# THE IMPACT OF EMOTIONAL TONE ON AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT IN PUBLIC SPEAKING
# (A QUANTITATIVE CASE STUDY OF GEORGIAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION)

**Ana Gadakhabadze**
Doctor of Education Sciences
Associate Professor at Caucasus University
Tbilisi, Georgia, Paata Saakadze street 1
+995 555377562, agadakhabadze@cu.edu.ge
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2511-4620

**Abstract**

 In the modern world, maintaining attention, especially in the educational environment, is becoming more and more challenging for younger audiences. Listening to a one-hour lecture by a professor or watching a public speech video for more than 20 minutes makes it unbearable for the majority of undergraduates. There might be various reasons for that, such as the lack of general attention span, lack of interest in that particular subject, or the lack of discipline from the audience. However, the scope of the research is not the listener but the speaker. It is said that confidence is a mandatory attribute to gain audience attention, but hardly any research emphasizes the importance and crucial role of emotional tone in keeping the audience fully engaged. Therefore, the paper examines whether the emotional tone of a speaker impacts listeners. The study was conducted at a higher education institution in Georgia, and it used a quantitative research method. In order to measure the correlation between two variables, emotional tone and audience attention,  15 public speaking course students were asked to assess video-recorded speech samples using the rating scale and fill out a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. The statistical tools used to measure the results included mean, median, mode, and standard deviation. Consequently, a positive and significant correlation was found between positive emotional expressiveness and audience attentiveness. As a result, the paper considers the value of awareness of emotional tone as one of the determinants in maintaining the audience's full engagement in public speaking, especially in educational settings.

**Keywords**: Public speaking, Emotional tone, Audience engagement, Attention Span, Higher education

**Introduction**

Due to the increased use of social media that provides easily digestible information within seconds or minutes, listening to lengthy discussions in person or via computer is not a comfort zone for many students in the 21st-century educational environment. It is not a new thing that the attention span has decreased drastically not only in students of tertiary education, but it has also dramatically influenced adults and kids of certain ages. The psychological nature of this very problem or the tangible consequences of this issue might not be that vivid in the present era, but it will definitely have negative outcomes in the years to come. However, the aim of today's paper is not to criticize social media or individuals of any age for the given reality, neither to go into the psychological depth or consequences that it might bring in the future, but to analyze the factor that plays an integral role in raising the attention span among students,  especially in an educational setting. If you are an educational field representative, I am sure you have witnessed students complaining about not having enough patience to listen to their professors for more than 20 minutes, or you might have noticed yourself when delivering a lecture that the majority of your class either scrolls their phones or have no willingness to listen to your speech. It is not for the reason that the lecture is boring, or they have no particular interest in the subject, or they

are not psychologically ready and mature enough to attend lectures, they just lose attention quickly and get distracted very easily, unless provided with some additional elements apart from just information. These additional elements in public speaking imply numerous features starting from attention grabbers, the elaborate choice of nice vocabulary, credibility factor,  controlling the non-verbal communication techniques such as, gestures, postures, stance; however, we fail to highlight one of the most crucial aspects and determinants in maintaining the audience attention span for longer period which is an emotional appeal to the listeners. We, professors, educators, and trainers, frequently forget that the audience is the most important priority, and if we lose the emotional connection with them, then it does not matter whether we are good speakers or not. Unfortunately, the emotional tone that comes from the educators is not quite appealing to the audience, especially to students. Sometimes they sound harsh and authoritative, which puts listeners off and disrupts their attention quality. Therefore, this paper aims to analyze and compare different emotional tones in public speakers based on students' perception, their feedback, and reactions to measure the correlation between two variables, emotional tone and audience engagement in public speaking.

