

# Insinuation in the View Talk Show: A Cognitive Discourse Analysis

Hussein Hamid Kareem<sup>1</sup>, Sadiq Mahdi Kadhim<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

*This study is about the insinuation in the View talk show from the cognitive discourse perspective. It aims to show how lack of knowledge can affect the way people talk to each other. This is conducted by the aid of an eclectic model of Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor (1980), and Sharfian's Cultural Cognition (2011). The data is collected from the episodes on You Tube from an American talk show called the View. It is concluded that insinuation is a process of indirect communication that is done according to some strategies for many purposes, among them is to avoid social embarrassment.*

**Keywords:** *Insinuation, Talk Shows, CODA, And Conceptual Metaphors.*

## Introduction

In a cognitive discourse analysis (CODA), language use is based on thoughts. Whatever we say must have gone through our minds, in one way or other, superficially or in depth. Thoughts can (to some extent at least) be put into words; people often ask "What are you thinking about?", and they expect a meaningful answer to follow. They may not even realize that the answer will be indirect and communicated through a medium, typically language. Nevertheless, there is no direct way of accessing thoughts, and the language people use to express them cannot be equated with their thoughts (Tenbrink, 2011). The relationship between language and thought is systematic (Miller, 1951). To the extent that systematic principles and patterns can be identified, they can be exploited for accessing what goes on in people's minds or why they really say indirectly in terms of insinuation. When a speaker, for example, says 'open the door', the hearer will have a complete mental schema of an opening the door process starting with standing up, walking towards the door, catching the door, and then opening it. Since researchers interested in human thought and behavior frequently aim to access cognition, language is a widely used medium across various research purposes and procedural steps used to insinuate to certain ideas. This starts with (mostly spoken, sometimes written) discussions among researchers when first designing the procedure, is carried further through task instructions that are conveyed verbally in most cases, and may further involve behavioral responses given through language, or direct questions during task performance. Centrally language-based methods include verbal protocols, episodes in talk shows and informal discussions can be used for inspiration that deserve to be investigated. Altogether there are many ways of gaining insights through language (Talmy, 2007).

This study aims to:

Finding out how insinuation is done in an American talk show called the View.

Identifying the indirect ideas that lie behind the use of insinuation.

### *Cognitive Discourse Analysis*

Cognitive discourse analysis, or CODA, is a way used to recognize the unambiguous and implied methods in which speakers' thoughts and impressions are reflected in their language. CODA inspects verbal information, containing spoken or written language (discourse) produced under situations that are relevant to thinking. CODA refers to guiding discourse analysis with highlighting on notions and mental processes. It is strictly linked to traditional discourse analysis approaches (Tenbrink, 2020). In fact, speaking is

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Sciences, Department of English

<sup>2</sup> University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Sciences Department of English

mainly depended on the process of thinking. If there is no thinking, there is no logical speaking at all. Meaning cannot be obtained without intellect, though some noises and sounds can. Furthermore, language is considered as the most best means of mental communication for humans; hence, it is closely unavoidable that we will reply to the inquest 'What do you think?' in terms of language rather than by any other means (Levinson, 2006). An ever-growing body of knowledge regarding the connections between language and cognition is being gathered by linguistic research across a variety of subfields. The interaction between language and the mind is the subject of numerous ideas in cognitive linguistics to understand necessary issues (Dabrowska, 2016). Particularly, it seems that the structures and functions of the brain are consistently related to language. The way we think and talk are related, according to this structural reality, which also applies to linguistic rules. This is accurate both usually in the sense of what language can accomplish for us (or what a specific language can achieve when comparing with other languages) and particularly in terms of what language accomplishes for us.

