



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Insinuation in a talk show a cognitive discourse analysis

Hussein Hamid Kareem ^{1*}, Sadiq Mehdi Al Shamari ²

¹ College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq

² Ph.D., Assistant Professor, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: **Hussein Hamid Kareem**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138

Volume: 05

Issue: 05

September-October 2024

Received: 04-07-2024

Accepted: 05-08-2024

Page No: 98-105

Abstract

This study examines, from the standpoint of cognitive discourse, the insinuation in a particular American talk show. It attempts to demonstrate how ignorance can impact interpersonal communication. An eclectic model of Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor (1980) and Sharfian's Cultural Cognition (2011) is used to facilitate this. The information is gathered from the You Tube videos of the American talk show called Good Morning America. The process of indirect communication known as insinuation is considered to be carried out in accordance with certain techniques for a variety of goals, one of which is to prevent social embarrassment.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2024.5.5.98-105>

Keywords: insinuation, talk shows, CODA, and Conceptual metaphors

1. Introduction

The basis for language use in a cognitive discourse analysis (CDA) is thought. Whatever we say must have crossed our brains in some manner, whether deeply or briefly. To a certain degree, thoughts can be expressed in words; when someone asks you "What are you thinking about?", they frequently anticipate a thoughtful response. They might not even be aware that the response will come from a medium—typically language—and will be delivered indirectly. However, thoughts cannot be directly accessed, and people's language is not a good indicator of what they are thinking (Tenbrink, 2011) ^[26].

There is a systematic link between mind and language. To the degree that systematic principles and patterns can be found, they can be used to gain insight into people's thoughts or what they actually say subtly through innuendo. When someone says, "Open the door," for instance, the hearer will have a fully formed mental schema of what it takes to open the door, including getting up, moving in the direction of it, catching it, and then opening it. Due to the fact that scientists studying human behavior and mind often want to get access to cognition, language is a commonly employed tool for a variety of research objectives and techniques that hint to specific concepts. This begins with (usually verbal, occasionally written) talks between researchers when they are first designing the procedure. It then progresses through verbally conveyed task instructions, which may also involve direct questions or behavioral responses made while performing the task. Verbal protocols, talk show segments, and casual conversations are examples of centrally language-based techniques that can serve as sources of inspiration and can be further studied. There are numerous ways to use language to acquire new ideas overall.

The purpose of this study is to

1. Determine the insinuation techniques used on the American talk show The View
2. Recognizing the subliminal concepts that underlie the use of implication

2. Cognitive Discourse Analysis

The technique known as cognitive discourse analysis, or CODA, is used to identify the clear-cut and implicit ways in which speakers' opinions and thoughts are expressed in their language. CODA examines verbal data, which includes discourse—spoken or written language—produced in circumstances that are pertinent to thought. CODA stands for concept and mental process

highlighting as a means of directing discourse analysis.

According to Tenbrink (2020) ^[27], it is inextricably related to conventional discourse analysis techniques.

Speaking actually depends primarily on thought processes. There can be no rational speech at all if there is no thinking. Though some sounds and noises can be understood without brains, meaning cannot. Furthermore, as language is thought to be the best medium for human mental communication, it is almost inevitable that we will respond to the question "What do you think?" using language rather than any other method (Levinson, 2006) ^[21]. Linguistic research across a range of subfields is contributing to an ever-expanding corpus of information about the relationships between language and cognition. Many theories in cognitive linguistics explore the relationship between language and the mind to comprehend essential problems (Dabrowska, 2016) ^[11].

In particular, there appears to be a constant relationship between language and the architecture and functioning of the brain. This structural truth, which also pertains to language rules, relates to the way we think and talk. This is usually true in terms of what language can do for us (or what a particular language can accomplish in comparison to other languages) as well as specifically in terms of what language does for us. Though not always obvious, the cognitive link between thought and language is systematic. The speaker's description of a situation may highlight what they are now focusing on, as opposed to other components of the circumstance that are either left unsaid or kept in the background. "Car next to the tree" conveys a clear center of consideration, even though their spatial connections are the same. There are never any depictions of other scene features, such the color of the car or the kind of tree. The mental process of language acquisition remains crucial (Boldyrev, Dubrovskaya, & Tolmacheva, 2017) ^[7].

Language choices convey important parts of speakers' concepts and coping methods at the moment of speaking, as well as their appropriateness in a communicative situation. Though some techniques may be intentional, most of the language decisions we make when speaking happen too quickly for us to fully comprehend. Because of these phenomena, cognitive discourse analysis offers a helpful means of gaining access to various levels of cognition—so long as one possesses the necessary knowledge of pertinent linguistic features. It will be possible to shed light on some features of the human mind and how it processes language and cognition by thoroughly investigating language (Tenbrink, 2011) ^[26].

