

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides conclusions of the study entitled “The Cooperative Principle in Debate”. Recommendations for further study dealing with the issue will be proposed further.

5.1 Conclusions

From this study, it can be observed that three of four maxims were violated in the three examined talk shows. They were the maxims of quantity, relevance, and manner, which was the most frequent violated maxim. They were violated as the speakers failed to observe the rules of each maxim. They gave redundant, vague, and verbose information about the topic discussed. They also changed the topic of the questions raised and focused more on the previous question rather than to the discussed one.

The speakers were likely to violate the maxims of quantity and manner by giving redundant, vague, and verbose responses to the questions raised as they defended their opinion from others. In other words, they delivered their best thought by providing much more detail—that sometimes turned into verbose and redundant—answers because they made sure everyone that their opinion was the true one.

In addition, the maxim of relevance was violated as the speakers provided irrelevant replies to the questions raised. The irrelevant answers

emerged since the speakers were likely to change the questions discussed. It might be due to the fact that the speakers did not know the exact answers to the questions raised. By doing so, they could hide their weaknesses in delivering their thoughts. Besides, the irrelevant responses also emerged as the speakers chose to discuss previous question instead of the question discussed.

Finally, it can be concluded that the aspiration of the speakers to win the debates they are involved in, tension felt by them in conducting the debates, prior knowledge of the speakers on the topics discussed, and cultural background of the speakers also determine the answers given by them.

A speaker will be liable to talk disorderly, vaguely, and verbosely when he feels nervous in answering the questions raised in debates. He will also defend his opinion to win the debate although, occasionally, his opinion is irrelevant with the topic discussed.

As stated above, prior knowledge on the topic discussed of the speakers also determines the way they answer the questions raised. For instance, when a speaker cannot answer a question, he will be likely to give less informative or irrelevant information. Nevertheless, when a speaker provided a redundant answer, he might master the problem discussed and be willing to give much more information than is required.

Moreover, cultural background plays a role in the way the speakers deliver their opinions. For instance, Indonesians are likely to speak cyclically.

Therefore, in the talk shows, it can be seen that the speakers were more liable to respond vaguely and verbosely to the questions raised.

On the other hand, adequate evidence provided by the speakers in their opinion caused the absence of the violation to the maxim of quality in the three talk shows.

5.2 Recommendations

Several recommendations are proposed for further studies on the same theory applied in this study. Examining the other types of non-observance of the conversational maxims that occur in debates is the first suggestion for further studies. It can be done to differentiate more easily types of non-observance of the maxims (for example violation from infringement).

And the second one is analyzing the observance of the conversational maxims to figure out most observed maxim in debate to yield more comprehensive findings.