The cognitive relationship between thought and language is systematic even though it is not clear-cut. In contrast to other aspects of the scenario that are either not stated or are kept in the background, the speaker's description of a situation may indicate what they are now focusing on. Despite the fact that their spatial relationships are the same, the phrase "car next to the tree" communicates a distinct center of consideration. Other elements of the scene, such the colour of the car or the type of tree, are not at all depicted in any instance. Mind is still essential in language process (Boldyrev, Dubrovskaya, & Tolmacheva, 2017). Important aspects of the speakers' conceptions and coping strategies at the time of speaking, as well as their suitability in a communicative context, are revealed through language choices. The majority of the linguistic choices we make when speaking happen too rapidly to be completely conscious, even though some of these strategies may be intentional. Because of these phenomena, cognitive discourse analysis provides a useful way to access different layers of cognition, provided that one has the requisite understanding of relevant linguistic characteristics. By closely examining language, it will be possible to shed light on certain aspects of human mind and the way it deals with language and cognition (Tenbrink, 2011).

CODA typically uses language as data that roughly accurately represents ideas and concepts. Examples include when someone thinks out loud while solving a problem, explains a difficult process to a friend, or recounts a complex scene or occurrence. Depending on the unique characteristics of each circumstance, cognitive problems present in all of these situations will gradually manifest themselves in language (Tenbrink, 2020). Speaking is fundamentally founded on thinking. There would be no language without ideas and concepts. Meaning cannot be created without cognition, although sounds and noises can. Moreover, language appears to be the most direct means of mental expression for humans; hence, it is nearly inevitable that we will respond to the inquiry "What are you thinking?" in terms of language rather than by any other means. For Evans (2009a), A growing knowledge regarding how language interacts with cognition is being gathered by linguistic research in a variety of subfields. Many cognitive theories discuss the connection between language and the mind (cognition). The way we speak and the way we think are related. This is accurate in terms of what language permits us to do in general (or in terms of using one language against another) as well as in particular terms of what we really do in everyday life. Talmy (2000) demonstrates that although there are certain subtleties in the relationship between language and mind, it is systematic. The speaker's description of a scenario could indicate what they are now focusing on in the circumstance, as opposed to other aspects of the scene that are ignored or placed in the background. "The car next to the tree" denotes a different focus of attention than "The tree next to the car," even though the spatial relationship is the same. Depending on the object of attention, such a thing indicates what the individual is focusing on.

The concepts and coping strategies that speakers use while speaking are revealed in significant ways by their language choices, which also show how applicable they are in a communicative context. The majority of the linguistic choices we make when speaking happen too rapidly to be completely conscious, even though some of these strategies may be intentional. These features make cognitive discourse analysis a valuable tool for accessing different levels of cognition—as long as one has the necessary knowledge of relevant linguistic components. Language is typically employed by CODA as information that roughly reflects ideas and notions. This can be clear when a speaker attempts to describe a certain situation or a scene, there will

be cognitive challenges that have their own effect on the process of describing that situation. In fact, such a process is not a haphazard one, but a very systematic one (Magirovskaya, 2009). CODA uses systematic analysis techniques to determine the conceptual relevance of these decisions. By closely examining language use and the context of production, the researcher can, according to CODA, uncover systematic facets of human mind by using rigorous tools applied through language analysis (Tenbrink, 2020).

There are countless methods to utilize and study language. Included in this are all kinds of varieties of spontaneous natural dialogue. Everything is adjustable, even the number of people having a conversation. Who is talking to whom? Is it women to women, men to men, or a mix of the two? What are their cultural background, age, and social standing? What are they talking about? Are they genuinely speaking, or are they writing, chatting, or posting messages on digital platforms? What is the circumstance, the setting in which they are speaking? What are they observing? What are they contemplating? What is pertinent to the speaker at this time? How are morphological processes are dealt with, so forth. All of these elements will have an impact on how people use language, communicate verbally or in writing, and select words. This has led to a variety of findings using methods from sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, pragmatics, and other disciplines. Such research frequently combines a specific analysis approach with the goal of learning how people use language in particular contexts or settings. For example, what are the verbal features of a particular text type? Do men and women speak in different ways? How do people sway others using language? How do they demonstrate their strength and supremacy, or alternatively, their subservience or lack of strength? (Besedina, 2015). According to Anderson (2009), numerous methods for learning about the human mind, which normally don't require linguistic expertise, revolve around language. To access memory, mental representation, or other cognitive phenomena, language is used in laboratory settings, for instance. That is done by limiting participants' replies to a group of well-defined choices or by taking out decontextualized textual elements that may be processed statistically.