Generally speaking, CODA employs language as data to roughly accurately express concepts and ideas. Examples include thinking aloud while working through an issue, breaking down a challenging procedure for a buddy, or narrating a convoluted scene or incident. Cognitive issues that are present in all of these situations will eventually show themselves in language, depending on the particulars of each one (Tenbrink, 2020) ^[27]. Thinking is the primary basis of speaking. Without concepts and ideas, language could not exist. Sounds and noises can be made without cognition, but meaning cannot. Furthermore, language seems to be the most straightforward way for humans to convey their thoughts, thus it's almost a given that we will reply to the question, "What are you thinking?" in terms of language rather than in any other way.

Regarding Evans (2009a) ^[15], Linguistic research across a range of subfields is providing an increasing amount of

information about the relationship between language and cognition. This is true both in terms of what language allows us to do in general (or when it comes to using one language against another) and specifically in terms of what we actually do on a daily basis.

Talmy (2000) ^[25] shows that the connection between language and the mind is systematic, despite some small differences. The way a speaker describes a situation may reveal what they are presently emphasizing about it, rather than ignoring or putting other elements of the scene in the background. Despite having the identical geographical relationship, "The car next to the tree" indicates a different focus of attention than "The tree next to the car." Such an item conveys what the person is concentrating on, depending on the emphasis. Speakers' language choices offer important information about the concepts and coping mechanisms they employ during speech, as well as how appropriate they are in a communicative setting.

Though some techniques may be intentional, most of the language decisions we make when speaking happen too quickly for us to fully comprehend. When one possesses the requisite understanding of pertinent linguistic elements, these characteristics render cognitive discourse analysis an invaluable instrument for gaining access to many cognitive domains. CODA usually uses language as information that generally represents concepts and ideas. This is evident when a speaker tries to describe a particular scenario or scene; there will undoubtedly be cognitive difficulties that affect the process of presenting that scenario. Actually, this kind of process is extremely methodical rather than random (Magirovskaya, 2009) ^[22].

According to Ericsson and Simon (1993) ^[14], cognitive scientists have leveraged the notion that human thoughts are directly expressed through content. Consequently, verbal expressions can reveal the cognitive processes individuals employ when addressing complex problems. However, language conveys more than just the technical communication of speakers. For instance, in the phrase "Have you still not finished reading?" the word "still" implies the speaker's unspoken expectations. Similarly, the word "too" in "I have heard about it, too" suggests that the speaker acknowledges the involvement of others in the conversation. Conversation Analysis (CODA) conducts a comprehensive examination of human language use, providing a robust framework for implementing its theories. The aim is to shed light on underlying concepts and cognitive processes that may not be immediately apparent in spoken language and could extend beyond the conscious awareness of individual speakers. This is due to the fact that speakers often lack awareness of the intricate network of options available to them, allowing for a diverse range of linguistic choices beyond their usual expressions. This network becomes evident only when a larger dataset of language, collected under controlled conditions, is analyzed. CODA employs systematic analytical techniques to assess the conceptual significance of these linguistic decisions. By closely scrutinizing language use and its contextual production, researchers can, according to CODA, reveal systematic aspects of the human mind through rigorous language analysis tools (Tenbrink, 2020) ^[27].

There are numerous approaches to utilizing and studying language, encompassing various forms of spontaneous natural dialogue. Every aspect is adjustable, including the number of participants in a conversation. Who is engaging

with whom? Is it women speaking to women, men to men, or a mix? What are their cultural backgrounds, ages, and social statuses? What topics are being discussed? Are they genuinely conversing, or are they writing, chatting, or posting messages on digital platforms? What is the context or setting of their interaction? What are they observing and contemplating? What is relevant to the speaker at that moment? How are morphological processes being handled? All these factors influence how individuals use language, whether verbally or in writing, and how they choose their words. This has led to various findings using methodologies from sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, pragmatics, and other fields. Such research often combines specific analytical approaches to understand how people utilize language in particular contexts or settings. For example, what are the verbal characteristics of a specific text type? Do men and women communicate differently? How do individuals persuade others through language? How do they assert their power and dominance or, conversely, express subservience or weakness? (Besedina, 2015) ^[4].

Anderson (2009) ^[2] notes that many methods for exploring the human mind—typically not requiring linguistic expertise—are centered around language. For instance, in laboratory settings, language is employed to access memory, mental representation, or other cognitive phenomena. This is achieved by restricting participants' responses to a defined set of choices or by removing decontextualized textual elements that can be statistically processed.

