ETHOS, PATHOS, LOGOS

This online lecture was prepared by Dr. Laura Umphrey in the School of Communication at Northern Arizona University

Aristotle (394 to 322 BC) the Greek philosopher (among others) laid down much of the foundation for public speaking and in particular persuasion. According to Aristotle there where three kinds of proof the speaker used to persuade an audience, they include:

- **Ethos** (credibility)
- **Pathos** (emotional and motivational appeals)
- **Logos** (logical appeals).

**ETHOS (establishing credibility)**
Our focus in this section is upon ethos because Aristotle described ethos, "as the most potent means of persuasion." Think in terms of sales situations, if a sales person lacks ethos then their sales presentation (pitch) is likely to fall upon deaf ears. If you walk on to a car lot and are greeted by a salesperson, how do you perceive that salesperson? Do they have high or low credibility to start with? Likely it is very low credibility, we would be suspicious of their motives (they only want to sell us a car because they are on commission). A salesperson has to establish and enhance their credibility as the conversation continues by building trust with you. Think about how a good salesperson would do that? Aristotle divided *Ethos* into **three parts:**

- **a speaker's good sense** - they demonstrate knowledge on the topic and use evidence to support their claims.
- **good moral character** - the speaker is perceived as being trustworthy, truthful, and a person of good moral character
- **goodwill** - the speaker makes an effort to connect with the audience and has a sense of caring for what is right for the
audience.


Enhancing Personal Credibility

"When speaking to people who are relatively unmotivated and who do not have enough background information to critically assess what they hear the higher your credibility the better your chances of being a successful persuader. Conversely if your credibility is low even strong arguments will not overcome your initial handicap"

You can increase the likelihood of being judged credible when seeking to persuade an audience by taking steps to enhance your image of competence and sincerity.

INCREASING COMPETENCY:

a. Carefully set forth all of the competing positions ideas and proposals relevant to a topic before you come to your own judgment.

b. Review various criteria for judgment to show that your recommendations or positions flow from accepted and generally held criteria.

c. Show that the recommendations you offer actually will solve the problems you identified in the need step of your speech.

INCREASING PERCEPTIONS OF SINCERITY:

a. Showing yourself to be open to correction and criticism should any listener wish to question you.

b. Exuding personal warmth in your relations with the audience

c. Maintaining direct eye contact with the listeners
d. recognizing anyone who has helped you understand and work on the issue of problem.
e. heighten audience members' sense of your expertise friendliness and dynamism especially when seeking to move them into action.

DEMONSTRATING EXPERTISE:

a. documenting your sources of information
b. using a variety of sources as cross-checks on each other
c. presenting your information and need analyses in well-organized ways.
d. using clear simple visual aids when they are appropriate or necessary.
e. providing adequate background information on controversial issues.
f. delivering your speeches in a calm and forthright manner.

DEMONSTRATING FRIENDLINESS AND CONCERN FOR OTHERS:

a. treating yourself and others as human beings regardless of how controversial the topic is and how intensely you disagree.
b. depersonalizing issues talking in terms of the "real world problem" rather than in terms of personalities and ideologies.

AN AUDIENCE'S SENSE OF YOUR DYNAMISM CAN BE ENHANCED BY:
Speaking vividly drawing clear images of the events you describe; using sharp fresh metaphors and an active rather than passive verb tense and a short hard hitting oral style.
PATHOS (Emotional Appeals)

"To be human is to be rational, but it is more than that. Love sometimes overcomes logic, reverence transcends reason, emotion contradicts evidence."

Pathos: Twofold - Emotions and Motivations and Needs.
First, the speaker can stirs up emotional responses, feelings, in the audience.

• Can stir either positive motivations or emotions (amusement, love, joy, etc.) or negative emotions (fear, anger, sadness, rage, etc.)
• Most powerful in stimulating listeners into action.
• Can be positive or negative appeals. Historically think of an example of someone who used pathos for a negative means? Likewise, historically think of an example of someone who used pathos for a positive means? Usually the responses to the question are fairly consistent. Negative (evil) = Adolph Hitler; Positive = Martin Luther King Jr.