According to Edwards and Potter (1992), these strategies abstract from the details of linguistic structure by avoiding dealing with the complexity of natural discourse and its social implications. This is why it's common to think that analysis in this discipline may be done without a foundation in language theory. But the abundance of information that can be obtained by using language as an external representation of things that would otherwise remain out of reach within the human mind is demonstrated by the widespread use of such approaches. Biber, Conrad, and Reppen (1998) argue that by relying on enormous and diverse data sets, it is possible to largely ignore situational effects. Using corpus linguistics techniques, this is done. Quantitative and inferential statistical approaches are frequently employed in this form of study, just like in controlled experimental studies. Finding out how people communicate generally and what is typical for them in a variety of contexts is made much easier by corpus linguistic tools. Depending on the method used to gather a corpus, this can be confined to particular dialects or socioeconomic areas. It can be highly beneficial to comprehend these findings when evaluating data collected in a certain setting. By understanding people's speech patterns, we can better appreciate the significance of the linguistic choices individuals make while expressing themselves in a particular setting. Additionally, as the information acquired may be considered a (small) corpus, corpus linguistic approaches can be useful in the study of a data set for CODA. Since CODA studies focus on how humans use language, they are most closely related to psycholinguistic studies of language production. This type of research, like CODA, is predicated on the idea that certain characteristics of language creation systematically mirror cognitive traits. The objectives and goals of the analysis are, nevertheless, rather dissimilar. Although CODA looks at the significance of a speaker's linguistic choices, the main goal of psycholinguistic research is to comprehend how the brain processes words and sentences. Because of this, they often use a slightly more limited approach to data collection than is typical of CODA studies. Nevertheless, there are a lot of connections. Numerous outcomes of psycholinguistic research include. These may immediately inform CODA studies, including methodological elements, which are directly applicable to CODA research. Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) study the way speakers cooperate in a speech to settle on a topic to be discussed. They discovered that references to things have a consistent pattern of change over time, getting shorter and shorter. In one case, the referential communication task was the task design used. Referential communication activities bear many similarities to in-person talks, and most studies agree that they provide a reasonably authentic dialog environment (Clark, 1996). Activities involving referential communication are often excellent candidates

for CODA situations. Actually, certain studies carried out in the psycholinguistic tradition are somewhat comparable to CODA in that they emphasize spontaneous linguistic judgments made by speakers rather than the brain's processing of language (Coventry, 2008). In general, it is difficult to draw a distinct line between psycholinguistic approaches and CODA. Where the approaches diverge, it's mainly a matter of emphasis: psycholinguistics is usually more interested in retrieving linguistic items from the mind (how long does it take?), whereas CODA concentrates on the actual linguistic choices (what words and constructions do speakers choose?) Which ideas are easier to come by?).

Cognitive science, and using CODA, may appropriately study complex thought processes as long as they are not random but rather represent generalizable processes that somehow connect to previous studies. For language data analysis to be successful, the task at hand needs to be controllable, bounded, specific, measurable, and verbalisable; the more precisely the task can be stated along these lines, the more applicable inferences may be derived from the resulting patterns in the language data. The process that is occurring in the mind is intricate, but it is also well-organized ( Boldyrev, 2011).