Edwards and Potter (1992) ^[13] argue that these strategies abstract from the nuances of linguistic structure by avoiding the complexities of natural discourse and its social implications. This has led to a common belief that analysis in this field can be conducted without grounding in language theory. However, the extensive insights gained from using language as an external representation of concepts that would otherwise remain inaccessible within the human mind highlight the value of such approaches.

Biber, Conrad, and Reppen (1998) ^[5] highlight the advantages of employing corpus linguistics techniques to analyze language use across diverse data sets. By leveraging extensive corpora, researchers can minimize the impact of situational variables, allowing for a more general understanding of communication patterns across different contexts. This quantitative approach, akin to controlled experimental studies, enables the identification of typical linguistic behaviors and trends that characterize various dialects or socioeconomic groups.

The insights gained from corpus linguistics are particularly valuable when evaluating data collected in specific settings. By analyzing speech patterns, researchers can discern the significance behind individuals' linguistic choices, shedding light on how context influences communication. Furthermore, the data collected can be treated as a small corpus, making corpus linguistic methodologies relevant for studies in Conversation Analysis (CODA). CODA focuses on the nuances of human language use, aligning closely with psycholinguistic research, which investigates language production and cognitive processes.

Despite their shared interest in language use, CODA and psycholinguistics differ in their primary objectives. CODA emphasizes the significance of linguistic choices made by speakers within interactions, while psycholinguistics seeks to understand how the brain processes language—examining

aspects like retrieval speed and cognitive mechanisms involved in language production. Nevertheless, there are numerous overlaps between the two fields, particularly in methodological approaches. For instance, Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) ^[9] explored cooperative referencing in conversation, revealing consistent patterns in how speakers adapt their references over time. Their work illustrates the relevance of referential communication tasks, which mimic natural conversational dynamics and serve as effective contexts for CODA research.

Moreover, some psycholinguistic studies focus on spontaneous linguistic judgments rather than solely on cognitive processing, further blurring the lines between the two disciplines. Ultimately, while psycholinguistics tends to prioritize the mechanics of language retrieval—such as response times—CODA is more concerned with the specific linguistic choices made by speakers and the contextual factors that influence these decisions. The interplay between these fields enriches our understanding of language use and cognition, providing valuable insights into how individuals communicate in various social contexts.

However, CODA was developed to accommodate a range of linguistic features that speakers may not be consciously aware of. Certain aspects of a speaker's personality can be reflected in their language structure. Regardless of the speaker's intentions, thoughts will inevitably manifest in their verbal expressions. For example, even if John does not explicitly express his surprise and happiness, the words and intonation he uses when exclaiming, "Found them!" inherently convey a sense of astonishment and joy. Additionally, various subtleties are represented through language choices, such as the level of detail, the perspective taken, and the aspects the speaker highlights as unique or assumes to be obvious. When searching for such elements, the availability of verbal data must also be considered. The only way a researcher could confirm that John found his keys without him verbalizing it would be if he were observed holding the keys in his hand. If the researcher aims to explore subconscious cognitive processes that are not reflected in verbalization, then CODA would not yield insights, as there would be no relevant linguistic data to analyze (Tenbrink, 2020) ^[27].

Cognitive science, utilizing CODA, can effectively study complex thought processes as long as these processes are not random but instead represent generalizable phenomena that relate to previous research. For successful analysis of language data, the task at hand must be controllable, bounded, specific, measurable, and capable of being articulated; the clearer the task is defined along these lines, the more applicable inferences can be drawn from the resulting language patterns. Although the mental processes involved are intricate, they are also systematically organized (Boldyrev, 2011) ^[6].

The systematic analysis of linguistic structures is the primary contribution of CODA to verbal protocol analysis, drawing on findings from cognitive linguistics and other fields. In contrast, Ericsson and Simon (1993) ^[14] advocate for isolating interesting elements from initial data collection for further investigation. These typically include cognitive concepts that speakers themselves recognize, such as specific thought processes or problem-solving approaches. This is achieved by focusing heavily on the verbal content while largely disregarding the linguistic structures used to convey it. In fact, Ericsson and Simon (1993) ^[14] specifically

recommend that analysts move away from the original wording and instead develop a classification system closely tied to theoretical reasoning. This approach often results in the loss of participant language structures during analysis, rendering them irrelevant for subsequent procedures.

