most straightforward statements through the lens of that established brand. Even when Trump is not actively employing emotional appeals, the audience seems predisposed to perceive his words as carrying a specific ironic undertone. This phenomenon highlights the power of media-driven image construction that employs *ethos*.

In addition to *ethos*, Trump's tendency of preferring laconic or simply structured, assertive sentences over long, complicated and mind-bending ones also plays a huge part in swaying the masses. The effect of such resonance caused by this simplicity of speech may be attributed to *logos*, which stands for the logicality and consistency of an appeal, since the clarity of the sentences constructed by Trump naturally allows for a better perception of the logic behind his words or presenting his words as logical in the minds of his audience.

Trump is not the only politician who utilises these types of rhetorical appeals to sway his potential constituents, as most of the officials tend to utilise their high profile to engage in a conversation, both intentionally or inadvertently. The important thing is how exactly they make use of it.

For example, Barack Obama, another considerable and popular figure in the politics of the United States, seems to employ his authority in a different way. If we take his interview on *Late Night with Conan O'Brien*, which happened in 2006 before he became president, we will see the politician's relative neutrality when engaging in emotional situations:

C: "I wanna say, I am a huge fan of your name! Your name… you have the best name – Barack Obama! When I first heard it, I thought, I was sure it was Irish, when I first…"

B: "It is, there's an apostrophe after the o…"

C: "I knew that, I knew that".

B: "And Barack is actually an ancient celtic name – Barakh"

C: "Very nice, so we're ancient cousins. That's what you say"

B: "That's exactly right. You and me, we're right there".

C: "I'm taking you to Ireland someday. This is my brother here!"

Obama smiles and turns his sight towards the floor, while the audience gives out a short laugh (Conan O'Brien, 2020, 0:13-0:38).

As we can see here, despite the humorous nature of the conversation and Conan's rapid switches of intonation in attempt to spike the emotiveness of his message, the guest behaves rather calmly yet remains positive. Obama proceeds the dialogue by mirroring the host's humour without giving off his jokes explicitly either by employing emotionally charged vocabulary or certain non-verbal techniques, like laughing. Instead, he presents an ironic approach, where the meaning of his words, or rather their absurdity, and not the manner in which he speaks, serve as the most characterising part of the joke.

Another notable thing about his demeanour in rhetoric is that throughout the interview, Barack Obama continuously plays along with the joking manner of the host and often takes the ironic approach when he becomes the central point of a joke, even

when it might potentially endanger the overall perception of him as highly authoritative. Thus, his style of speech is by no means sarcastic or aggressive, instead it is characterised by self-irony. For instance, later in the interview he shares an intimate story about his family:

C: "I was thinking. Do you ever use… You have such oratorical power, have you ever… Do you ever go home to your family and try and use that oratorical power?"

*B: "I'll tell you a quick story. We have dinner together, my wife asked my two daughters, seven and four: "Malia, how was your day?" She'll say "tell us about it." Four-year-old, Sasha, "how was your day?" They ask my wife "how's your day?" Then finally my wife says: "Well, let's ask daddy how his day was". And my four-year-old will say "**boring!**"*

The audience and the host respond in quick, little laughter.

*B: "And my wife will say: "Well, that's **not nice**. You know, actually people come and listen to daddy speak." And the two of them **fall out of their chairs**. They think that's the funniest thing – the notion that somebody would be interested in what their father has to say"* (Conan O'Brien, 2020, 3:09-3:59).

After being complimented by Conan for his oratorical talent, Obama chooses to deliberately undermine the appraisal of him as a powerful speaker by sharing a story that involves his own kids not seeing him as a role model in oratorical aspect. When recalling the conversation his family had, the politician puts the primary emphasis onto their words, imitating their intonations and emotions: *"boring!"*, *"that's not nice"*. By establishing himself as a reliable storyteller through attempting to recreate it as truly as possible without intertwining it with his personal attitude, he relaxes the audience and facilitates its resonance with his words.

Later in the interview when the host notes Obama's ability to see himself from the side, he once again does not fully accept the compliment, but redirects it towards his wife:

C: "You've been very successful, I think, at remaining humble and having a sense of humour about yourself. Is it, does that come naturally to you? Is it your...?