On one hand, the word "ideology" is used to describe how people act in contrast to their interests. It is used to influence people to act in a certain way such when the poor do their best for the wealthy. This inherent disparity between the rich and the poor cannot be altered (Thomas, Shan, Ishtla, Jean, Joanna, & Jason, 2004). Ideology, on the other hand, is a social construct rather than a system of ideas. Semiotics, which encompasses signs like messages, photos, films, and other visual representations, also contains ideology in addition to discourse and interaction. Ideology can be thought of as a boundary between discursive action and cognition (Van Dijk, 1995). Power, according to Wrong (1979), is the capacity to affect people. The fundamental difference between it and authority is that the former relies on persuasion, whereas the latter relies on social forces (Hoffman, 2007). Dahl (1957) describes power as a person's position of dominance over others, which may include persuading people to act in ways that are not in their best interests. Language cannot be viewed as an end in and of itself; rather, it aids in shifting power and conformity to either virtue or responsibility (Thomas, 2004). In fact, language is powerful because of people who use it. Language and power manifest this obvious relationship between them in many different ways that speakers use in talk shows to affect the way people think about something (Weiss & Wodak, 2003).

### *Insinuation*

Insinuation is a linguistic concept used in communication when a "speaker intends to make an addressee believe p, but does not want to be held accountable for communicating p" The ability of the mind to simultaneously activate and operate many parallel mental regions connected to various intentions is a requirement for the complex process of insinuation (Bertuccelli Papi, 2014). The concept "insinuation" is derived from the Latin word "insinuate" which means "to penetrate," "to drill," "to infiltrate," and "to get inside." Developing a covert strategy to accomplish concealed goals entails presenting what is untrue as true in metaphor. The phrase is assumed to signify "shrewdness, keenness, and getting to the heart of things." Additionally, it is connected to inciting uneasy feelings and suspicions in others. Additionally, "insinuate" can mean "to win someone over" or "to weasel one's way into," as it does in modern Italian (Kremplewska, 2019). One of the main points of contention in cognitive studies is the issue of the said/unsaid distinction. Finding implicitly communicated meanings entails cognitive processes that can easily become confused if the appropriate mental setting is not chosen. Languages allow speakers to construct complex verbal communication mechanisms that influence thoughts in order to confuse listeners who are trying to understand the multitude of possible hidden meanings between what speakers say and what they express (Lepore & Stone, 2015).

### *Talk Shows*

Munson (1993) asserts that the word "talk show" merges two distinct, frequently at odds rhetorical paradigms by equating interpersonal discourse, which derives from the pre-modern oral tradition, with the mass-mediated spectacle, which emerged in modernity. A "conversationalization" of public discourse has taken place as a result, leading to the development of a public-colloquial language, which is demonstrated in many methods after the conventions of conversational speech (Leech, 1966). Burke (1993) claims that

talk shows are historically modern Anglo-Saxon institutions that are comparable to some pre-modern sociocultural practices of intentional discourse. The academy was an intellectual discussion group that existed in 16th-century Italy. It had a fixed membership and defined schedule of meetings. The salon, the French equivalent, originated in the seventeenth century. It was a semi-formal social event for a mixed group of ladies and men of letters, usually held once a week and hosted by a hostess. Similar social organizations such as the assembly, club, and more informal coffeehouse were highly successful in eighteenth-century England. Ilie (2006) points out that the audience participation talk show, sometimes referred to as a "studio debate program" or "audience discussion program," made its television debut in 1967 thanks to Phil Donahue. His program was the first to debut what is now known as a daytime talk show or tabloid talk show. This format was created by Oprah Winfrey in 1984 as a modern take on late 19th-century women's service periodicals, primarily geared toward housewives and frequently addressing topics that affect women. American talk programs like Oprah Winfrey, Ricki Lake, and Montel Williams have steadily spread to the United Kingdom, a number of European nations, and the majority of South American nations. In Europe, talk shows replaced discussion programs in the 1980s as a consequence of a growing reorganization of the media. For Ilie (2006), it is extremely difficult to define talk shows for three basic reasons: They exhibit intertextuality by overlapping with other mediatized forms of conversation, representing quickly evolving hybrid media phenomena, and endlessly reconstructing themselves by breaking and transgressing their own discursive norms.