How are emotions evoked/stirred in an audience?

• Through Visual Aids - show an emotional picture: Example - I remember one student presentation in which the student was trying to persuade people to become organ donors, they began their presentation by showing a series of photos of people who had died because they hadn't received an organ for a transplant in time, especially emotional, was the photo of a small-child.
• Through Supporting Materials - we love to hear stories, tell an emotional story, or give an emotional example.
• Vivid Language - Use emotional laden language: Example - Opponents of Abortion label abortion as "murder."
• Nonverbal - emotional or enthusiastic delivery: Example - Hitler is a perfect example, also charismatic preachers.
• The location of the presentation - Often the backdrop or location of a presentation gives strong emotional meaning: Example – Al Gore gave a presentation with two American flags in the background. In Bill Clinton’s next presentation there were about 8 American flags in the background.

Uses of Emotional Arguments:

d. Always combine emotional appeals with rational and logical appeals: example - debating the death penalty (see page 417) - First presenter - focuses on the ghastly horrors of electrocution - showing photos and very visual descriptions but has little or no logical evidence to support their argument. - Second presenter - quickly conceded that electrocution is barbaric but argued for the death penalty by lethal injection, supported with moral justifications for the death penalty, and focused on the victims of crime, giving examples, and cites statistics. Who would you find most believable?

f. Know how to use fear: example - arguing for seat belts - do you show statistics of traffic fatalities or show graphic photos of victims - fear often wins out but too much fear can turn the audience off. Thus, graphic photos might turn away some members of an audience.

g. Use emotional appeals ethically. Often times politicians arguments are based solely upon emotional arguments: example: "If we cut social security benefits the elderly will starve" - needs to be supported by logical arguments.
Motivations (Needs) - Second part of pathos (Appealing to motivations - needs and values that impel a person toward a goal or away from a negative situation).

Some examples:

1. Love and esteem - friends - esteem at work
2. Health
3. Safety
4. Success
5. Financial Security
6. Self-improvement

Probably the best-known model of needs is Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, put forth in the late 1950's. Maslow's hierarchy of needs can be a basis for persuasive appeals. The principle behind the model is that people are motivated to act on the basis of their needs; thus to best persuade listeners to take an action, point to some need they want fulfilled and then give them a way to fulfill it (the balance theory).

How to motivate an audience:

- **Focus on listener's needs rather than your own** - requires a careful audience analysis.
- **Appeal to more than one motivation** - not everyone has the same emotions (esteem might be important to one person while to another just belonging might be more important: **Example** - persuading to the benefits of bicycling: (all of the following could be motivations for different audience members) feeling good, looking good, health, friendship, adventure, competition, etc.
- **Determine the strongest motivational appeal and appeal to – again, it requires a careful audience analysis!**
- **Anticipate conflicting needs: example** - of persuading someone to invest in the stock market - You would likely have two extremes in your audience - some members might
enjoy/want risk (make money quick), while others might be more conservative (slow safe growth) The people in your audience who are conservative pose an objection that you need to deal with in your presentation

**Creating Needs and Motivations - A Different Approach:**
Generally you as the presenter create needs and motivations orally in your presentation. But there are ways you can get the audience to help you create those same needs and motivations. How? By getting them involved in your presentation, for example you might ask a thought provoking question of an audience member or the audience as a whole (informally poll the audience).

**Example:** In a presentation on drinking water filters a student filled a clear plastic bottle with tap water, that when held up appeared cloudy with things floating in it. He then proceeded to walk from person to person in the audience asking them if they wanted a drink - nobody took him up on his offer. He appealed to the basic human need of thirst and health.