Ericsson and Simon (1993) ^[14] also suggest conducting annotation and analysis in a manner that minimizes context to avoid influencing the analyst's interpretation by preceding or succeeding discourse. However, context significantly affects language use; in some cases, it can make it nearly impossible to grasp what the speaker intends to communicate. The examination of verbal protocols related to complex cognitive processes traditionally conducted by CODA is enriched by linguistic insights. To incorporate this additional layer, it suffices to consider the medium of the message without requiring extensive linguistic knowledge.

According to Van Dijk (2015) ^[29], discourse plays a crucial role in exerting influence and shaping members' thoughts. Consequently, discourse is often utilized by elites such as politicians, scientists, and journalists. Two key components of this dynamic are ideology and power.

On one hand, the term "ideology" refers to the ways in which individuals act against their own interests. It is often utilized to persuade people to behave in certain ways, such as when those who are less fortunate exert effort on behalf of the wealthy. This inherent inequality between the rich and the poor is a fundamental aspect that cannot be changed (Thomas, Shan, Ishtla, Jean, Joanna, & Jason, 2004) ^[28]. Conversely, ideology should be understood as a social construct rather than merely a collection of ideas. It encompasses semiotics, which includes signs such as messages, images, films, and other visual representations, alongside discourse and interaction. Ideology can be seen as a boundary that separates discursive action from cognition. According to Wrong (1979) ^[30], power is defined as the ability to influence others. The key distinction between power and authority lies in the fact that power is based on persuasion, while authority relies on social forces (Hoffman, 2007) ^[16]. Dahl (1957) ^[12] describes power as a person's dominance over others, which may involve convincing them to act contrary to their own best interests.

Language should not be regarded as an end in itself; instead, it serves to shift power dynamics and promote either virtue or responsibility (Thomas, 2004) ^[28]. In fact, the potency of language stems from the individuals who wield it. The relationship between language and power is evident in various contexts, such as talk shows, where speakers utilize language to influence public perceptions and opinions.

3. Insinuation

A "speaker intends to make an addressee believe p, but does not want to be held accountable for communicating p," according to the definition of insinuation in language. The intricate process of insinuation requires the mind's capacity to simultaneously activate and function numerous parallel mental areas linked to disparate objectives (Bertuccelli Papi, 2014) ^[3]. "Insinuate" is a Latin word that means "to penetrate," "to drill," "to infiltrate," and "to get inside." This is where the word "insinuation" originates. Creating a stealthy plan to achieve hidden objectives requires using metaphor to present false information as truth. It is said that the word means "shrewdness, keenness, and getting right to the point." It is also associated with arousing others' uneasiness and suspicions. Additionally, "insinuate," as it

does in modern Italian, can indicate "to win someone over" or "to weasel one's way into" (Kremplewska, 2019) ^[18]. The distinction between said and unsaid is a major source of disagreement in the field of cognitive sciences. Determining implicitly communicated meanings requires cognitive processes that can quickly become muddled if the wrong mental environment is selected. According to Lepore and Stone (2015) ^[20], languages enable speakers to create intricate verbal communication mechanisms that sway listeners' perceptions and make it difficult for them to decipher the plethora of potential hidden meanings that exist between what speakers say and what they express.

4. Talk shows

According to Munson (1993) ^[23], the term "talk show" combines two different, often incompatible rhetorical paradigms by comparing the mass-mediated spectacle that arose in modernity with interpersonal discourse that originated in the oral tradition of pre-modern times. This has resulted in a "conversationalization" of public discourse and the creation of a public-colloquial language that is modeled in many ways after conversational speech standards. According to Burke (1993) ^[8], talk shows can be compared to some pre-modern sociocultural practices of purposeful discourse because they are historically modern Anglo-Saxon organizations. An Italian intellectual debate group known as the academy flourished in the sixteenth century. Its membership was set, and its meeting schedule was predetermined. The French equivalent, the salon, dates back to the seventeenth century. It was a once-weekly semi-formal social gathering, hosted by a hostess, for an eclectic mix of ladies and men of letters. In eighteenth-century England, analogous social institutions like the assembly, club, and more casual coffeehouse had great popularity.

The audience participation talk show, sometimes known as a "audience discussion program" or a "studio debate program," debuted on television in 1967, courtesy of Phil Donahue. What is today referred to as a daytime talk show or tabloid talk show had its premiere on his program. Primarily targeted at housewives, Oprah Winfrey launched this format in 1984 as a contemporary interpretation of late 19th-century women's service journals, often addressing issues that impact women. Talk shows from the United States, such as Oprah Winfrey and others, have made their way to the United Kingdom, several European countries, and most of South America. In the 1980s, a significant media rearrangement led to the replacement of debate programs in Europe by chat shows (Ilie, 2006) ^[17].