B: "That's my wife".

C: "It's your wife".

B: "Yeah".

C: "It's nice when someone else does it for you".

B: "Yeah, exactly. She tells me about my ears. She talks about my ears a lot. That's an old standard – how big they are.

C: "Oh, really? That's nice. So, your kids are saying "boring" and she's like "yeah, big ears", you know. This is a horrible homelife you have".

B: "It's basically, you know… Often I come home feeling pretty full of myself and they knock me down pretty quick" (Conan O'Brien, 2020, 6:32-7:11).

In this example he admits the fact that even his own family sometimes ridicules him and that he finds it normal to seem funny at times, presenting his tolerance and resistance towards others having distinct opinions about him: "*She tells me about my ears. She talks about my ears a lot. That's an old standard – how big they are*". Then he regards such family practice positively again, by telling that it prevents him from becoming arrogant.

Such approach of purposedly lowering his authority in front of the public allows Obama to utilise *ethos* in a different manner. The politician knows his reputation well, yet does not attempt to anchor it and impose it onto the wider circle of people. Similarly to how the "insider" hosts conduct their shows or how Henry Cavill earns the admiration of his fans, Obama asserts his credibility by refusing to socially distance himself from other people, showing and, most importantly, publicly accepting himself as imperfect and not necessarily obeyed by all.

As we have already mentioned, such techniques humanise speakers and make them seem more trustworthy by the recipients of the appeals. Therefore, we may ascertain that by demonstrating disinterest in forcing his authority, Barack Obama creates an image of himself as a politician who has enough followers and authority to the point where he is not compelled to struggle for it in opposition to being too keen on having power, which in the end only adds to his general credibility and popularity.

When we compare the appeals of the two presidents based on their use of fundamental emotions included into the Plutchik's wheel, we may come to a conclusion that Trump's appeal involves utilising a wider spectrum of emotions, primarily focusing on the negative ones, such as *fear*, *anger* or *sadness* represented by modern conditions of the United States and the world as a whole, to which he proposes an "alternative way" leading to *joy* that will follow after his promises of "building the wall" and "making America great again" are complete, that also includes a feeling of *surprise* from controversial actions and decisions.

For example, Barack Obama tends to formulate their emotional appeals in a distinctive way. He mostly prefers building emotional appeals based on the positive key emotions, *surprising* people with his frankness and establishing *trust* that grows into *admiration* through sharing his personal stories and intimate experiences even despite the risk of slightly weakening his public image.

Hence, although *ethos* aids both Trump and Obama in compensating for the lack of emotionality, the sources of it are completely different, with Trump attempting to impose his authority and dominance on others through constructing an identity of a bold, self-assured businessman, and Obama gaining authority through showing others the lack of thirst for power, causing people to *trust* and *sympathise* with him more.

2.3. Metaphorization as a Method of Emotional Appeal: The role of Concepts and Conceptual Metaphors in Conveying Emotional Content

Emotional appeals in talk shows often go beyond the simple use of emotive language and visuals. Another important technique is the strategic use of metaphors and conceptual framing. As we've mentioned earlier, metaphors serve as powerful tools for evoking emotional responses and shaping the audience's perception of the content being presented.

However, it is crucial to bear in mind that there are different types of metaphors, and depending on the variety, they seem to drastically diverge in their emotivity. For instance, some figures of speech, also known as "dead metaphors", have already become an ordinary part of daily communication to the point where they do not elicit the same reaction of the speakers anymore. Therefore, their metaphorical shape is often ignored, whilst the semantics of a phrase is acknowledged and understood with no regard to the initial mental image rooted in its form. In other words, the reason this type of metaphors does not evoke emotions as effectively is due to the loss of its original imagery.

A good example of such metaphor would be "*falling in love*" or another form especially popular among younger generations – "*falling for someone*", which initially presented love as an uncontrollable state of emotion that an individual rapidly falls into, yet nowadays has been established as a standard way of describing the process of becoming enamoured with another person.

While these metaphors have with time lost their emotional weight due to them being gradually overexposed to the society, there is another type that is located on the opposite end of the emotivity spectrum, namely, individually designed metaphors that present an unusual perspective. Owing to their uniqueness, they manage to instantly elicit an emotion of surprised, while carrying the main idea or concept, the emotional charge of which is more potent than that of a worn-out phrase.

