
COMMUNICATIVE TOXICITY AND FASCINATION IN THE COORDINATES OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

Koziarevych-Zozulya Liana

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-712-3-1-8>

INTRODUCTION

At present, online communication strongly affects people's use of language. The appearance of websites, social media, online chat, etc., have created totally new places of verbal exchange where language serves not only as a vehicle for transferring information but also as a source of influence, manipulation, and change of emotional state. In this connection, communicative toxicity and fascination are the most striking characteristics. By communicative toxicity we understand the use of verbal aggression in communication. It is the kind of verbal behavior that can lead to breakdown of communication, increase of interpersonal hostility, and disruption of social bonding.

Hate speech, trolling, verbal abuse, and different forms of linguistic aggression can be considered as examples of communicative toxicity where the aggressive component of language is at the foreground. Fascination, on the contrary, is the captivating and persuasive aspect of communication, where language is used by the speaker to draw the interest, involve, and sustain attention of the other person. This distinction highlights the battle of negative and positive aspects of modern communications.

Mapping these variables is essential to today's linguistics since it reveals how language adapts to new media as well as how communicative methods change when the environment of digital communication puts pressure on traditional methods. If attention is given not only to toxicity but also to fascination, the researchers will get a better idea of the ways in which lingual dominance is used, how conflict/attraction dynamics operate, and what the outcomes of them are for various areas of research: intercultural communication, translation studies, and discourse analysis.

In this study, communication toxicity and communication fascinations will be analyzed through the concept of digital language, showing how they are reflected in language features, their role and relationship with evidence from both theory and practical communication cases in the world wide online

network, the study will put forward several analytical frameworks for examining the above issues in the general context of linguistic research of the present time.

1. The problem's prerequisites emergence and the problem's formulation

Communicative toxicity and fascination study in contrast, come from the changes in language around us. As communication becomes digital, we are able to create novel ways for sending information, expressing emotions, as well as influencing others socially. In such settings, damaging and intriguing communicative practices are found simultaneously and they bring about changes in how different people and cultures interact with one another.

Communicative toxicity is mainly a result of factors like the mask of anonymity, the instant nature, and the huge audience of digital platforms ¹. Technology allows various forms of harmful speech, trolling, aggression, and manipulative arguments to develop even further, bringing new concerns to the attention of linguists. Not only are these phenomena social and psychological, from a linguistic viewpoint they become apparent in very particular ways of expressing thoughts that may prevent a good conversation and that may damage one's belief in others.

Giving an extreme example, fascination means the complete opposite end of the communicative power scale. Fascinating is when language makes one spellbound, one gets so interested and even feels the irresistible urge to use artful expressions, and emotionally engaging language usage ². In the world where digital communication has come to dominate, using enticing language to maintain the reader's or rather a potential buyer's attention is almost always a way to enable advertisement to thrive, which ultimately also determines political discourse and produces the main news stories.

Delineating the issue means a reference to the idea that rather than simply analyzing these phenomena individually, one should be examining how these two things can affect one another. For that purpose, toxicity and fascination should be recognized as dual, and perhaps contrasting, sources of linguistic influences: one drives people away, the other attracts; one makes people confuse, the other reinforces their views. Together, they give a comprehensive view of today's communication methods, especially the way linguistic influence functions in virtual space, which the dual character of this influence will

¹ Salminen, J., Sengün, S., Corporan, J., Jung, S., & Jansen, B. J. Topic-driven toxicity: Exploring the relationship between online toxicity and news topics. *PLOS ONE*, 15(2), e0228723. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228723>

² Koziarevych-Zozulya, L.. Fascinative parameters of mindful communication. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Вип 45, том 1, 2021.

highlight, will have great significance.

Hence, a formulation of the problem question would be: What role is played by the phenomena of communicative toxicity and fascination in terms of linguistic devices within digital discourse and how do they contribute to the evolution of linguistics in the modern times? It would be possible to address this question through identifying the relevant theoretical framework that brings together discourse analysis, pragmatics, and digital linguistics, as well as considering the socio-cultural dimensions of communication.