According to Ilie (2006) ^[17], there are three main reasons why it is so challenging to describe talk shows: By portraying rapidly changing hybrid media phenomena, overlapping with various mediatized forms of discussion, and constantly recreating themselves by defying and exceeding their own discursive standards, they demonstrate intertextuality.

5. Methodology

The research is carried out utilizing an eclectic model and a qualitative methodology. The study's model is based on Sharfian's Cultural Cognition and Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor. Good Morning America is a popular American talk show from which the data is gathered. A single talk show episode is selected, its political content examined, and then analyzed using an eclectic model.

6. Model of the Study

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) Conceptual Metaphor (CMT) is an essential tool for understanding how language users manage their discussions. According to the well-established view, metaphors can be used conceptually to organize, reshape, and even create reality. Decades of research serve as its basis. Conceptual metaphor is the process of explaining an abstract idea in terms of a concrete one.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) ^[19] assert that metaphors are common in genres that aim to have an artistic effect, such as literature, as well as in the most neutral or casual forms of language. When CMT researchers first started studying conceptual metaphors, they gathered linguistic metaphors from a range of sources, including as conversations, radio and TV broadcasts, dictionaries, newspapers, magazines, and talk shows. Conceptual metaphors are logical comparisons between two different fields of experience. This is what is meant by "understanding one domain in terms of another". "Mapping" is another word for "correspondence" that is frequently used in the literature.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) ^[19] assert that metaphors are common in genres that aim to have an artistic effect, such as literature, as well as in the most neutral or casual forms of language. When CMT researchers first started studying conceptual metaphors, they gathered linguistic metaphors from a range of sources, including as conversations, radio and TV broadcasts, dictionaries, newspapers, magazines, and talk shows. Conceptual metaphors are logical comparisons between two different fields of experience. This is what is meant by "understanding one domain in terms of another". "Mapping" is another word for "correspondence" that is frequently used in the literature.

According to Sharfian's Cultural Cognition, Allan (2013) ^[1] attempts to elucidate a very important idea called "common ground," which is considered to be the basis of innuendo. "Our understanding of linguistic utterances rests on an assumption of common ground," says the writer. Common ground is the thread that binds the speaker and the hearer together and permits appropriate interpretive interpretation. Additionally, alternative approaches to describe common ground include "common knowledge, mutual knowledge, shared knowledge, assumed familiarity, and presumed background information". To be interpreted as innuendo, the language assertions need to be well-formed (Allan, 2013) ^[1]. It is important to keep in mind that there might be restricted as well as universal common ground. The global common ground is the knowledge that all individuals share and rely on while speaking a language. For instance, "sun" connotes "light," "heat," "life," and so on. According to Sharfian the constrained common ground is the limited knowledge that a group of speakers communicates to their listeners, such as using "the word 'Hobgoblin' to refer to man's first wife."

7. Text Analysis

Episode: One

"Duchess Meghan celebrates International Women's Day" 2019/03/08

According to the cognitive metaphor, the speaker employs both insinuation and traditional metaphor strategies, referring to Friday as a day of happiness and joy. This not only suggests that it is a cheerful day but also creates a positive impression for the listener, implying that they are at an exciting event and have an important guest to meet during the

program. The talk show highlights the source of happiness through another strategy, known as the source strategy, by featuring a meeting with an influential figure, whom they refer to as a duchess on the program. This hints at the presence of a significant personality during the gathering, aimed at directly capturing the listener's attention: "News happy Friday again with the Duchess of Sussex this morning leading the way on International Women's Day...". It also implies that all the news covered during the program is essential and objective, presented in a straightforward manner during interviews between individuals in the American program.

Additionally, the speaker employs a repeated strategy by mentioning Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard as a primary source of joy on Friday. This serves as another avenue for accurate and objective information, particularly regarding discussions about International Women's Day, which is celebrated in the United States. The speaker also uses a synthetic narrative strategy to present events clearly and smoothly, avoiding complexity in order to convey ideas effectively: "Former Prime Minister of Australia Julia Gillard, along with other female thought leaders and activists, will discuss how to...". This smooth delivery indicates the talk show's closeness to American listeners and its influence on their perceptions.

The speaker employs a traditional metaphor strategy by referring to individuals as "active," which underscores the significance of the meeting with various guests during the talk show. This indicates that the show features prominent figures who play crucial roles in American society, significantly influencing the audience's perception. The intent behind this choice of words is to captivate the audience's attention and prevent any feelings of boredom or alienation. Each term has been meticulously selected and articulated to engage the listeners effectively, ultimately contributing to the show's success.