To start with, we need to remind readers of the huge importance of public speaking skills in the 21st century in education as well as in other fields. Based on the the articles and the research on public speaking ("The Necessity of English Public Speaking Course at Higher Educational Institutions"(Gadakhabadze, 2020); "Public Speaking: Challenges and Benefits" (Gadakhabadze, 2020); "The Impact of Deductive, Inductive and Mixed Approaches on EFL students' Public Speaking Skill" (Gadakhabadze, 2021); "Public Speaking in Georgian HEIs: Teachers' Perspectives on EFL/Public Speaking Integrated Course implementation" (Gadakhabadze, 2022); "The Impact of Using Authentic Public Speech Samples on English as a Foreign Language Students' Public Speech Quality" (Gadakhabadze, 2022); From Stage Fright to Spotlight: The Evaluation of Public Speaking Course Through English as a Foreign Language Students' Oratory Performance"(Gadakhabadze, 2024)  the researcher managed to raise the awareness of its necessity in Georgian educational sector, as well as designed the course for English as a foreign language (EFL) students to master the skills of oratory. Now it is time to raise the awareness that emotional appeal is an equally and evenly important factor, if not more,  in achieving the smooth flow of speech along with consistent and adequate attention from the audience. For that reason, we need to delve into the emotional aspect of public speaking by reviewing the three pillars of persuasion by Aristotle: *Ethos*: the trustworthy nature of a speaker, which implies the evidence of fair judgment, noble intent, and personal virtue; *Pathos*: the emotional appeal that speakers can provoke in their listeners and  *Logos*:  logical argumentations of their judgments (Aristotle, Roberts, et. al., 1954). It has to be mentioned that many public speakers in today's world do pay reasonable attention to the message what they deliver and whether it has solid grounds for logical arguments (logos)  to seem more trustworthy to the audiences (ethos), but hardly do they care or fail to keep the emotional bond and the tone of their speech (pathos) which is equally necessary for good public speakers, especially to solve the above-mentioned problem in connection with attention quality and audience engagement.

Audience engagement, along with other features, involves creating a suitable environment for emotional attitudes and feelings. Pathos, the emotional state of a speaker, can evoke either positive or negative feelings in the audience (Aristotle, Roberts, et. al., 1954). Maintaining an emotional bond with the listeners is crucial,  especially if the speaker wants to persuade and make them believe in what he says. Pathos does not necessarily need to imply too much dramatism or sadness, it can include basic emotional human instincts,  such as love and respect, gratitude and compassion, patriotism and loyalty, humour and joy, as well as some negative emotional features anger and guilt, anxiety and frustration, or some neutral ones: nostalgia, curiosity, calmness. According to Aristotle (384–322 BCE) oratory is the process of delivering the argument in a persuasive manner; therefore, using all three artistic evidences-ethos, pathos and logos are crucial components of persuasive and compelling speeches (Schreiber, et. al., 2011:2_4). What is persuasion? Different scholars define it differently. For Perloff (2003), persuasion is a communication process between the speaker and the listener, where listeners are convinced into believing what the speaker suggests. Lucas (2015) defines it as "changing people's beliefs or actions" (p. 306).  Therefore, when speaking in front of the audience, we should always have a clear goal, whether we want them just to believe in what we say or we call them for action that implies changes in their attitudes and behaviour. For that reason,  the listeners should always see the benefit in altering their attitudes(Harris, 2017; Lucas, 2015). The success of persuasive speeches lies in constant