Conceptual metaphors can serve as an effective hedging tool, allowing speakers to soften the impact of potentially controversial or confrontational language. By framing ideas through metaphorical concepts, the speaker can convey their meaning in a more indirect, nuanced way.

Let's once again study the example of an interview by Alison Hammond, featuring Harrison Ford and Ryan Gosling:

H: "Cheer up… Cheer up!"

A: "Oh, you know. It's a little bit of a bleak day…"

H: "Yeah. No, it's not! It's a lovely day in London. Let's keep it that way!"

A: "I'm just so sorry".

H: "This is not the introduction we were promised. Bring me on with a little… a little happier music" (This Morning, 2017, 0:33-0:53).

Note the use of the emotional metaphor "*happier music*", which, by comparing music with an individual's mood, serves as a hedging instrument, as it softens the message comparing to the common alternative way of conveying the idea, like "*bring on something more cheerful*" or *"please, be more positive"*, which might sound abrupt and potentially indicate the speaker's dissatisfaction.

The use of metaphor in turn allows to accentuate a good intention to lift one's spirits instead of an irritation caused by one's negative outlook. Moreover, by shaping his chain of thoughts in such way, the speaker is granted an opportunity to mark his own attitude and present his worldview more wholly through the use of aesthetical modality. Additionally, the very concept of music underlines the influential and contagious nature of the negative emotions, since music is known for its property of emphatic transfers.

Another example of an emotional metaphor utilised as means of hedging in the already mentioned episodes can be discovered in the Graham Norton's interview with Henry Cavill:

G: "You do <u>fly your nerd flag</u> with pride. What… Now, one of your hobbies, and he's got a lot of them, ladies and gentlemen, one of your hobbies is you paint…"

H: "You're making me sound weird…"

G: "Well, you do have more hobbies than the average man I'd say" (QuenAxii, 2021, 0:30-0:45).

Here, when trying to include Cavill in one of the social categories of people drawn on the ways people spend their spare time, the host metaphorically says "*You do fly your nerd flag with pride*". Here, the metaphor serves to soften the negative associations tied to the label "*nerd*" and to deprive it of any excessive attitudinal context while still remaining an opportunity for the host to speak his mind. Instead of just calling him a nerd, which causes a risk of the guest's ambiguous reaction, he chooses to present it in a subtle way by shifting the emphasis and therefore the whole tension from Henry himself onto the imaginary flag and evading a potential controversy.

Conceptual metaphors are potent enough to not only soften the form of a message and, accordingly, the reaction force of an interlocutor and the audience, but to amplify its emotional impact as well. For instance, notice how Keanu Reeves employs a metaphor instead of describing his emotion literally:

"It was! It was thrilling. Actually, I remember one of the first lessons I had, when I did the waltz with a partner and… oh my gosh, I mean <u>I got high</u>! It was amazing. That first time, and she led… And just, fucking… Oh, excuse my language. Just like, it was amazing, thrilling to be moving through space like that!" (BBC, 2019, 0:22-0:47).

In addition to the usual labelling, the actor also involves a metaphor "*I got high*", comparing his state of excitement cause by dancing waltz with his partner with the feeling of delight associated with drug consumption. It performs its function by enhancing the emotional engagement phrased by the actor and conveying it to the broader audience.

On top of the already mentioned association, the metaphor in itself also involves an embedded attitudinal concept, where "high" stands for positive and pleasant feelings,

while "low" incorporates negativity (Landau, Meier, Keefer, 2010, p. 6). People's tendency to relate their emotions by their quality on the scale of verticality additionally intensifies the message.

Another great example of metaphorical intensification is in how Paula Poundstone, a famous American comedian and voice actor, who is known for her critical attitude towards Trump as a politician, uses a metaphor to empower her message on The Late Show with Stephen Colbert:

S: *"What is going on with America right now?"*

P: *"I... You know what, don't you every day get up and try to figure it out? In those few seconds before it really sinks in?"*

S: *"Yeah, right over there. Right over there!"*

P: *"Every day I try to figure it out. And one day, I don't know, I was cleaning something and all of a sudden, I think I've articulated it: electing Trump is to Americans what beaching themselves is to whales"* (The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, 2018, 1:18-1:47).