## Methodology

The study is conducted according to a qualitative method using an eclectic model. The model of the study depends on Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor (1980), and Sharfian's Cultural Cognition (2011). The data is collected from a well-known American talk show called the View. One episode is gathered from the talk show by focusing on the political aspect and analysed to an eclectic model. Conceptual Metaphor (CMT) by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is a crucial resource for comprehending how language users control their conversations. The long-standing theory sees metaphor as a conceptual tool for organizing, reshaping, and even creating reality. It is founded on decades of research. The process of understanding an abstract notion in terms of a tangible one is known as conceptual metaphor.

Metaphors are prevalent in both the most neutral or informal forms of language as well as in other genres that seek to create an artistic effect (such as literature), according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Linguistic metaphors were collected by CMT researchers from a variety of sources, including talks, TV and radio broadcasts, dictionaries, newspapers, magazines, and talk shows, especially in the early phases of their work on conceptual metaphors. A logical set of similarities between two distinct domains of experience is known as a conceptual metaphor. "Understanding one domain in terms of another" means something like this. An alternative term for "correspondence" that is commonly used in the literature is "mapping".

Metaphors are prevalent in both the most neutral or informal forms of language as well as in other genres that seek to create an artistic effect (such as literature), according to Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Linguistic metaphors were collected by CMT researchers from a variety of sources, including talks, TV and radio broadcasts, dictionaries, newspapers, magazines, and talk shows, especially in the early phases of their work on conceptual metaphors. A logical set of similarities between two distinct domains of experience is known as a conceptual metaphor. "Understanding one domain in terms of another" means something like this. An alternative term for "correspondence" that is commonly used in the literature is "mapping". Sharfian's Cultural Cognition (2011) states that Allan (2013) makes an effort to explain a crucial concept known as "common ground," which is seen as the foundation of insinuation. "Our understanding of linguistic utterances rests on an assumption of common ground," the author claims. The thread that unites the speaker and the hearer and allows for proper insinuation interpretation is called common ground.

## Data Analysis

*"Hillary & Chelsea Clinton on Trump Impeachment, Presidency" 2019, OCT, 02*

According to the cognitive metaphor, the speaker uses many strategies to attract the attention of society and the audience to the situation of electoral campaign towards the American presidency as well as presidents' interrogation in general. One of these strategies is the use of the source and target strategy. The speaker uses the phrase "We are back" in order to attract the attention of the audience to the fact that they have previously addressed this topic of presidency, and now, because it is a very important and vital topic, they are focusing on it again, and this greatly affects the attention of the listener, as the speaker is indirectly insinuating to the importance of the topic of presidential interrogations. The fact of interrogating presidents and interviewing some of them such as Hillary Clinton, reinforces the idea of the American justice, which has a great impact in creating beneficial insinuation that helps creating meaningful signs of America in general.

The speaker sometimes resorts to using some names that have a significant role in American life, and one of these names is the use of Hillary Clinton. The use of such a name is considered as a structural metaphor to make something clear as when the interviewer says "hey we're back with the authors of the new book gutsy women Hillary and Chelsea Clinton this is the book Pelosi is ...". By using a specific name, he wants to make the presentation the impeachment topic based on objective foundations that greatly influences the public's opinion. Therefore, the mere use of a name is a hint at the veracity of the news reported in American talk shows.

Also, one of the strategies that the speaker uses is the use of orientational metaphor to show the importance of reasons through the use of comparative degrees such as "*you support it what's the biggest reason ...*". This is done intentionally, as the speaker alludes, by means of insinuation, to the importance of this vocabulary and the extent of its impact on American life. The use of vocabulary must be based on a prior decision of choosing the correct meaning in order to make his insinuation clear to the public. This helps convince listeners be acquainted with the process of impeachment.

In addition, the speaker reinforces his position by using the strategy of structural metaphor again for the purpose of emphasis by saying "*it became absolutely unavoidable when the summary of the phone call came out plus the whistleblower complaint and the reason for that is, you know, people can argue back and forth about what he might have done ...*". This insinuates that 'phone calls' and 'complaints' imply some aspects of disagreement among some prominent American figures.