care for the audience and maintaining an emotional bond with them. Along with emotional appeal, the speaker's credibility and logical reasoning of an argument play a huge role in achieving the desired outcome in public speaking. However, moving and passionate storytelling, providing real-life examples, relatable to the audience,  have always had the strongest impact on audiences (Tucker, et. al., 2019). Monroe's motivated sequence, public speech pattern,  is a good illustration of the goal-result precision. The reason why it is named a sequence is that it is offered in five stages: attention, need, satisfaction, visualization, and action. Therefore, each stage step-by-step guides the listeners to the idea that something needs to be changed. On the attention stage the speaker gains the credibility from the audience and catches their attention; on a need level the speaker tries to make the problem tangible and real so that it provokes the interest and raises audience curiosity; on a satisfaction stage the speaker suggests viable solutions to the above-mentioned problem; on a visualization level the speaker makes it beneficial for the society and makes them aware why they should take part in it, therefore preparing the grounds for the last stage which is an action level where listeners are asked to take specific measures in solving the problem (Harris, 2017; Lucas, 2015). On each of these levels, the speakers should be sure they are in harmony with the audience in terms of feelings and emotions, otherwise, they would lose the most important bond that the outcome of the speech is based on.  Furthermore, public speakers should be very cautious about directly revealing their intentions to persuade the audience. If it is a case, it most frequently ends up with criticism and condemnation from the listeners (Kirmani & Zhu, 2007). To summarize, based on the above-mentioned observation and literature review, the core of the problem needs to be highlighted. Due to the students' frequent complaints concerning their attention quality when attending the lectures or listening to lengthy video recordings of public speakers, the researcher decided to measure the correlation between the emotional tone of public speakers and the audience engagement, to see whether the correct emotional signals keep the listeners attached to the speaker, regardless of its length. For that reason, the research was conducted.

**Methods**
Emotional tone as already mentioned above can be positive, neutral or negative, which can be expressed via many different components. The first and most essential components in maintaining harmony with the audience are the vocal elements such as, pitch, volume, rate, pace, intonation, articulation, pronunciation, pauses- vocalized and non vocalized,  fluency and tone, accent and dialect (Capecce, V. (n.d.) (Schulman,  1989). The second equally important determinant in maintaining cohesive flow of the emotional appeal is lexical elements such as, style and register, formality, informality, figurative language vs. literal, abstract vs. concrete language, jargon vs. slang. Another group of elements that support emotional expressiveness is non-verbal means of communication such as body language, smiling or sad face, gestures,  facial features, posture, and manners. And last but not least, a general group of essential elements of compatibility, such as dressing style, general enthusiasm and interest towards the topic, moderate and respectful sense of humour, and awareness of the audience's likes or dislikes, equipment usage, and general knowledge of the public speaking guidelines.
All of the above-mentioned public speaking components were grouped in the 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire, which was designed by the researcher, to measure students' engagement in the public speaking procedure and to ask them to evaluate the speakers' emotional tone based on the criteria. Totally 15 students, who were attending a public speaking course in one of the higher educational institutions in Georgia during the research period, took part in the experiment. They were provided with two speech samples, namely Ted speeches, one after another, during the lecture. All 15 students watched both public speeches on a big screen monitor, in complete silence to avoid any distraction. They were given a Likert-scale questionnaire to fill out the forms after each speech was over. Apart from closed-ended Likert questions, there was one open-ended question at the end of the survey that asked students to assess the speaker and why they liked him/her, what they liked about their speeches, and what made it appealing / not appealing. After listening to both speakers and finishing filling out the forms, the researcher took an open class feedback, in order to listen to students' reactions, feelings, emotions, and attitudes more closely, rather than in written form. The researcher recorded students' oral feedback and later analyzed it along with written responses. Below, in the results section, you will read the summary of what students responded to an open-ended question and how they reacted in their oral feedback towards the TED speakers.

As for the close-ended questions in the survey, it contained 23 public speaking items, and each of them had options to choose from: 1- strongly disliked, 2- disliked, 3- neither liked nor disliked, 4- liked, 5- strongly liked. Students had to assess how easy or difficult it was to follow the flow of the speech; how appropriate and suitable all the given aspects were in accordance with emotional attachment and engagement with the audience, and overall, how positive or negative impact each speaker had on them. Since students were attending the public speaking course delivered by the researcher in that semester, they were well aware of powerful public speaking techniques that they had tried and tested themselves based on Public Speaking Competence Rubric (PSCR) (Schreiber, et al., 2011), which till this day is considered as one of the most detailed and scrutinized assessment rubrics for public speeches. However, they did not know what the researcher intended to measure prior to the experiment in order to maintain an unbiased and genuine evaluation of public speakers.  The questions/ elements that students were asked to evaluate based on each Ted speaker's performance were the following, divided into several sections: *vocal varieties* (1. Voice, 2. Tone,  3. Volume, 4. Pitch, 5. Rate, 6. Articulation, 7. Pronunciation, 8. Pauses- vocalized /non vocalized, 9. Fluency ); *lexical varieties* (10. Speaking style, 11. Register (formal/informal), 12. The use of figurative language, 13. The use of direct language, 14. The use of slang and jargon);  *non-verbal communication* (15. Emotional bond with the audience, 16. Body language,  17. Gestures,  18. Posture /moving on the stage, 19. Manners) and *general compatibility* (20. Dressing style/outfit, 21. The use of humour, 22. Genuine interest and enthusiasm towards the topic of the talk, 23. The use of facilities/equipment).