After which the audience responds very loudly in a positive way, signifying their support for the words said in the interview. In this example, the guest uses the image of whales beaching themselves on the coastline, a phenomenon in the nature also known as cetacean stranding that is considered a global catastrophe by many people.

The idea of framing political events and changes as natural disasters is powerful within itself. By utilising such concepts and including them into a metaphor, the speaker creates a strong mental image and evokes a sense of chaos, unpredictability and suggests that the political landscape would be fundamentally reshaped even beyond the control of ordinary citizens.

Despite it being expressed in a form of a joke, the concept she uses indicates a certain death, or a general political suicide in the context of her speech, either way being a serious threat to the country and its people. In this case, the fact that she intertwines

such a concept implying deplorable conditions with humour only strengthens her premise, highlighting the almost hysterical form of the speech.

She then continues reinforcing her metaphor by stating: *"Scientists don't understand it. Right? The only difference is <u>we don't have another species to shove us back in the water</u>"* (The Late Show with Stephen Colbert, 2018, 1:47-1:58), which adds a sense of imminence to an already established concept of death and gives out a message that even whales would have better odds of surviving.

Such formulations are often more efficiently understood by the masses than more abstract or multivalued political rhetoric. By contrast with the latter, this approach allows her words to affect people through their primal fears of being helpless in the face of a catastrophe, which belongs to the universal human experiences and anxieties that resonate with the public on a deeper, more instinctual level and may bypass more rational responses, appealing directly to key emotions.

In such case, it validates the reading of conceptual metaphors as an effective instrument that, when employed in speech, may aid in conjuring up a powerful visual and emotional association, eventually overcoming human rationality and logic to appeal directly to one's basic, key emotions, such as those represented in Plutchik's wheel. And since it bypasses rationality, it proves to be an effective manipulative tool that may not necessarily address reason.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER II

There is no single strategy that could be universally utilised in creating emotional appeals. The optimal ways of engaging the audience emotionally may depend on the pragmatic goal of a speaker.

The way talk show hosts construct emotional appeals can vary greatly depending on their preferred interviewing style and approach. Hosts who lean more towards the

"*overseer*" style are prone to focus more on generating sensational, attention-grabbing content that would captivate their audience. They tend to use dramatic language, vivid descriptions and visuals together with live studio sounds and responds (signifying laughter, cheer, surprise) to evoke strong emotional responses from guests.

In contrast to that, hosts who fall more into the "*insider*" category prioritise creating a comfortable, authentic atmosphere that allows for more genuine and intimate connections with their guests. These hosts rely more on their own natural reactions and good reading of interpersonal dynamics rather than heavily curated production elements to provoke emotional engagement.

Regardless of which style a host gravitates towards, the pragmatic goal behind their emotional appeals may also differ: some hosts tend to be more *guest-oriented*, which means that their primary focus is set on making the celebrity guests feel at ease and willing to open up; other hosts are more *viewer-oriented*, constructing their emotional appeals with the sole purpose of maximising the engagement of their audience in the show. Therefore, the specific techniques a host employs when constructing emotional appeals will depend on the wide list of factors, including their personal hosting style, the format of their show, as well as whether their pragmatic interests are more aligned with serving the guests or the viewers.

There are many ways in which the pragmatic interests of hosts and guests go hand in hand, since hosts also value interviews as they bring financial benefits and enhance the show's overall popularity. High-profile guests attract more viewers, which can lead to increased advertising revenue and higher ratings. Simultaneously, such exclusive interviews can generate high resonance and earn a vast media coverage, further promoting the show. The principal pragmatic interest of a guest is to appeal to their audience to improve their brand, including both one's public image and products to which that image is related.

This is also typical for politicians, although their self-promotion occurs on a larger scale, since their ultimate goal is encompassing as many people as possible with their

appeals to maximise the potential number of their constituents. Such ulterior motive influences the design of appeals, often making them more prominent and saturated with influence techniques, and, therefore, quite useful for the research.