The speaker uses the strategy of source and target for the second time to connect two important events of the American issues and their consequences that led to some kind of disagreement among political figures. The interviewer attempts to explicate things to the American society and showing that the previous problematic issues can have bad reflections on the American life. This is a negative insinuation that sheds light on the American problems and showing them to the public by saying "*a range of other issues but this was in the pursuit of his official duties as ...*".

In addition, the speaker uses the source and target strategy again by focusing on the US Department of Defense. The speaker attempts to show that the situation of Department of Defense was calm previously, but it was motivated badly because of the political tension among some well-known figures. This insinuates that the American president failed to calm down situation in America and that led to some kind of difficult matters "*and the Defense Department was in favor of it state was in favor everybody was in favor of it and then the day after ...*". The speaker also uses the traditional metaphor, to explain the indirect simile through the use of specific vocabulary, including the role of the Ukrainians and their indirect relationship with the Americans "*he did holds up that aid calls the president of Ukraine ...*". Such words indirectly insinuates the American administration's accuracy and knowledge in dealing with events in Ukraine, as all matters are planned very precisely to avoid any failure in the future, and this indicates the existence of a strong policy running the country. Such a thing is a positive insinuation that draws optimistic signs of America in general.

In addition, the structural metaphor is a frequently used strategy by using some security officials as vocabulary within the dialogue, which would add some objective touches with a political aspect and hint that there is a harmony among the parties of American politics through indirect expressions used by the speaker. Those official figures are concerned with the election campaign towards presidency and the

impeachment between Clinton and Trump. Though some disagreements can be found between political figures, it is still that all officials care for the security of the country in general “*there's enough concern by former security officials...*”.

The use of some numbers in American dialogues gives a positive sign of the objectivity of the episode. Here, the speaker also repeatedly uses the structural metaphor through which he explains the use of some vocabulary, including numbers, in tweets on Twitter that attack some aspects of politics. This use of numbers indirectly insinuates to people's dissatisfaction with American policy “*by this morning it had over 260,000 likes it had over 38,000 retweets now we know Trump can be really roulette went relentless with his Twitter attacks*”.

Also, the orientational metaphor refers to the use of some geographical levels in order to convey a specific idea to the mind of the hearer, and this would indirectly insinuate to Trump's role in isolating his country from others in a regular way through which he ensures the protection and security of his country. It is a successful way to control and develop the country's economy and seek to establish other economic relations with neighboring countries by defining borders and protecting it from immigrants “*President Trump wanted to dig a ditch at the border and put alligators and the dead snakes and snakes and shoo shoo-shoo migrants ...*”.

According to the cognitive schema, the speaker uses a number of cognitive strategies, and one of these strategies is the use of fact and concept, through which the speaker explains a specific fact by using certain words that ensures the credibility of his speech to affect the opinion and attention of the hearers. Such words greatly affect the mind of the listener which insinuate to the possibility of interrogating some American officials “*this is the book Pelosi is called for an impeachment inquiry ...*”.

One of the strategies used is the strategic schema, through which American officials are interrogated for assuring the authenticity of the impeachment. This indirectly indicates the extent of the objectivity of the American policy in obtaining information from all individuals, whether they are in a position of authority or from the general public, and this enhances the people's confidence in the administration. These words may not have a significant impact on the public, but they indirectly insinuate the extent of the legality of American policy “*called for an impeachment inquiry you support...*”.

There is also the use of a strategy of emotion, where the speaker uses some vocabulary that indicates or expresses private feelings in order to attract the attention of society and arouse the desire to listen more about this topic. Among these expressions is the use of comparison, which directly indicates the existence of a difference between certain classes. Such a use insinuates that there are many reasons for impeachment, but some of them more important than others. This helps attract listeners' attention on one side, and proves the justice of the American interrogation “*what's the biggest reason you think now's the time to do it and that it's the right thing to do*”. The speaker may use more than one strategy at the same time, as sometimes he combines the person's strategy with the method's strategy in order to affect listeners' mind so they can be convinced easily by what they were saying. This is clear when saying “*it's the right thing to do now I think it became absolutely unavoidable when the summary of the phone call came out...*” to show that right things are unavoidable to be done to ensure security of the country.