**Results and Discussion**

As mentioned above, all 15 students evaluated two TED talk speakers based on their performance using the Likert-scale questionnaire, where they had to choose 1-5, from strongly disliked to strongly liked, aspects of the speakers' performances. By analyzing the questionnaire, the researcher gathered all the responses in personally designed Tables 1 and 2 below, which give an illustration of the raw scores given by the students.

**Table 1. The raw scores credited by students to  Brene Brown's ted talk "the Power of Vulnerability"**

| Public Speaking Aspect | St 1 | St 2 | St 3 | St 4 | St 5 | St 6 | St 7 | St 8 | St 9 | St 10 | St 11 | St 12 | St 13 | St 14 | St 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Voice | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 2. Tone | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 3. Volume | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Pitch | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 5. Rate | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 6. Articulation | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 7. Pronunciation | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 8. Pauses | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 9. Fluency | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 10. Speaking style | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 11. Register | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 12. Figurative language | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Direct language | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| 14. Slang / Jargon | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 15. Emotional bond | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 16.  Body language | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 17. Gestures | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 18. Posture/moving | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Manners | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Dressing style/outfit | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. The use of humour | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

| 22. Genuine interest / enthusiasm | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 23. The use of facilities /equipment | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

**Table 2. The raw scores credited by students to Martin Baumann's talk "How to Make a Whole Audience Listen?"**

| *Public Speaking Aspect* | St 1 | St 2 | St 3 | St 4 | St 5 | St 6 | St 7 | St 8 | St 9 | St 10 | St 11 | St 12 | St 13 | St 14 | St 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Voice | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Tone | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 3. Volume | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Pitch | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5. Rate | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Articulation | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 7. Pronunciation | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. Pauses | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9. Fluency | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 10. Speaking style | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. Register | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 12. Figurative language | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 13. Direct language | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Slang / Jargon | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. Emotional bond | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 16.  Body language | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17. Gestures | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18. Posture/moving | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 19. Manners | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 20. Dressing style/outfit | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 21. The use of humour | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 22. Genuine interest / enthusiasm | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 23. The use of facilities /equipment | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

From the raw scores it is already visible that they liked the first speaker's, Brene Brown's, talk and disliked the second speaker's Martin Baumann's, talk. However, the researcher still measured the data statistically to find whether the difference between the two speakers' assessments is significantly important. For that reason, the statistical SPSS program was applied and central results statistics: mean, median, mode, and Std. deviation were calculated for each table. Table 3 below illustrates the central results statistics (mean, median, mode, Std. Deviation) per public speaking element observed and assessed by all 15 students.

**Table 3. The measurement of central results statistics per aspect based on Brene Brown's speech**

| Central results statistics | Mean | Median | mode | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Voice | 4.8 | 5 | 5 | 0.4 |
| 2. Tone | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 3. Volume | 4.8 | 5 | 5 | 0.4 |
| 4. Pitch | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 5. Rate | 4.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 6. Articulation | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 7. Pronunciation | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 8. Pauses | 4.4 | 5 | 5 | 0.7 |
| 9. Fluency | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 10. Speaking style | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 11. Register | 4.7 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 12. Figurative language | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0.8 |
| 13. Direct language | 4.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 14. Slang / Jargon | 4.2 | 4 | 5 | 0.7 |
| 15. Emotional bond | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 16.  Body language | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 17. Gestures | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 18. Posture/moving | 4.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 19. Manners | 4.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |
| 20. Dressing style/outfit | 4.1 | 4 | 4 | 0.8 |
| 21. The use of humour | 4.7 | 5 | 5 | 0.4 |
| 22. Genuine interest / enthusiasm | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 23. The use of facilities /equipment | 4.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 |