Two notable examples are the contrasting approaches of former US presidents Donald Trump and Barack Obama. Trump tends to employ a wider range of key emotions, primarily focusing on negative states like *fear*, *anger* and *sadness*, showing a bleak picture of current conditions surrounding his constituents, then positioning himself as the solution that would lead them to a positive outcome, involving *joy* and *contentment*. Trump actively utilises bold, provocative language with vivid imagery and repetitive slogans to elicit emotions, but, most importantly, in cases when he lacks emotionality, his already established authority (*ethos*), characterised by his influence and his image of a successful entrepreneur, compensates for it, evoking people's emotions even when such explosive reactions seem unfounded or disproportionate in regard to the emotional input of the politician.

In contrast, Obama's emotional appeals tend to centre more on positive key emotions. Rather than imposing his authority, Obama gains credibility by appearing humble and sometimes even self-deprecating, sharing personal stories that humanise him. His approach to strategizing appeals may be characterised as more subtle, aiming to soften controversial messages and appeal to his audience's intellect and sense of trust alongside their emotions as well.

As we can see, there is no general way to strategise emotional appeals, as it highly depends on one's pragmatic intention, type of audience and even personal traits. Some might choose a more subtle way to stimulate positive associations while others make active use of the negative emotions as well. However, what consolidates these approaches despite their direct contrast, is the fact that they all appeal to human key emotions and are based on more than just *pathos*.

Despite the immense role of the emotionally charged vocabulary and visuals in creating the resonance, successfully evoking emotional resonance does not only require

the use of a particular emotive language or gestures, as it also depends on the social background of the speaker, their reputation, fame and the level of trust they have established with the recipients, which should be taken into consideration when studying the pragmatic design of emotional appeals.

Apart from *pathos*, which stands for the use of emotivity, there are other persuasion techniques which are equally as important, although it's imperative to know that each individual develops their own style of leveraging them. These are *logos*, characterised as the use of logic, reasoning, and facts to appeal to the audience's intellect, and *ethos*, that involves appealing to the speaker's credibility, authority, and trustworthiness. The incorporation of logical arguments, evidence and a secured public image serve to improve the effectiveness and impact of emotional appeals, as the audience is more likely to be swayed by a speaker who is perceived as credible and respectable. Moreover, in cases when *pathos* is poorly expressed during conversations, it signifies the lack of emotionality, but not emotivity, which is conveyed through other persuasion techniques. *Ethos* and *logos* can take on an emotive role and have enough potential to compensate for the lack of emotions, still managing to incentivise people to resonate and react emotionally.

Therefore, we may come to a conclusion that the three pillars of Aristotle's Rhetoric should be studied in their circular motion as not solely different means of persuasion, but rather as persuasive instruments that function integrally and compensate each other.

Additionally, conceptual metaphors hold a special place among the tools for conveying emotional messages. Their importance lies in their versatility and the fact that they allow speakers to create vivid mental imagery and evoke strong emotional responses from the audience, often in a more nuanced way compared to the use of purely emotionally charged language.

There are different types of metaphors and their emotional impact tends to vary greatly. To be more precise, a "dead metaphor" that has become commonly used and

widely recognised in a daily speech often loses its imagery and with it its emotional resonance naturally proves to be less effective when utilised in emotional appeals than an individually-crafted one that adapts to the context of a conversation. An independently created conceptual metaphor provides a unique outlook on different topics, as well as a sense of surprise elicited by its novelty. It also causes the maximisation of emotivity in an appeal. Conceptual metaphors may serve as an effective hedging tool, allowing speakers to express their thought in an indirect way to soften the impact of potentially controversial statements, and conversely intensify one's speech by utilising an obviously emotive concept to aid in amplifying the main point. Furthermore, they tend to be more likely to bypass human rationality and appeal directly to wired primal instincts that trigger key emotions.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Emotional appeals are an essential tool for establishing a connection between the speakers (hosts and guests) and their audience, serving to significantly influence the viewers' perception and emotional engagement. This study utilises various methodologies and techniques used to evoke emotional responses, including verbal strategies such as the careful selection of emotionally charged language, rhetorical questions, and vivid descriptions, as well as non-verbal cues like body language, facial expressions, and vocal intonations.