In addition, the speaker uses some a mental strategy by presenting specific linguistic structures “*what we think he did on a range of other issues but this was in the pursuit of his official duties ...*” to affect the mind of the hearers, as he clarifies things in a rational and clear way to convey a specific idea to have a clear-cut solution for the case of impeachment. The speaker also uses the strategy of fact and concept to focus on scientific facts that occur during dialogue between people, and among these facts is mentioning names of countries or cities. This is clear when the speakers uses the name of ‘Ukraine’ where war is taking place with Russia, which is an indirect reference to the United States role in helping Ukraine against the Russian invasion “*president of the United States and that phone call very clearly indicates an effort to not only pressure but in effect extort the president of Ukraine over much necessary medical military*”.

In fact, there are many strategies that can be found throughout an American talk show, and one of these strategies is the person strategy, through which the speaker mentions the names of some people such as “Arneson”. It is considered as an evidence of the veracity of his words in order to add some objectivity

during speech, which has a major role in directly hinting at the accuracy of the information in order to have some influence on the listener's decision. The speaker also adds a number of other strategies and emphasizes the use of the strategy of fact and concept, which is considered as one of the most repeated strategies during speech and it has a major role in making speech objective and reasonable especially when the speaker mentions names such as "the Congress" or other official figures.. The use of this strategy in particular is considered an important matter. It is intended in order to make the words believable, as well as to convey the idea clearly. The speaker also uses strategy of procedure, through which he explains the occurrence of events in a sequential manner, which directly insinuates that there is a policy behind these events that has a role in direct planning for them "*by the Congress and was about Arneson by partisan it was about to be delivered and the Defense Department was in favor of it state was in favor everybody was*".

One of the strategies used is the strategy of emotion, through which it is clear that some countries express their rejection or assistance for some of the behaviors used, including helping some people who ask for help, and this indicates the use of another strategy directly, which is the mental strategy. It shows the speaker's opinion about the direction of something certain, as he explains through these strategies the extent of his desire to help these needy people, some may consider it an indirect request in order to exert efforts in helping people "*through the American consciousness about everything that's been going on for ...*". The speaker also uses the strategy of fact and concept, in which he relies heavily on the American Congress in order to clarify his idea of food aid with regard to Ukrainian affairs "*that point for the Congress led by speaker Pelosi to say okay another really bad thing we're just going to ...*". The speaker also returns to using another strategy, the strategy of emotions, which clarifies the extent of concern posed by the need of some countries, including Ukraine, especially at the time of questioning of US President Donald Trump.

Additionally, the strategy of fact and concept is recurrent here combined with the strategy of context to indicate the objectivity of the speech. They show the combustion of social media news, especially on Twitter "*by this morning, it had over 260,000 likes it had over 38,000 retweets ...*", about president Trump, who was exposed to an accusation "*now we know Trump can be really roulette went relentless with his Twitter attacks*". Among the interrogations, the role strategy is used too to explicate the role of some groups during the American talk shows, including the American President, who is subjected to interrogation, as well as the role of viewers and users of social media talk shows in greatly influencing the events taking place in the United States. In addition to that, the speaker uses the mental strategy in terms of the use of some linguistic vocabulary through which he indicates the extent of his understanding of events through his confirmation and direct knowledge of the development of things there. Frankly, political news in American talk shows is very abundant in strategies, as there are many and many strategies used, including the memory strategy, where some mathematical issues are used, including the use of numbers, which are of utmost importance in emphasizing objectivity of the news. In addition, the user returns once again to using the strategy of emotion, as well as facts, and all of this is through some revolving linguistic vocabulary that indirectly insinuates to the credibility of their words "*were you at all concerned about sort of poking that bear no I do believe that he's the greatest scam in American political history really yes*".