As we can see from table 3, mean, median and mode for each component are very close to each other, in some components even being exactly the same (components: tone, pitch, articulation, pronunciation, fluency, speaking style, emotional bond, body language, gestures, genuine interest & enthusiasm), which means the results are very reliable. Therefore, the responses are homogeneous, implying that there is a strong agreement on the given aspects from the participants. Moreover, since the questionnaire was designed on a 5-point Likert scale, it implies that the positivity of the outcome is measured based on the following formula:  mean, median, and mode should be > 3.5. And if we observe Table 3, it is clearly visible that all 15 students responded positively and all components are > 4, which proves the positivity of the results. Besides, if mode is observed, it can be noticed that it mostly contains 4 and 5 on a 5-point Likert scale, again proving that positive assessment markers 4 and 5 were most frequently used by the students when assessing Brene's speech.  To validate the data, Std. Deviation was also calculated, which clearly illustrates the true nature of the above-mentioned statistics and the reliability of the responses. In all cases (23 components) Std. Deviation is < 1, which means that there was very little variation between the respondents' results, and they agreed to the positivity of the speech sample.

**Table 4. The measurement of central results statistics per aspect based on Martin Baumann's speech**

| Central results statistics | Mean | Median | mode | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.Voice | 1.7 | 2 | 2 | 0.6 |
| 2. Tone | 1.4 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 3. Volume | 1.9 | 2 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 4. Pitch | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| 5. Rate | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | 0.6 |
| 6. Articulation | 1.3 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **7. Pronunciation** | 1.3 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| **8. Pauses** | 1.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **9. Fluency** | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **10. Speaking style** | 1.3 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| **11. Register** | 2.4 | 2&3 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **12. Figurative language** | 2.4 | 3 | 2 | 0.6 |
| **13. Direct language** | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.8 |
| **14. Slang / Jargon** | 1.6 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| **15. Emotional bond** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **16.  Body language** | 1.4 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| **17. Gestures** | 1.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **18. Posture/moving** | 1.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **19. Manners** | 1.2 | 1 | 1 | 0.4 |
| **20. Dressing style/outfit** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **21. The use of humour** | 1.8 | 1 | 2 | 0.8 |
| **22. Genuine interest / enthusiasm** | 2.3 | 2 | 2 | 0.6 |
| **23. The use of facilities /equipment** | 2.3 | 2 | 2 | 0.6 |

As for table 4, here, as in table 3 above, central results statistics mean, median, and mode are close to each other, which means that all the respondents agreed on the idea that Martin's TED talk and the speaker himself deserved lower scores compared to the previous one. The answers here are also homogeneous, but in a negative aspect. As is visible, all means, medians, and modes are < 3.5, so on a 5-point Likert scale, it is considered to be a negative outcome and assessment. Besides, in the mode section, we can see that the most frequently chosen numbers were 1 and 2, which is a negative assessment marker.  The most noteworthy feature is that two very important components for our research, emotional band and dressing style, received Std. Deviation = 0, meaning that all 15 participants responded negatively to those 2 aspects of the speech. In other components, the answers varied but not as much, since Std. Deviation is still < 1 in all aspects. To sum up, the central results statistics prove that the agreement and consensus were achieved over the assessment of both TED speakers; however, in the first case, Brene Brown's TED was positively assessed, and in the second case, Martin Baumann's performance was criticized and disliked.

As for the qualitative element of the research, students' oral interviews along with an open question to assess the talks according to their impressions, what they liked and disliked in them, here is the overview of their feedback, and again a clear illustration of how emotional tone impresses and engages the audiences.