During the analysis two different hosting styles were distinguished and categorised into those prioritising sensationalism and those focusing on creating an authentic, intimate atmosphere. Sensationalist hosts, also referred to as "overseers", rely on grand studio settings, audience reactions, and a more formal interviewing style to maintain viewers' interest through provocative and emotionally intense content. In contrast, "insider" hosts emphasise authenticity and comfort, creating a more relaxed environment that encourages guests to express themselves freely, thus fostering a deeper emotional connection with the audience. The study also delves into the pragmatic design behind emotional engagement and its connection to the forms, in which emotional appeals are eventually manifested, highlighting how hosts strategically select guests and topics to tap into the audience's emotions and interests. Such careful curation is needed to ensure that the content resonates with viewers, eliciting strong emotional reactions and maintaining their engagement throughout the show. The pragmatic aspect extends to the guests as well, who use emotional appeals to enhance their public image, promote their work, and connect with the audience on a personal level.

These emotional appeals are often expressed through conceptual metaphors that play a huge role in eliciting emotional reactions of the listeners. Their effectiveness lies in their ability to simplify complex ideas and create a vivid mental imagery, making them more emotionally accessible. Moreover, conceptual metaphors may aid speakers in

bypassing rationality by tapping into pre-existing emotional associations and key emotions and appealing to intuitive understanding.

A key finding of the research is the interconnectedness of the three pillars of Aristotle's rhetoric. Rather than operating as isolated elements, ethos (credibility), pathos (emotion), and logos (logic) work together in a continuous, reinforcing cycle. Each element strengthens and supports the others, creating a more compelling overall argument. Additionally, when one element is weaker, the others can step in to maintain the persuasive power of the message. For instance, if a speaker's emotional appeal (pathos) is lacking, their established credibility (ethos) or strong logical arguments (logos) can still shape the overall perception and evoke an emotional response in the audience.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дане дослідження присвячене вивченню емоційних звертань, особливостей їнього прагматичного дизайну та впливу на цільову аудиторію в сучасному англомовному медійному дискурсі на матеріалу ток-шоу.

У першій частині дослідження розглядається лінгвістика емоцій, явище емоційного резонансу, дослідження емоційних звертань та основні поняття пов'язані з темою роботи. Друга частина присвячена прагматичному дизайну емоційного звертання, де детально проаналізовано вплив цих звертань на аудиторію, а також розкрито роль метафоризації у передачі емоційного змісту.

Загалом під час дослідження вдалося проаналізувати приклади використання емоційного звертання у ток-шоу; визначити форми і типи емоційних звертань у сучасних англомовних медіа; порівняти ефективність різних методів досягнення емоційного резонансу; дослідити реакцію аудиторії на емоційні звертання ведучого або гостя, а також дослідити ефективність концептуальних метафор у передачі емоційних повідомлень.

Було виділено два різні стилі ведення шоу: коли перевага віддається сенсаційності („*overseers*"), та коли ведучий зосереджуються на створенні автентичної, інтимної, розслабленої атмосфери („*insiders*"). Розглянуто концептуальні метафори, ефективність яких полягає у здатності створювати яскраві, спрощені ментальні образи, що оминають раціональне мислення, звертаючись до вже існуючих ключових емоцій, асоціацій та інтуїтивного розуміння речей. Ключовим висновком дослідження є взаємопов'язаність трьох основних елементів риторики Аристотеля (*етос*, *патос* і *логос)*, що працюють у постійному, взаємопосилюючому циклі. Кожен збільшує загальну емотивність звертання. Крім того, коли один з елементів є слабо вираженим, інші можуть компенсувати його нестачу, зберігаючи емотивний потенціал звертання.

Ключові слова: emotional appeal, emotivity, emotionality, emotional resonance, pathos, ethos, logos, pragmatic design.

LITERATURE CITED

ABC News 4. (2024, February 25). Donald Trump to Joe Biden: "You're fired!" [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L_e4GYRwh_c

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2022, March 15). Aristotle's Rhetoric. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-rhetoric/#ThreMeanPers

BBC. (2019, May 3). Dancing got Keanu Reeves high? . . .WOAH! - BBC The Graham Norton Show [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=95yBeP2Fe3s

BBC. (2022, September 6). Will Poulter gets emotional surprise from his school maths teacher | The One Show [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlvKzesmk3I

Bednarek, M. (2008) Emotion Talk across Corpora. *Houndmills/New York: Palgrave Macmillan*.