Additionally, the speaker utilizes an infinitive strategy by mentioning the Queen, her established trust, and her societal role. This subtly emphasizes the Queen's importance and positive influence within the community. The mention of "Queen" resonates strongly with the audience, encouraging them to watch the episode with enthusiasm and engagement—this is a primary objective of its inclusion. Similarly, vocabulary that hints at the presence of significant figures in the program aims to draw the listener's interest, as seen in the phrase "the Queen's Commonwealth trust in her new role...".

The speaker also employs a goal-oriented strategy by highlighting key personalities featured in the program, such as Meghan Markle, and emphasizing her positive contributions to society. The episode centers on the international celebration of women and their vital roles, reflecting the United States' recognition of women's importance as integral members of society with equal rights alongside men. This focus leads to discussions about women's empowerment, suggesting a shift in policies that now promote women's rights and responsibilities within society. Phrases like "education and limitations within employment" indicate this change, particularly with the announcement that Meghan will take on a new role.

Furthermore, the speaker uses a synthetic metaphor strategy, simplifying complex ideas through carefully chosen vocabulary. While this may serve as a subtle appeal to the audience, it also aims to broaden public understanding by

clarifying that all individuals involved experience joy. On this day, recognized as International Women's Day and her first holiday, we celebrate the freedom and empowerment granted to women in society, allowing them a role in decision-making and involvement in various spheres. This includes political empowerment, enabling women to hold government positions. The speaker employs a targeted strategy by emphasizing a specific demographic—young women—which suggests that the American government is keen on highlighting youth to engage them with direct American policies. The reference to "a galaxy far, far away" alludes to the excitement surrounding Star Wars: Galaxy's Edge at Disney parks, indicating a connection between entertainment and policy engagement.

Moreover, the vocabulary used reflects the positive role of the government in promoting women's rights, particularly in contrast to countries where women have historically been deprived of their rights. The speaker also utilizes a traditional metaphor, likening women to the fundamental galaxy that contains planets, which symbolizes the crucial role women play in society. This metaphor underscores that women are the foundation of society; without their sacrifices and contributions—whether at home, in schools, or in raising children—the world would lack meaning. Thus, empowering women is essential to the policies of various nations.

Additionally, the speaker employs several strategies that may seem repetitive but serve to draw increased attention to the topic. The traditional metaphor reinforces the idea that while some may view women's empowerment as premature, American policy recognizes it as timely and necessary. This empowerment is supported through ongoing efforts to ensure equality and promote women's roles in society.

The objective is to address and put an end to certain violations that women face, and there is a collective eagerness for this change. The speaker employs a goal-oriented strategy by drawing parallels between some women and characters from popular television and film, such as those from the "Galaxy" series and figures like Kylo Ren from Star Wars. This comparison subtly suggests that the empowerment of women is not without its challenges; in fact, it may encounter significant societal obstacles, as some may resist it due to long-standing policies and beliefs that have been ingrained for years. Consequently, American policy emphasizes the empowerment of women, viewing this initiative as a form of encouragement.

The language used throughout the speech underscores the vital role of women in society and their positive contributions. The speaker frequently utilizes the strategy of source and target, which is intentional, as it centers on women and aims to draw societal attention. For instance, references to attractions like the "Millennium Falcon Smugglers Run" and upcoming events in the Star Wars franchise highlight this focus.

At the core of this dialogue is the theme of women's empowerment within society. The speaker also employs traditional metaphors multiple times, acknowledging that while empowering women is crucial, it is often accompanied by various challenges. This is reflected in the use of resistance-related vocabulary, which indirectly indicates the pushback against women's roles and empowerment. Some male politicians may perceive women as weak or overly compassionate beings who can be easily manipulated by others, affecting state or societal policies.

For example, the announcement regarding Meghan's new role

as VP of the Queen's Commonwealth Trust illustrates a commitment to working with young women. The speaker also uses directive metaphors when discussing trends or initiatives within the country, specifically mentioning New York City and its significance in shaping decisions that enhance women's status. This city holds a vital reputation and political influence, making it an essential space for empowering women.

According to the cognitive schema, the speaker employs a truth strategy, emphasizing that their regular Friday meetings are among the happiest occasions. They view these gatherings as positive, suggesting that the discussions held during these meetings have a beneficial impact on society, aimed at capturing public attention. The speaker further strengthens their message through a person strategy, mentioning various individuals during the interview. This approach plays a significant role in shaping the narrative of the American program, as referencing names at the beginning of the episode can enhance audience engagement and attract more viewers. For instance, the speaker states, "Janaina, we're back! It's time for pop news. Happy Friday again with the Duchess of Sussex, who is leading the way on International Women's Day..."