Ted speaker 1- Despite the fact that Brene Brown's ted talk "the Power of Vulnerability" (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iCvmsMzlF7o) was recorded 14 years ago, which might mean that is a little bit older for today's generation, and it was quite lengthy(approximately 21 minutes), meaning that there was a likelihood of losing the audience attention quickly,  she still managed to maintain the students' attention due to several factors that are in direct connection to the emotional tone. As students responded in their evaluation forms, she had a nice conversational tone, a deep understanding of the topic that she was talking about without any hesitation, and drastic changes in her volume. The speech had a storytelling nature, and it was pleasant and engaging. The knowledge was enriched and accompanied by her personal experiences of struggles and fear as well as practical applications and solutions to those difficulties, which sounded relatable to the audience. She at some moments, used quite a subtle humour that the audience found enjoyable, with delicate tone shifts and reasonable pauses. Her intonation and volume slightly varied when she wanted to spread a stronger message to the audience. Body language was adequate to the environment, which made her seem more open to conversation and stress-free.  Besides, students highlighted the speaker's attitude, saying that it felt as if she was talking with them, not at them, so it was a feeling of sharing, not preaching or teaching. The most important appeal that almost all 15 students noticed was the authenticity and reliability that Brown revealed through her talk. Due to all the above-mentioned criteria, students assessed her as a speaker

quite pleasant to listen to and her talk as quite compelling, believable, and trustworthy. Besides, students stated that they could not even notice how the time flew. They did not feel tiredness or boredom, on the contrary, they gladly recalled the core messages that she spread around. Some students even expressed in their evaluation that her talk was memorable due to the fact that it was emotionally resonant.

Ted speaker  2  -  As for the second speaker, Martin Baumann, with the talk "How to Make a Whole Audience Listen?" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F7qJtpBUp3c did not manage to make that much of an emotional appeal compared to the first speaker. Despite the title that he used for his speech and despite the fact that it was quite a recent (recorded 4 years ago) one, more than that it was not as lengthy as the previous speech (approximately 15 mins), still the emotional tone was not that strong and impactful since it lacked a lot of aspects, therefore failed to maintain students' attention and engagement.  Although he started his talk with humour, it did not seem quite enjoyable for the students, saying that starting a speech with a joke hardly ever works, which is very true because you have to warm up the ground a little bit and socialize with the audience and only after that it might be used as a relief, moreover, the relevance and appropriateness to the audience should be checked in advance.  In terms of emotional tone, his tone seemed boring and monotonous to students, without any variations and distinctions. Despite the fact that he used personal stories in his speech, the narration itself seemed quite mechanical without any conversational or storytelling style that made it off-putting. Students claimed that the tone was too formal and of a very high register, so that it felt like a professor delivering a lecture without any emotional reflection. Due to the fact that it was not emotionally deep for students, it was not memorable, and hardly anyone remembered the main message from the speech. Besides, students criticized his dressing style, body language and too much mannerisms that they described as distractors.

In addition, the researcher noticed when observing the participants during their assessment process that they were very concentrated, involved, and enthusiastic while watching Brown's TED, however, they felt distracted and sometimes indifferent when watching Baumann's performance. Therefore, the attention span and quality were much higher in Brown's case rather than in Baumann's case, meaning that she managed to maintain students' engagement throughout the whole speech, while Baumann failed to do so. It has to be mentioned that both TED speakers were quite experienced ones in their own fields as well as in speaking in front of the audiences, they both had equal educational backgrounds and expertise, they were approximately the same age, at least representing the same generation and quite familiar with TED societies. So, the variable that was different was the emotional tone and attitude, which was perfectly detected by the students during the research.