**Another Example:** In a presentation in which a student was persuading fellow students to start investing in an IRA while they were in college, the presenter picked 3 members of the audience and asked them when they wanted to retire, every student said a age under 65, then he proceeded to tell them that this might not be possible unless they got started investing now. He appealed to security and wealth. Remember the danger with questions is that you might not get desirable answers - so you had better know your audience.
Logos (logical proof)

We now turn to a discussion of Aristotle's final means to persuasion - logical proofs "All facts, statements, truths, beliefs and values are relative to the mind that entertains them" What does this statement mean to you? To me it means that we can all take the same statement and interpret it based upon our individual attitudes, values, and beliefs. Thus, the same statement can have many different interpretations. Example: The following statement was made by a student in a persuasive presentation against gun control, how do you interpret the statement: "Eliminating gun control laws won't only protect our constitutional rights but it will actually lower crime" How you interpret the statement would depend upon your own value and belief system and your attitude and preconceived opinions towards gun control and crime in general. If we examine the above statement again what is it? A fact, A truth, an opinion? To different people it could be each. As it stands I would label the statement an opinion because in and by itself it has no logical evidence to support the statement. As a presenter you would need to support that statement with credible evidence, such as where in the constitution does it declare that the right to bear arms is a constitutional right? Statistical evidence to support that if we have less gun control laws and more guns we will have lower crime. Expert testimony to support your idea of lowered crime with less gun control, etc.

Sadly some people would interpret the statement as a truth just after hearing it - often times dependent upon the speakers’ credibility. So in this section on logical reasoning we will do the following:

- Develop what truth, facts, and opinions are. Making an important distinction between "T"ruth and "t"ruth.

- What is logical reasoning and how do we as humans reason to
reach logical conclusions (inductively and deductively)

The goal of this section is twofold:
To become better persuaders by knowing how to create logical arguments.

To become better evaluators/listeners of persuasive arguments (as citizens and consumers) by being able to recognize faulty and illogical arguments.

"TRUTH OR APPARENT TRUTH" - What does this mean?

Rush Limbaugh on his radio talk show makes/or has made the following statement: "Rush Limbaugh telling the truth 98.7% of the time" (note, I'm not sure about the actual figure that he uses).

What does Limbaugh mean by this statement? Is it possible for someone to tell the truth 98.7% of the time? My interpretation of this statement is that Limbaugh means it in a humorous way, he is saying that what he says has more truth than those whose opinions are opposed to his. To examine this statement we need to define further what the "truth" is. Plato (another ancient Greek philosopher) first made the distinction between truth with a capital "T" and truth with a small "t." Capital T Truth is a statement/fact that is 100% absolute, often scientific in nature, examples, "If you heat water to 212 degrees at sea level, then it will boil." Often they can be categorical in nature, example, "All Volkswagens are motor vehicles." We know that these are 100% absolute, you can't deny the validity of these statements. But often in persuasive situations do we have the ability to use evidence to support our ideas that is 100% absolute ("T"ruth)? Is it 98.7% of the time as Limbaugh states? Unfortunately NO. If you state that "gun control in any form is wrong" - is this a "T"ruth? No it is simply your opinion as stated unless it is supported by valid evidence then the
degree of truthfulness increases. "Any remotely intelligent group of people will not be moved by hearing what you think; they will want to know why you think it." Thus, after I make such a statement (as above in reference to gun control) I must support it with evidence, statistics, expert opinions, examples, etc.

I would adapt Plato's conception of Capital "T"ruth this way:

e. **Capital "T"ruth** = 100% absolute, generally scientifically provable - How many arguments can we construct that are 100% absolute? Not many

f. **Small "t"ruth** = a claim or assertion that is backed by credible evidence, in other words, we have stated an opinion but made it more truthful through the use of backing evidence.

g. **Opinion** = A claim or assertion with no backing or evidence. In letter #2 in the forthcoming Letter to the Editor assignment, someone wrote the following claim: "Gays are the people that spread AIDS" (no evidence offered). Which of the three do you think this person feels his statement is? Sadly this person would opt for Capital "T"ruth.