During dialogue on American talk shows, one notices the speaker's emphasis on using the mental strategy in order to clarify that these events represent his opinion, and represent the opinion and the private sector, and do not represent the president of American policy. This has a major role in conveying the news with high accuracy and objectivity in order to absolve them of responsibility for any bad behavior or unjustified insinuations "*I think tag line from Adams who are at the Atlantic that cruelty is the point I think that article came out a year ago this week but the depths of the cruelty and the inhumanity towards migrants*".

## Conclusion

It is concluded that insinuation is made by using many strategies, all of which aim to convey the idea indirectly to the recipient, and this emphasizes the importance of mental communication between the speaker and society for the purpose of conveying the message correctly. Through the study, the use of strategies and the repetition of some of them emphasize the extent of its importance for the speaker to rely on for the purpose of conveying a specific idea that target viewers' cognition. This indicates that the



insinuation is made indirectly by the speaker in order to avoid any social or political embarrassment during speech. This reinforces the idea of cognitive study, which aims to focus on and identify the private thoughts of the speaker and the recipient in order to know how to make indirect insinuations that are either positive or negative alike.

## References

- Allan, K. (2013). What is common ground? in alessandro Capone, Franco lo Piparo and Marco Carapezza (eds), *Perspectives on Pragmatics and Philosophy*. Milan: springer Verlag.
- Anderson, J. R. (2009). *Cognitive Psychology and Its Implications*. (7th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.
- Bertuccelli, M. (2014). The Pragmatics of Insinuation. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2014; 11(1): 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2014-0001>.
- Besedina, N. A. (2015). Morphology: From Morpheme To Morphological Concept. *Research Result. Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 1. Retrieved from <http://rrlinguistics.ru/media/linguistics/2015/1/selection.pdf>
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Boldyrev, N. N. (2011). The Role of an Interpretative Function in Linguistic Category Formation. *Tambov University Review. Humanities*, 1(93), 9–16.
- Boldyrev, N., Dubrovskaya, O., & Tolmacheva, I. (2017). Meaning in the Mind within the Sociocultural Commitment of Cognitive Linguistics. *Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 23(2), 206–225.
- Burke P (1993). *The art of conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Clark, H. H. & Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1986). Referring as a Collaborative Process. *Cognition* 22, 1–39
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dabrowska, E. (2016) Cognitive Linguistics' Seven Deadly Sins. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 27(4), 479–491.
- Dahl, R. (1957). The Concept of Power. *Behavioural science*. 2.3: 201–2014.
- Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage
- Ericsson, K. A. & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press.
- Evans, V. (2009a). *How Words Mean: Lexical Concepts, Cognitive Models and Meaning Construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffman, J. (2007). *A Glossary of political theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ilie C (2006), Talk Shows. In: Keith Brown, (Editor-in-Chief) *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, Second Edition, volume 12, pp. 489–494. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Kremplewska, K. (2019). *Life as Insinuation*. University of New York. University of New York Press, Albany
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lepore, Ernie and Matthew Stone (2015): *Imagination and Convention: Distinguishing Grammar and Inference in Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Levinson, S. (2006). Cognition at the Heart Of Human Interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 85–93.
- Magirovskaya, O. V. (2009). Conceptual Configuration Theory: conception and method. *Tambov University Review. Humanities*, 2(70), 9–13.
- Munson, W. (1993). *All Talk: The Talkshow in Media Culture*. Temple University Press.
- Sharifan, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language: Teoretical Framework and Applications*. amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tenbrink, T. & Seifert, I. (2011). Conceptual Layers And Strategies In Tour Planning. *Cognitive Processing* 12(1), 109–25.
- Tenbrink, T. (2020). *Cognitive Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. University Printing House.
- Thomas, L., Shan, W., Ishtla, S., Jean, S.P., Joanna, T. and Jason, J. (2004). *Language, Society, and Power: An introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. (2015). *Critical Discourse Studies: A sociocognitive approach*. Web. 8 Nov. 2016.
- Wrong, D. H. (1979). *Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses*. Oxford: Blackwell.