It is important to note that these elements are not presented randomly; they are intentionally crafted. The language and vocabulary used throughout the program are strategically chosen to engage listeners effectively. This intentionality is a key reason why some American talk shows, including this one, rank among the most popular programs. Their fame and widespread following stem from the careful delivery of words and messages that resonate with listeners' minds.

Additionally, the speaker employs a mental plan strategy, presenting information in a realistic and positive manner while avoiding negativity. This approach influences how listeners perceive events and impacts their mindset regarding women's leadership in society. By citing notable figures such as Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard and other influential women, the speaker aims to target both women and men, reinforcing the notion that empowering women politically and socially is essential for governments. As highlighted in the statement, "Speaking on a panel to students about important issues like access to education and limitations within employment, it was just announced that Megan will become VP of the Queen's Commonwealth..."

Another strategy employed by the speaker is the fact strategy, where he highlights that their regular Friday meetings are among the happiest occasions. They perceive these gatherings as positive experiences, suggesting that the discussions held during these meetings have a beneficial impact on society, aimed at capturing public attention. The speaker significantly enhances his message by utilizing the person strategy, referencing various individuals throughout the interview. This approach plays a crucial role in the narrative of the American program, as mentioning names at the beginning of the episode greatly influences audience engagement and helps attract a larger viewership. For instance, the speaker states, "Happy Friday again with the Duchess of Sussex this morning, leading the way on International Women's Day. Megan is joining singer Andy Linux and former Prime Minister of Australia, Julia Gillard..."

It is important to note that these elements are not executed randomly; they are carefully planned. The language and vocabulary used throughout the program are intentionally

crafted to engage listeners effectively. This intentionality is a key reason why some American talk shows, including this one, rank among the most popular programs. Their fame and widespread following stem from the effective delivery of words and messages that resonate with the audience's mindset.

Additionally, the speaker employs a mental plan strategy, presenting information in a realistic and positive manner while steering clear of negativity. This approach influences how listeners perceive events and impacts their attitudes toward women's leadership in society. By citing notable figures such as Australian Prime Minister Julia Gillard and other influential women, the speaker aims to target both women and men, reinforcing the idea that empowering women politically and socially is essential for societal progress. As highlighted in the statement, "Prime Minister of Australia Julia Gillard, along with other female thought leaders and activists, will discuss..."

The speaker also employs a stylistic strategy that organizes events in a logical and coherent manner. He draws a comparison between women and celestial bodies, suggesting that women have historically been undervalued in society. This comparison serves to persuade the interviewees that women have made significant strides in gaining rights that were long denied to them, and that they now play a vital and positive role in society—one that was previously suppressed by a patriarchal system that doubted their potential for development.

Currently, there is a consensus that women's contributions on both political and social fronts are equally important as those of men, forming a fundamental building block for a well-structured society. The speaker likens the presence of women to a galaxy, which encompasses various elements of the universe; similarly, women encompass essential aspects of society, including family dynamics, individual roles, and broader political life.

To reinforce his message, the speaker employs factual strategies, highlighting the positive roles women occupy in various domains, including film. He illustrates how women in cinema have portrayed strong, impactful characters that contribute positively to society. This analogy underscores their successful representation both in fictional narratives and in real-life societal roles.

Additionally, the speaker utilizes contextual strategies to emphasize the reactions and positions that have emerged from women's empowerment. The dialogue is filled with vocabulary that reflects the successful and distinguished roles women have played. Their ability to articulate their thoughts and advocate for themselves enhances their social and political status, enabling them to address critical issues effectively—such as when they speak on panels about access to education and employment challenges.

Moreover, the speaker incorporates a cognitive strategy that acknowledges the complexities involved in empowering women. He makes it clear that this progress does not come without challenges, emphasizing that the journey toward women's empowerment is fraught with obstacles that must be addressed for meaningful change to occur. The term "resistance" suggests a refusal to accept the empowerment of women in society, indicating that this rejection is not merely a contemporary issue but rather a deeply rooted belief that has persisted for many years. Historically, women have been denied roles and positions due to the perception that they were unfit for certain responsibilities. In contrast, modern

society increasingly recognizes and embraces the complete empowerment of women, viewing them as an essential and integral part of the community. However, this progress is often met with challenges, including resistance from specific groups. Despite these hurdles, there is a growing consensus regarding the positive contributions women make to society. The speaker employs various strategies to convey his message, showcasing his extensive knowledge of global contexts. He highlights during the talk show that many individuals have been liberated to pursue their social and political roles, with some even creating and sharing video clips aimed at promoting and empowering women. These actions underscore the significance of women's roles in society, both politically and socially.