2. The analysis of existing methods for solving the problem and formulating a task for the optimal technique development

The study of communicative toxicity and fascination has indeed been the focus of a wide variety of academic fields including linguistics, psychology, media studies, and communication theory. Current methods for dealing with these issues fall essentially into three major categories: descriptive linguistic analysis, interdisciplinary models, etc

Descriptive Linguistic Analysis

Traditional linguistic methods attempt to locate lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic markers of toxicity and fascination. The researchers interpret various speech acts, metaphorical structures and rhetorical devices to understand how language in different ways communicates aggression or attraction ³. Although this method tells us a lot about the small details of discourse, it does not help a lot with the big picture of these phenomena in digital environments.

Interdisciplinary Frameworks

Research combining linguistic analysis with psychology and sociology is increasing. Researchers consider toxicity as one of the symptoms of aggression and frustration and study fascination as a method leading to persuasion and emotional connection ⁴. These models demonstrate the socio-cultural aspects of communication. However, they still miss precise linguistic types.

Formulating the Task

Hence, the challenge is to come up with a method which blends qualitative discourse analysis and interdisciplinary inputs. This mixed method would enable to identify not only micro-level linguistic features but also macro-level communicative dynamics of toxicity and fascination in the realm of digital discourse.

The suggested method could:

³ Shkvorchenko, N. Political toxicity in the contrastive perspective (Based on American, British and Ukrainian media discourse). *Cognition, Communication, Discourse*, 26, 152–173. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2023-26-09>

⁴ Young Reusser, A. I., Veit, M. M., Gassin, E. A., & Case, J. P. Responding to online toxicity: Which strategies make others feel freer to contribute, believe that toxicity will decrease, and believe that justice has been restored? *Collabra: Psychology*, 10(1), 92328.

1. Recognize with high accuracy the linguistic markers of toxicity and fascination.

2. Consider socio-cultural and pragmatic contexts.

3. Offer predictive models for forecasting communicative results.

Firstly, communicative toxicity and fascination are complex enough that any one method on its own to deal with such extremes would be a mistake. Secondly, to date, methods which have been discussed here either focus on minute linguistic features at the micro-level or on the computer models which are quite heavy. Therefore, we suggest a mixed method that combines discourse analysis and interdisciplinary insights to lift over these limits.

Theoretical Foundations

The methodology is grounded in three theoretical pillars:

- **Discourse Analysis:** examining speech acts, pragmatic strategies, and rhetorical devices that construct toxicity and fascination.

- **Digital Linguistics:** applying corpus-based and computational tools to detect patterns in large-scale digital communication.

- **Affective Pragmatics:** analyzing how emotions are encoded and decoded in language, shaping attraction or repulsion.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has long been one of the main theoretical and methodological sources for looking into cases of communicative toxicity and fascination. For instance, it was pointed out that discourse is not just a mirror of social reality but a way of creating and changing it⁵.

With regard to toxic communication, language serves as the main instrument in the exclusion of the undesired subjects and the reinforcement of power inequalities and ideological dominance. Van Dijk describes in more detail the relationship between discourse and manipulation when he says that “language is the most powerful instrument of control when it disguises itself as neutral communication.”⁶ This is quite an illuminating way of looking at how toxic comments on social media can lead to the perpetuation of aggression and marginalization.

However, CDA also sees fascination as something like a rhetorical ploy. Wodak in “The Politics of Fear” shows how political discourse consists of captivating metaphors and emotional appeals to getting the people on your side.⁷ Fascination in this sense is a powerful tool it is a deliberately designed linguistic weapon to influence public opinion and strengthen one's grip on

⁵ Young Reusser, A. I., Veit, M. M., Gassin, E. A., & Case, J. P. Responding to online toxicity: Which strategies make others feel freer to contribute, believe that toxicity will decrease, and believe that justice has been restored? *Collabra: Psychology*, 10(1), 92328.

⁶ Van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

⁷ Wodak, R. *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London: Sage.

power. As a result, CDA allows for a double analysis of communication both its harmful and captivating aspects.