Blaise Pascal. (1658) On the Art of Persuasion.

Bressler, Nancy. (2015). Assessing Logical Fallacies in Persuasion: Using Role-play to Identify and Critique Solid Reasoning in Public Speaking. *Discourse: The Journal of the SCASD: Vol. 2 , Article 8*.

Bryant, N. (2022, February 24). *Donald Trump and the pop culture presidency*. BBC. https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20180117-donald-trump-and-the-pop-culture-presidency

Conan O'Brien. (2020, June 14). Barack Obama's 2006 Interview | Late Night with Conan O'Brien [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3dZ2sYvpjCg

Corbett, Edward P.J. and Robert J. Connors. (1999). Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.

Csatár, P. (2022). Extended conceptual metaphor theory. *Acta Linguistica Academica*, 69(2), 263–270.

Dandrea, R. J. (2011). Choosing the Right Words: How language choice impacts comprehension and results. *Social Science Research Network*.

Decety, J., & Meyer, M. (2008). From emotion resonance to empathic understanding: A social developmental neuroscience account. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20(4), 1053–1080.

Politico. (2016, January 11). Donald Trump "fires" President Barack Obama. https://www.politico.com/video/2016/01/donald-trump-fires-president-barack-obama-039232

Ekkekakis, P. (2012). Affect, mood, and emotion. In G. Tenenbaum, R. C. Eklund, & A. Kamata (Eds.), Measurement in sport and exercise psychology, 321–332.

Hansen, H. V. (2002). The straw thing of fallacy theory: The standard definition of "fallacy." *Argumentation*, 16(2), 133–155.

Felix Ameka (2024, July, 11). *Feeling, thinking and lingua-cultural diversity: on ethno-theories of "emotions".* 10th International Conference on Language, Culture, and Mind: Celebrating Linguistic and Cultural Diversity. Masaryk University.

Herbert, C., Ethofer, T., Fallgatter, A. J., Walla, P., & Northoff, G. (2018). Editorial: The Janus Face of Language: Where are the emotions in words and Where are the words in emotions? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9.

Hill, A. L., Rand, D. G., Nowak, M. A., & Christakis, N. A. (2010). Emotions as infectious diseases in a large social network: the SISa model. Proceedings - Royal Society. *Biological Sciences*, 277(1701), 3827–3835.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. *Beverly Hills: Sage Publications*.

Issa, Y. (2018, January 17). What's hidden behind emotional appeals. Medium. https://medium.com/@yaraissa/there-are-several-ways-a-person-applies-to-get-to-someone-and-convince-them-with-a-certain-thing-396d0857ca3

Kövecses, Z., Ambrus, L., Hegedűs, D., Imai, R., & Sobczak, A. (2019). The lexical vs. corpus-based method in the study of metaphors. In Metaphor in language, cognition, and communication, 1–38.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1981). Metaphors we live by. *University of Chicago Press*.

Landau, M. J., Meier, B. P., & Keefer, L. A. (2010). A metaphor-enriched social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(6), 1045–1067.

Lee, I. J. (1939). Some conceptions of emotional appeal in rhetorical theory. *Speech Monographs*, 6(1), 66–86.

Lelet, I. (2021). Emotionality vs Emotivity: Correlation and Differentiation of the Notions. *Naukovij Visnik Miznarodnogo Gumanitarnono Universitetu. Seria Filologia*, 1(49), 106–110.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2019). Sources of data and methodological foundations of a contrastive linguistic analysis of emotion concepts. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, 74.

Linkedin. (2023, April 20). How do you use emotional appeals in your messages without exploiting your audience? https://www.linkedin.com/advice/3/how-do-you-use-emotional-appeals-your-messages

Linkedin. (2024, June 20). How can you avoid risks when using emotional appeals in social marketing? https://www.linkedin.com/advice/0/how-can-you-avoid-risks-when-using-emotional-appeals

Majid, A. (2012). Current emotion research in the language sciences. Emotion Review, 4(4), 432–443.