With this important distinction in mind let's turn to how we reason, and how we can construct valid arguments that raise the level of truth in our statements/opinions.
Logical reasoning

What is reasoning? The act of reaching conclusions on the basis of logical thinking, can you think of an example of how you used logical reasoning today? I use the example of how we reason to cross a street. As small children what are we taught? Look both ways, don't cross in the middle of the street, cross at a crosswalk, etc. What happens as we get older? Do we always look both ways? NO, do we always cross at the crosswalk? No, have you ever driven across a busy college campus? People cross the street with little regard for vehicles in the street, don't they? Why? Because they assume from past experiences that cars will stop or slow down for them. Which is highly likely, probably 99.99% of the time but not absolute - not 100% absolute! What we have done here is reasoned inductively from our past experiences to reach a probable conclusion. Inductive reasoning is the most common type of reasoning that we use, it guides our everyday behavior there are two common types of reasoning that we are going to discuss:

Inductive Reasoning

The simplest and most common. Consists of collecting enough instances (specific examples, facts, statistics, and opinions) to establish a pattern from which to reach a probable conclusion. Inductive moves from the specific to the general, this is important to remember because deductive reasoning does the opposite.

Another Example: You buy a Ford Pickup (no intention here - just for examples sake) and that Ford pickup is the biggest lemon that you have ever owned, it is nothing but trouble, broken all of the time, expensive to fix, etc. What conclusion do you come to? Ford Pickup's are not quality vehicles - they are lemons. Is this a valid and accurate conclusion? NO - why? Because you have only experienced one Ford pickup, how many are there in
circulation? Thousands and thousands, you would have to experience and drive many more Ford pickups than one to reach a valid conclusion. What you have done here is leaped to a **hasty generalization**, which is one of the most common ways in which we reason to a faulty conclusion (**fallacies**). **Some important considerations**

1. The important thing to remember when using inductive reasoning is that your conclusions are always probable rather than absolute! Most of human reasoning is this way - not many absolute truths ("T"ruth)
2. An inductive conclusion can fall anywhere along this continuum (you want your evidence to fall at the higher end - 97% plus: **possible ------- probable ------- almost certain**
3. The issue of "**enoughness"** is a question of individual perception. -> usually 97%+ is considered significant

**How to construct an inductive argument:**

1. Ask a question or state a fact, examples ("**Smoke detectors save lives**". or "**Do smoke detectors save lives**"?)
2. Then support with inductive evidence. Give several examples of how smoke detectors have saved lives - but is this enough (enoughness)? Probably not - because two examples are likely not enough - so you might further support with statistical evidence, or even expert testimony (for example from a Fire Chief).

**When to use inductive argument:**

1. When your audience is skeptical or hostile to your central idea. Example - you are in favor of gun control. Your audience is hostile towards gun control. You don't want to state your specific purpose until you lead them through a
chain of inductive evidence - build your case block by block, piece by piece with statistics, examples, quotations, etc. before you state your purpose.

2. To soundly develop any argument/statement/opinion as shown above in the smoke detector example.

How to know if inductive arguments are rational and valid:

• The issue of enoughness - how many cases did you examine, example, how would we establish that crime in Flagstaff is a problem? Would I want to relate one real-life example of a horrible crime incident that occurred in Flagstaff, is that enough? Probably not I would want to support that with other examples, statistics, etc.

• Are the specific instances typical? If I relate one horrible crime incident in Flagstaff is this an atypical or isolated event?

• Are the instances recent? A recent example is much more powerful than one that happened 5-10 years ago.

• Remember that your conclusions are only probable - back to the question of "T"ruth - Even 99.9% certain might not be enough to convince some. For example with nuclear energy is 99.99% good enough in terms of safety?

• Acknowledge that your evidence is not absolute ("T"ruth). Use qualifiers like many, most, evidence strongly indicates, etc.
DEDUCTIVE REASONING

Deduction is reasoning from a general principle to specific conclusion, the opposite of induction. Deduction constructs a chain of reasoning. Unlike collecting observable data (like in induction), deduction consists of manipulating verbal statements, or premises, according to formal rules. Does not involve bringing new data into play but just rearranging what you already know. Like putting together a puzzle. \[ a = b \quad b = c \quad c = a \] Aristotle coined the term "Enthymeme" or "Syllogism", which means literally "in the mind." The Speaker persuaded by relying on a premise (a statement) that was in the minds of the listeners, or by inviting the audience to complete the chain of reasoning. We the listeners fill in, "ah ha," this is the beauty and the power of deductive reasoning. If your listeners accept your premises they must accept your conclusion.