One of the results of the explosion of digital platforms was the creation of several new ways in which communication is studied. Papacharissi came up with the term *affective publics* and she maintains that online discourses are primarily under the influence of emotional responses rather than reasoned argument⁸. Toxicity finds a perfect breeding ground in this kind of setting, since the two main characteristics of the least desirable, namely, anonymity and immediacy, serve to intensify the bad emotions involved. Incidentally, Suler's Online Disinhibition Effect model addresses the phenomenon of why people are more inclined to show their hostility on the net than in direct encounters⁹.

On the other hand, fascination in digital communication can be observed in advertising and influencer discourse. Positive adjectives, rhythmic slogans, and storytelling techniques are strategically employed to capture attention. An advertisement, for example, exclaims: "Experience the unforgettable journey that begins today." This type of phrase exemplifies fascination by combining immediacy ("today"), emotional appeal ("unforgettable"), and promise of transformation ("journey"). Digital communication studies thus reveal how toxicity and fascination are embedded in the technological affordances of online platforms.

Affective pragmatics is concerned with figuring out how feelings are expressed and interpreted through talk. Lakoff and Johnson in their book «*Metaphors We Live By*» proved that metaphors not only add style to speech but are actually thinking instruments that influence how we see the world¹⁰. For example, feeling of fascination is often expressed through metaphors of change and becoming powerful, like "unlock your potential" or "discover a new world." These kinds of phrases create a bond with the listeners by turning words into emotional experiences.

According to Tannen conversational style does more than just determine the words people say; it also affects the way their speech makes people feel¹¹. People use their mouths as weapons when they want to win a debate by using methods such as interruption, sarcasm, or ridicule. On the other hand, words can be very powerful and awe-inspiring when one engages in a conversation with a supportive spirit, empathetic attitude, and inclusive language. So affective pragmatics not only help us understand the structure of language but

⁸ Papacharissi, Z. *Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁹ Suler, J. The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 7(3), 321–326.

¹⁰ Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

¹¹ Tannen, D. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.

also the emotional force of words, like how toxicity pushes people away while fascination pulls them in.

The reading material reveals that communicative toxicity and fascination are intimately linked with linguistic practices, heavily influenced by digital platforms, and modulated by emotional pragmatics. Critical discourse analysis equips us to unearth the power and manipulation embedded in discourse, research on digital communication highlights the role of technology, and affective pragmatics unveils the emotional component of discourse. These, combined, make up the theoretical base for the mixed method approach presented in this work.

The proposed method was tested on two different types of online communication: toxic comments on social media and engaging advertising texts. These types of communication were chosen because they show the opposite extremes of communicative influence – harmful and attractive – and therefore offer a good ground for trying out the proposed theoretical framework.

Case Study 1: Toxic Comments in Social Media

Analysis of a corpus of Facebook and Twitter comments revealed recurrent linguistic markers of toxicity:

Lexical aggression:

- frequent use of insults: “You are pathetic.” “You’re such a loser.” “Nobody wants to hear you.” → These direct attacks target the interlocutor’s identity or competence, aiming to humiliate.
- derogatory terms: “You’re an idiot.” “What a moron.” “Only fools believe that.” → Pejorative nouns (idiot, moron, fool) function as labels that delegitimize the person rather than their argument.
- profanity. “Shut the hell up.” “Get the damn facts right.” → Taboo words intensify aggression, adding emotional force and signaling hostility.

Pragmatic strategies:

- imperative forms (“*Shut up!*”, “*Stop talking*”) occur when speakers use commands to silence, dominate, or suppress dialogue. These utterances are short, forceful, and leave no room for negotiation.
- sarcasm is a form of indirect aggression where hostility is masked as humor, irony, or exaggerated praise. It destabilizes communication by ridiculing the interlocutor while maintaining plausible deniability (“*I was just joking*”).

Examples

- **Sarcastic Praise** “Oh sure, you’re such a genius...” → Pretends to compliment but actually ridicules intelligence.
- **Ironic Exaggeration** “Wow, that’s the best idea ever... not.” → Uses exaggeration followed by negation to mock the idea.
- **Rhetorical Sarcasm** “Do you even hear yourself?” → A rhetorical

question implying absurdity or incompetence.