Additionally, the speaker utilizes language strategies effectively; he emphasizes that the choice of words in his dialogue plays a crucial role in persuading the audience. By intentionally selecting impactful vocabulary, he seeks to influence listeners' perceptions.

Another tactic employed is the use of personal references. The speaker mentions specific individuals to lend credibility to his arguments and persuade others of his perspective. This indirect form of persuasion is powerful, as people tend to respond strongly when they hear familiar names. For instance, referencing figures like Lil' Kim serves as a positive cue that encourages listeners to reconsider their views on women's roles in society. The mention of her background and achievements resonates with the audience, reinforcing the importance of recognizing women's contributions in various spheres.

8. Conclusion

The conclusion emphasizes that insinuation is crafted through various techniques, all aimed at subtly conveying a message to the listener. This underscores the importance of mental communication between the speaker and society for effectively delivering the intended message. The study's use of specific tactics, along with the repetition of certain elements, highlights the necessity for the speaker to rely on these methods to communicate a particular point. This implies that the speaker is making insinuations in a subtle manner to avoid potential embarrassment in public or political settings. Furthermore, this supports the relevance of cognitive research, which seeks to uncover the innermost thoughts of both the speaker and the audience in order to understand how to provide subtle suggestions that can have both positive and negative implications.

9. References

1. Allan K. What is common ground? In: Capone A, Lo Piparo F, Carapezza M, editors. *Perspectives on Pragmatics and Philosophy*. Milan: Springer Verlag; c2013.
2. Anderson JR. *Cognitive Psychology and Its Implications*. 7th ed. New York: Worth Publishers; c2009.
3. Bertuccelli Papi M. The pragmatics of insinuation. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. 2014;11(1):1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2014-0001>.
4. Besedina NA. Morphology: From morpheme to morphological concept. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics [Internet]*; c2015 [cited 2024 Jul 10];1. Available from: <http://rrlinguistics.ru/media/linguistics/2015/1/selection.pdf>

5. Biber D, Conrad S, Reppen R. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; c1998.
6. Boldyrev NN. The role of an interpretative function in linguistic category formation. *Tambov University Review. Humanities*. 2011;1(93):9-16.
7. Boldyrev N, Dubrovskaya O, Tolmacheva I. Meaning in the mind within the sociocultural commitment of cognitive linguistics. *Revista de Linguas para Fines Específicos*. 2017;23(2):206-25.
8. Burke P. *The Art of Conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press; c1993.
9. Clark HH, Wilkes-Gibbs D. Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition*. 1986;22:1-39.
10. Clark HH. *Using Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; c1996.
11. Dabrowska E. Cognitive linguistics' seven deadly sins. *Cognitive Linguistics*. 2016;27(4):479-91.
12. Dahl R. The concept of power. *Behavioural Science*. 1957;2(3):201-14.
13. Edwards D, Potter J. *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage; c1992.
14. Ericsson KA, Simon HA. *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press; c1993.
15. Evans V. *How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning Construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; c2009.
16. Hoffman J. *A Glossary of Political Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press; c2007.
17. Ilie C. Talk shows. In: Brown K, editor-in-chief. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 2nd ed. Vol. 12. Oxford: Elsevier; 2006:489-94.
18. Krempleska K. *Life as Insinuation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press; c2019.
19. Lakoff G, Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; c1980.
20. Lepore E, Stone M. *Imagination and Convention: Distinguishing Grammar and Inference in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; c2015.
21. Levinson S. Cognition at the heart of human interaction. *Discourse Studies*. 2006;8(1):85-93.
22. Magirovskaya OV. Conceptual configuration theory: conception and method. *Tambov University Review. Humanities*. 2009;2(70):9-13.
23. Munson W. *All Talk: The Talk Show in Media Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; c1993.
24. Sharifan F. *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; c2011.
25. Talmy L. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; c2000.
26. Tenbrink T, Seifert I. Conceptual layers and strategies in tour planning. *Cognitive Processing*. 2011;12(1):109-25.
27. Tenbrink T. *Cognitive Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; c2020.
28. Thomas L, Shan W, Ishtla S, Jean SP, Joanna T, Jason J. *Language, Society, and Power: An Introduction*. London: Routledge; c2004.
29. Van Dijk T. Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. Web [Internet]; c2015. [cited 2024 Jul 10]. Available from: <https://www.example.com/>
30. Wrong DH. *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell; c1979.