If we know certain things about how two terms (concepts, events, characteristics) are related, we can discover other relationships that are logically entailed or implicated. Term A is related in a known way to Term B. We know certain things about B. Therefore, we can draw certain conclusion about Term A. To use deductive reasoning in a presentation, you need to transpose this into a series of steps: **Step 1**: Establish that a relationship exists between two terms. **Step 2**: Establish the actual condition/status of one of the terms. **Step 3**: Show how a conclusion about the other term necessarily follows. The beauty of deduction lies in its certainty. If your listeners accept the premises, they must accept the conclusion. The problem with deduction is that in order for its conclusion to be absolute, its premises must be absolute.

Example of Deductive Reasoning-> consists of three statements.

**Major premise** states a generalization: **All Christians believe in God.**
**Minor premise** relates a specific case or class to the generalization: **Fred is a Christian.**

**Conclusion** is deduced from the two premises: **Fred believes in God.**

**Other Examples:**

- Often used as a justification for war.  
  (**Major premise**) All Wars should be won  
  (**Minor premise**) Vietnam is a war  
  (**Conclusion**) Therefore, The Vietnam war should be won

- (**major premise**) Nations attacked by atomic bombs will surrender  
  (**minor premise**) We will drop an atomic bomb on Japan  
  (**Conclusion**) Japan will surrender

**What is wrong with the following deductive argument?** Often we want to express deductive arguments in this form to test their validity.  
(**Major premise**) If you do aerobics, you will look thin  
(**minor premise**) Jane does aerobics  
(**conclusion**) Therefore, Jane looks thin

The major premise is not believable because we can think of many exceptions: Just because someone does aerobics doesn't mean they will be thin. This persuader then needs to rethink their main arguments.

**Other Examples** (Business)

(**major premise**) XYZ Corp hires only college graduates for their sales department and their sales are higher than ours

(**minor premise**) We will hire only college graduates for our sales department

(**conclusion**) Our sales will increase  
(**major premise**) Workers who are given annual pay raises based upon merit
are more motivated (minor premise) We will give annual pay raises based upon merit (conclusion) Our workers will be more motivated

How to use deductive reasoning:

• Putting your audience's reasoning into a syllogism (deductive form) helps you plan your persuasive strategy: example, you want to persuade your office to ban smoking in the offices - so you talk to smokers and you find that they envision smoking as a legal right that they should be allowed to do, so you fashion the following syllogism:

  Major: any legal activity should be permitted  Minor: smoking is a legal activity  Conclusion: therefore, smoking should be permitted.  So from the perspective of smokers in your office you decide to attack the fact that yes it is legal but harms the health of others and thus should be banned. So by examining your listeners thinking you can find a point of attack, your major argument (main idea/or point).

• Putting your own thoughts into a syllogism helps you create a persuasive structure, so you come up with the following overall argument;

  Major: Any activity should be prohibited if it hurts others  Minor: Smoking in the office building hurts others.  Conclusion: Therefore, smoking in the office building should be prohibited.  So now you can see that you need to convince the listeners of your major and minor premises (these can be your main ideas/arguments).

• Finally, to test the soundness of your argument once you have developed a rough-draft, aerobics example from above (major premise) If you do aerobics, you will look thin
Applications of Deductive Reasoning:

Sherlock Holmes, the famous fictional detective, solved crimes by using deductive reasoning like this:

- Watchdogs bark at strangers
- When Jenkins was murdered, the dogs did not bark
- Jenkins was not killed by a stranger

The educational children's cable television show "Blue's Clues" uses deductive reasoning to teach children. In the program, a blue dog gives clues to the host who has been trained to immediately sit in a thinking chair once he receives 3 clues. The host then sits in the thinking chair and uses deductive reasoning to rearrange (or premises) the 3 facts until a right combination (conclusion) is found to solve the puzzle every time! As the show illustrates deductive reasoning is like putting together the pieces of a puzzle.