**Conclusion**

To summarize the whole experiment and the research around emotional influences on listeners' engagement, it should be highlighted that the research hypothesis, which claims that apart from knowledge and confidence in public speaking, emotional tone plays a very crucial role in attaining the audience's attention, is corroborated. All the experimental procedure and quantitative statistical measurements and their calculations, along with oral classroom feedback, empirical observations with real feelings and reactions expressed by the research candidates prove the reliability of the findings and once again emphasizes a huge role of emotional attitudes in maintaining listener's engagement, therefore developing their attention span and quality, which as mentioned in the introduction, needs more control and care, especially in today's educational setting. Furthermore, similar studies carried out outside Georgia, namely   Van Zant and Berger's (2020) experiment and Sauter's (2017) study, both confirm the same that tone, especially the emotional tone, attracts listeners' attention more and manages persuasion more easily. However, neither of them is from an educational setting, which makes our research more unique and novel, especially in the Georgian educational environment.

**REFERENCES**

Aristotle, Roberts, W. R., Bywater, I., & Solmsen, F. (1954). *Rhetoric*. New York: Modern Library.

Capecce, V. (2011).Vocal aspects of delivery. *In The Public Speaking Project*. Millersville University. http://publicspeakingproject.org/psvirtualtext.html

Gadakhabadze, A. (2020). The necessity of English public speaking course at higher educational institutions (A case of Georgian higher educational institution). *Modern Trends in Education in Georgia, 3, 7-29*. Proceedings of the INTERC conference on education.

Gadakhabadze, A. (2020). Public speaking: challenges and benefits. International Research Conference on *Education, Language and Literature (IRCEELT), 10,* 7-17. ISSN: 2298-0180 / e-ISSN: 2587-472

Gadakhabadze, A. (2021). The impact of deductive, inductive and mixed methods of instruction on EFL Students' public speaking skill (A case of Georgian higher educational institution). *European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 17* (33), 128-150. DOI: https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p128

Gadakhabadze, A. (2022). Public speaking in Georgian HEIs: Teachers' perspectives on EFL/Public speaking integrated course implementation. *International Research Conference on Education, Language and Literature* (IRCEELT)

Gadakhabadze, A. (2022). *The impact of using authentic public speech samples on English as a foreign language students' public speech quality.* Doctoral dissertation. International Black Sea University.

Gadakhabadze, A. (2024). From stage fright to spotlight: The evaluation of a public speaking course through English as a foreign language students' oratory performance. *Philological Researches, 8*, 128–138.

Harris, L. J. (2017). *Stand up, speak out: The practice and ethics of public speaking*. Communication Faculty Books. 1. Retrieved from https://dc.uwm.edu/comm_facbooks/1

Kirmani, A., & Zhu, R. (2007). Vigilant against manipulation: The effect of regulatory focus on the use of persuasion knowledge. *Journal of Marketing Research, 44,* 688-701. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.44.4 .688

Lucas, E. S. (2015). *The art of public speaking.* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Perloff, R.M. (2003). *The dynamics of persuasion: Communication and attitudes in the twenty-first century.* UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing.

Sauter, D. A. (2017). The role of vocal expression in communication and emotional experience. *Emotion Review, 9*(3), 280–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916669133

Schreiber, L., Hartranft, M., Decaro, P., Millner, M., Goddu, J., Adams, T., Price, R., Jefferis, B., Russ, T., Stone, W. S., Barnett, T. J., Sandmann, W., Ramsey, M.E., Grapsy, R., Capecce, V., Kasperek, S., Dhanesh, G.S., Scholl, J., & Wood, J. (2011). *Public speaking: The virtual text. The Public Speaking Project*. Retrieved from
https://www.academia.edu/29334544/Public_Speaking_The_Virtual_Text

Schulman, R. (1989). Articulatory dynamics of loud and normal speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 85*, 295–312. http:// dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.397737

Tucker, B., Barton, K., Burger, A., Drye, J., Hunsicker, C., Mendes, A., & LeHew, M. (2019). Exploring public speaking. (4th Ed.). *Communication Open Textbooks*. 1. Retrieved from https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/communication-textbooks/1

Van Zant, A. B., & Berger, J. (2020). How the voice persuades. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 118*(4), 661–682.