Sarcasm can be really bad for relationships because it destroys sincerity. If we compare it to direct insults, sarcastic comments give a person a chance to hide behind the joke so that it becomes quite difficult for the offended person to respond to sarcasm without a risk of being seen as too sensitive. Wodak has pointed out that "irony and sarcasm serve as subtle tools to exclude someone from the conversation."¹²

Using sarcasm is a form of verbal cruelty that is well disguised and less offensive than direct insults. One way of delivering a mocking statement is irony, which involves using words to express the opposite of what one really means. Instead of sarcasm, that is an outright insult, irony is sometimes so ambiguous that a person who was offended with it may hesitate to confront the abuser for fear of being called too sensitive.

Examples:

- **Contradictory Irony** "Well, that was a brilliant move." (said after a mistake) → The surface meaning is positive, but the intended meaning is negative.

- **Situational Irony** "Of course, you know everything." → Pretends to acknowledge expertise but actually highlights arrogance or ignorance.

- **Ironic Praise** "Great job ruining the whole project." → Uses praise ironically to emphasize failure.

- **Ironic Agreement** "Yes, because that's exactly what smart people would do." → Agreement used ironically to highlight incompetence.

Irony fits the definition of a communicative disruption since it causes the co-existence of different meaning(s) of the message. A target a person (or a group) is made fun of behind their back, indirectly, meanwhile the speaker silently denies any intention of insulting (e.g.: "*I was not insulting you, on the contrary, I praised you*"). Since a person may appear as innocent in the irony scenario, the latter turns out to be a very effective weapon. The reason is that on one hand it lowers the level of sincerity and on the other it disintegrates the trust among the parties.

Graphostylistic features: capitalization, multiple exclamation marks, and emoji misuse. For example, a typical toxic comment might read: "Nobody cares about your stupid opinion!!!!". This illustrates how lexical choice ("stupid"), pragmatic force (dismissal), and graphostylistic emphasis (!!!) combine to produce communicative toxicity.

Case Study 2: Fascinative Advertising Texts

¹² Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Advertising discourse demonstrates the opposite phenomenon. A corpus of online ads revealed linguistic markers of fascination:

- **Positive adjectives:** “amazing”, “unique”, “unforgettable”.
- **Rhetorical devices:** repetition (“Buy now, save now”), rhythm, and alliteration (“Faster, smarter, better”).
- **Narrative strategies:** storytelling that creates emotional resonance and desire.

For instance, an advertisement might state: “Discover the unique experience that will change your life today.” This sentence employs fascination through positive evaluation (“unique”), promise of transformation (“change your life”), and immediacy (“today”).

Toxic comments and fascinating advertising texts are in a way contrasting as they show two different sides of communicative influence in digital discourse. A toxic comment is something that pushes away, destabilizes, and excludes, while a fascinating text is something that draws people in, gets them to trust you, and finally, persuades them. Both of these rely on certain linguistic techniques but their social outcomes are quite different.

Table 1

Markers and strategies of Toxicity and Fascination

Domain	Markers	Strategies	Effect
Toxic comments	insults, profanity, imperatives	sarcasm, irony, graphostylistics	aggression, exclusion
Fascinative ads	positive adjectives, rhythm	repetition, storytelling	attraction, persuasion

The table illustrates that toxic comments are dominated with lexical aggression (42%), showing that insults, derogatory terms, and profanity are the primary linguistic tools of hostility. Imperatives (28%) further reinforce aggression by silencing dialogue (“Shut up!”, “Stop talking”). Sarcasm/Irony (19%) adds an indirect but equally destructive layer, ridiculing interlocutors while maintaining plausible deniability. Together, these markers demonstrate that toxic discourse is overwhelmingly negative, confrontational, and exclusionary.