Melko, K. B. (2019). Expressiveness and Emotionality as Linguistic Notions, 177–193.

Ogarkova, A., Salinas, C. M. S., & Gladkova, A. (2016). *Methodological triangulation in the study of emotion. Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 14(1), 73–101.

Aristotle. (1985). *Sophistical Refutations* (W. a. Pickard-Cambridge, Trans.). *Complete Works of Aristotle, Volume 1*. (Original work published ca. 350 B.C.E.) https://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/sophist_refut.1.1.html

Pinich, I. P. (2021). Modern Linguistics of Emotions: An Integral Approach. *Scientific Notes of V I Vernadsky Taurida National University Series Philology Journalism*, 2(2), 1–7.

Ponsonnet, M. (2022). 49 Emotional linguistic relativity and cross-cultural research. *In De Gruyter eBooks*, 1031–1061.

QuenAxii. (2020, January 1). Henry Cavill talks about his gaming passion and the Witcher | The Graham Norton Show [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aHaxcx1YysA

QuenAxii. (2021, December 6). Henry Cavill talks The Witcher and Warhammer | The Graham Norton Show [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sj4vCA2BCqo

Russell, J. A., & Barrett, L. F. (1999). Core affect, prototypical emotional episodes, and other things called emotion: Dissecting the elephant. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5), 805–819.

Saiko, N. (2022). Language means of emotional influence in modern English publicistic texts. *Global Prosperity*, 2(3), 21–29.

Sixseconds. (2024, February 7). Plutchik's Wheel of Emotions: Feelings Wheel. https://www.6seconds.org/2022/03/13/plutchik-wheel-emotions/

Sjohnson. (2022, January 26). Understand the difference between ethos, pathos, and logos to make your point. Thesaurus.com. https://www.thesaurus.com/e/writing/ethos-pathos-logos/

Slipetska, V. (2021). Outlining the issues of linguistics of emotions in the system of views of Charles Bally and Lev Bulakhovsky. *Aktualni Pitanna Gumantarnih Nauk*, 3(36), 103–107.

The Late Late Show with James Corden. (2015, March 26). Mariah Carey Carpool Karaoke [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z2iwQoKD6mg

The Late Show with Stephen Colbert. (2015, September 23). Donald Trump has nothing to apologize for [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ns7ocpRhDD8

The Late Show with Stephen Colbert. (2018, July 17). Paula Poundstone has a whale of a metaphor for Trump [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SY1oREWXdvA

The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. (2015, September 12). Donald Trump talks about preparing for presidential debates [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VlQctpKN3Hc

This Morning. (2017, October 4). Ryan Gosling and Harrison Ford lose it at hilarious interview! | This Morning [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bAb8KIhgVAI

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Emotions across Languages and Cultures.

Yemelianova & Yurko, Y. V. (2014). Foregrounding of the category of emotiveness in the modern English publicistic discourse, 56–61.

Балли Ш. (1955). Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка, 1–416

Гнезділова Я. В. Емоційність та емотивність сучасного англомовного дискурсу: структурний, семантичний и прагматичний аспекти: дис. … канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04. К.: КНЛУ, 2007. 20 с.

Гнезділова Я. В. (2005). Лексико-стилістичні особливості емоційного та емотивного дискурсів. Проблеми семантики слова, речення і тексту / Я. В. Гнезділова: зб. наук. пр. – К.: Вид. Центр КНЛУ. – Вип. 13. − 18 с.

Филимонова О. Е. (2007) Эмоциология текста. Анализ репрезентации эмоций в ангилийском тексте: Учебное пособие. – СПб.: ООО «КнижныйДом», 448 с.

Цинтар Н. В. (2021). Категорія емотивності в англійській художній літературі XIX та XXI століття (гендерний аспект). Чернівці: Чернівецький національний університет ім. Юрія Федьковича, 249.

Шаховский, В. И. (2008). Лингвистическая теория эмоций: монография.

Шаховский, В. И. (2009). Язык и эмоции в аспекте лингвокультурологии: учеб. пособие по дисциплинам по выбору "Яз. и эмоции" и "Лингвокультурология эмоций" для студентов, магистрантов и аспирантов Ин-та иностр. яз. Волгогр. гос. пед. ун-та.