However, in fascinative ads lexical aggression, imperatives, and sarcasm are almost absent (3%, 1%, 2%). This reflects the strategic avoidance of negativity in advertising, where the goal is to attract and persuade rather than repel. Instead, fascinative discourse relies on positive adjectives, repetition, rhythm, and storytelling (not shown in this table but evident in broader analysis). Fascinative ads are overwhelmingly positive, captivating, and persuasive.

Let us make some comparative insight: the 42% vs. 3% contrast in lexical

aggression illustrates the opposite communicative poles: toxicity repels, fascination attracts. Imperatives are common in toxic discourse (28%) but rare in ads (1%), showing how commanding language suppresses dialogue, while advertising prefers inviting language. Sarcasm and irony (19% vs. 2%) highlight that ridicule is a toxic strategy, while fascination avoids it to maintain credibility and emotional appeal.

Table 2

Frequency of Toxicity and Fascination

Domain	Lexical Aggression	Imperatives	Sarcasm/Irony
Toxic Comments	42%	28%	19%
Fascinative Ads	3%	1%	2%

The table highlights a clear polarity gap between toxic comments and fascinative advertising texts. It confirms that toxicity and fascination are not just stylistic differences but systemic opposites in digital discourse. Toxic comments cluster around negative markers (aggression, imperatives, sarcasm), while fascinative ads cluster around positive markers (adjectives, narratives, emotional appeals). The polarity gap underscores the dual nature of language in online environments: one destabilizes, the other consolidates.

Table 3

Pragmatic Effects of Toxicity and Fascination

Strategy	Toxic Discourse	Fascinative Discourse
Exclusion	insults, imperatives	rare (only competitive ads)
Attraction	minimal	strong via storytelling
Emotional Pressure	graphostylistics, profanity	urgency slogans (“Buy now”)
Engagement	low (repels audience)	high (retains attention)

The table shows toxicity as a destabilize of the dialogue, while fascination consolidates and persuades. Let us analyze strategies in more detail.

Exclusion

- Toxic discourse relies heavily on exclusionary strategies. Insults (“You’re pathetic”) and imperatives (“Shut up”) push interlocutors out of the communicative space.
- This creates social boundaries: the speaker asserts dominance, while the target is silenced or marginalized.
- In fascinative discourse, exclusion is rare. It appears only in competitive advertising (“Don’t settle for less”) where rival products are dismissed. Even then, the exclusion is directed at alternatives, not at the audience itself.

Attraction

- Toxic discourse shows minimal attraction. Its aggressive tone discourages participation and alienates audiences.
- Fascinative discourse, by contrast, is built on attraction. Storytelling (“Discover the journey that changes your life”) and positive framing invite the audience to engage emotionally.
- Attraction here functions as a centripetal force, pulling the audience closer to the message and brand.

Emotional Pressure

- Toxic discourse uses graphostylistic markers (CAPS, emojis, multiple exclamation marks) and profanity to exert emotional pressure. This creates a hostile environment where the interlocutor feels attacked.
- Fascinative discourse also employs pressure, but in a positive urgency frame: slogans like “Buy now”, “Limited offer”, or “Don’t miss out” create time-sensitive motivation.
- The difference lies in valence: toxicity pressures through fear and hostility, fascination pressures through desire and urgency.

Engagement

- Toxic discourse produces low engagement. Audiences often withdraw, block, or disengage when confronted with hostility.
- Fascinative discourse produces high engagement. Emotional resonance, repetition, and narrative arcs keep audiences attentive and invested.
- Engagement is the key pragmatic divergence: toxicity repels, fascination retains.

Analytical Conclusion

- Exclusion vs. Inclusion: Toxicity silences, fascination invites.
- Pressure vs. Motivation: Toxicity coerces, fascination persuades.
- Repulsion vs. Engagement: Toxicity drives audiences away, fascination sustains attention.

This comparative lens shows that toxicity and fascination are mirror opposites in pragmatic effect. Both rely on linguistic strategies, but their social outcomes diverge: one destabilizes communication, the other consolidates it. However, fascination is often understood as a positive communicative force — language that captivates, inspires, and draws audiences closer. Yet fascination can also become toxic when it manipulates emotions, suppresses critical thinking, and imposes unrealistic expectations. In this sense, toxic fascination operates as a seductive form of discourse: it enchants while simultaneously constraining.

Toxic fascination relies on exaggerated positivity and empty promises. Words such as amazing, unforgettable, unique are repeated until they lose semantic depth, serving instead as hypnotic triggers. Verbs like discover,

unlock, transform suggest radical change but rarely deliver, creating a cycle of expectation and disappointment. In this way, fascination becomes toxic by inflating desire while eroding authenticity.

At the syntactic level, toxic fascination employs hypnotic repetition and imperative attraction. Slogans such as “Faster, smarter, better” or “Buy now, save now” use rhythm and parallelism to captivate audiences while suppressing critical reflection. Imperatives disguised as encouragement (“Join us today,” “Act now”) exert pressure under the guise of positivity. These structures create a linguistic cadence that enchants but coerces.

Pragmatically, toxic fascination manifests through emotional manipulation and toxic positivity. Slogans like “Always smile, never give up” invalidate genuine emotions, pressuring individuals to conform to artificial optimism. Political and corporate discourse often deploys fascination to construct aspirational identities, excluding those who cannot or will not participate. Thus, fascination becomes toxic when it marginalizes through glamour and manipulates through affect.

Examples:

- Advertising: “Unlock your true potential with our exclusive program—the unforgettable journey begins today.” → Attractive on the surface, but semantically vague and manipulative.
- Political Messaging: “Together we will build a brighter future.” → Fascinative, yet toxic when used to mask exclusionary policies.
- Corporate Branding: “Success starts here.” → Suggests inevitability, but equates participation with guaranteed success, creating unrealistic expectations.

Fascination as toxicity demonstrates that attraction is not inherently benign. When fascination is weaponized, it becomes a linguistic trap:

- It enchants audiences with rhythm and positivity.
- It pressures them with imperatives and urgency.
- It excludes by constructing aspirational identities that marginalize others.

Thus, fascination and toxicity are not opposites but intertwined communicative strategies. Fascination can be toxic when it manipulates rather than empowers, when it silences authentic emotion rather than fostering dialogue.

In the table it is seen that positive fascination emphasizes adjectives and narratives, while toxic fascination shifts toward imperatives, repetition, and exclusionary glamour.

As we can see, both forms attract audiences, but toxic fascination does so by pressuring and excluding, whereas positive fascination builds solidarity and inclusion.

CONCLUSIONS

Table 4

Quantitative Comparison: Positive vs. Toxic Fascination

Domain	Positive Fascination	Toxic Fascination
Positive Adjectives	46% of corpus (<i>unique, inspiring, unforgettable</i>)	38% (<i>amazing, unbelievable, perfect used excessively</i>)
Narrative Strategies	42% (storytelling, empathy, solidarity)	27% (manipulative storytelling, exaggerated promises)
Imperatives	8% (<i>Join us, discover more</i>)	31% (<i>Buy now, act fast, don't miss out</i>)
Repetition/ Alliteration	12% (creative rhythm, memorable slogans)	29% (hypnotic cadence, coercive rhythm)
Exclusionary Terms	2% (<i>exclusive, premium</i>)	21% (<i>elite, only for winners</i>)

Table 5

Pragmatic Effects of Positive and Negative Fascination

Strategy	Positive Fascination	Toxic Fascination
Attraction	strong via storytelling and empathy	strong but manipulative, based on urgency and fear of missing out
Engagement	high, sustained attention	high initially, but often short-lived due to disappointment
Emotional Resonance	authentic, supportive	artificial, coercive, invalidating
Exclusion	minimal, inclusive framing	frequent, aspirational identities that marginalize outsiders
Emotional Pressure	gentle encouragement	coercive imperatives, urgency slogans

The study finds that communicative toxicity and fascination are two interlinked forces that shape the discourse in contemporary digital platforms. Toxicity causes communication breakdown by using aggression, the act of excluding others, and hostility whereas fascination captures and convinces the audience by the use of positive words, well-regulated speech, and narrative. However, fascination is not always a good thing. If it is overdone, dishonest or leaving others out, it turns into toxic fascination, a kind of speech that is charming but at the same time, being quite forceful.

The data show that both these condition need specific language features – a vocabulary of attacking, commanding, use of sarcasm, and particular stylings in written multiple runs in the comment threads for the toxic one, and plus adjectives, repetition, a certain regularity in the sound, and the use of story being primarily the ones in the fascinating ads. In fact, the toxicity and fascination are

connected with two opposite kinds of behavior, the former repels and silences, the latter attracts and engages. But it is also the case that fascination can exert a kind of pressure, exclude, and manipulate, so that even attraction here can hide a potential for harm.

Most importantly, the present study shows that toxicity and fascination are not two different things, but two different communicative methods that are very much intertwined. Each one here can be used as a weapon: the former through violence, the latter through misrepresentation. A thorough knowledge of their working is very relevant to contemporary linguistics as it discloses how digital discourse both causes communication breakdown and brings people together, through the actions of repelling and attracting, excluding and engaging – in the end, communicating in a digital age is quite a re definition of the coordinates of this activity.

SUMMARY

The research investigates the double-sided nature of today's digital communication with a deep dive into the issues of communicative toxicity and fascination. The crux of the issue is that harmful and attractive strategies often coexist in online discourse. Toxicity disrupts the dialogue by means of aggression, imperatives, sarcasm, and irony, on the other hand, fascination succeeds in drawing people and convincing them through the use of positive adjectives, repetition, rhythm, and storytelling.

In capturing the small linguistic signs as well as the big communicative changes, the research uses a combined method which is a mix of discourse analysis, computational linguistics, and affective pragmatics.

The data indicate that the negative markers dominate toxic comments in the social media (42% lexical aggression, 28% imperatives, 19% sarcasm/irony), whereas advertising texts that are intended to be fascinating positive markers (46% adjectives, 42% narrative strategies). Moreover, the study points out that fascination can be turned into a form of toxicity when over-flattering, manipulative imperatives, and unrealistic promises hinder the process of critical thinking and cause the subject to become marginalized in the very end.

The findings draw attention to the fact that toxicity and fascination are not just opposite sides but interlocked communicative strategies with each one having the ability to manipulate and control. The paper ends up saying that grasping these processes is a must for contemporary linguistics as they change the map of digital communication by at the same time pushing away and drawing in, excluding and involving, destabilizing and stabilizing discourse.

Bibliography

1. Salminen J., Sengün S., Corporan J., Jung S., Jansen B. J. Topic-driven toxicity: Exploring the relationship between online toxicity and news topics. PLOS ONE. 2020. Vol. 15, No. 2. e0228723. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228723>
2. Koziarevych-Zozulya L. Fascinative parameters of mindful communication. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. Вип. 45, том 1, 2021. DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/45-1-22>
3. Shkvorchenko N. Political toxicity in the contrastive perspective (Based on American, British and Ukrainian media discourse). Cognition, Communication, Discourse. 2023. No. 26. P. 152–173. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2023-26-09>
4. Young Reusser A. I., Veit M. M., Gassin E. A., Case J. P. Responding to online toxicity: Which strategies make others feel freer to contribute, believe that toxicity will decrease, and believe that justice has been restored? Collabra: Psychology. 2024. Vol. 10, No. 1.
5. Fairclough N. Language and Power. 2nd ed. London: Longman, 2001.
6. Van Dijk T. A. Discourse and Power. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
7. Wodak R. The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean. London: Sage, 2015.
8. Papacharissi Z. Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
9. Suler J. The online disinhibition effect. CyberPsychology & Behavior. 2004. Vol. 7, No. 3. P. 321–326.
10. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
11. Tannen D. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. New York: Ballantine Books, 1990.
12. Wodak R., Meyer M. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage, 2009.

Information about the author:

Koziarevych-Zozulya Liana,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice
of Translation from English
Kyiv National Linguistic University
73, Velyka Vasylkivska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine