

The Use of Hedges for Observing Cooperative Principles in Joe Biden versus Donald Trump Debate in the 2020 American Presidential Election

Nur Farida Khotam

English Education Department, Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Nur Farida Khotam

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20221264>

ABSTRACT

This study discussed the use of Hedges to observe cooperative principle rule, especially in debate. As is known that in a debate, usually a moderator gives questions to the debaters and the debaters try to answer the question. And when they are not sure about their answer, hedges are used which function to make things fuzzier as defined by Lakoff (1975). This study's aims are to analyze the use of hedges for observing the cooperative principles rule and to analyze the interlocuter's responses in the 2020 American presidential election debate between Joe Biden versus Donald Trump. The researcher adopted the theory about understanding hedges from Lakoff, (1973), the hedges' function from Fraser (2010), and the cooperative principle theory from Grice maxim (1983). This research is qualitative research and to analyze the data the researcher uses discourse analysis. The sources of the data were the transcripts and the videos of Joe Biden and Donald Trump's presidential debate. From the results of the study, the researcher found that the 2020 American presidential candidate, Joe Biden, broke the maxim quality 4 times and obeyed the maxim quality once, for the maxim quantity Biden neither broke nor obeyed the maxim quantity. while for maxim relation, Biden broke 5 times and obeyed once, and for maxim manner, Biden broke once and 0 obeyed with maxim manner. While the 2020 American presidential candidate, Donald Trump broke the maxim quality 4 times and obeyed the maxim quality once, for the maxim quantity Trump neither broke nor obeyed the maxim quantity. while for maxim relation, Trump broke 5 times

and obeyed once, and for maxim manner, Trump broke once and 0 obeyed with maxim manner.

Keywords: *Hedges, Cooperative Principle, Joe Biden, and Donald Trump debate*

INTRODUCTION

Lakoff (1973) defines Hedges are words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy. The use of hedges in political discourse is relatively underexplored, even though hedges are frequently used as mitigating devices in such discursive contexts. Moreover, most of the research on hedges focuses on written text (e.g., Chen and Zhang, 2017, Itakura, 2013, Yang, 2019) rather than oral texts (e.g., Ahmed & Maros, 2017). This study focuses on The 2020 US Presidential debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump to fill these gaps.

The concept of the Cooperative Principle was introduced by philosopher H Paul Grice in his article "Logic and Conversation" at Harvard University. He proposes that participants in a conversation obey a general Cooperative Principle (CP), which is expected to be in force whenever a conversation unfolds: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Grice thinks there is a sense of privacy between speaker and hearer that the two parties

should obey in all language communications. To guarantee the dialogue can be carried out smoothly and ensure that the task can be completed effectively, both sides of the speakers ought to observe this principle. Grice views pragmatic interpretation as heavily relying on inferential processes; the hearer can hypothesize about the speaker's meaning, based on the importance of the sentence uttered, background or contextual assumptions, and, last but not least, on the general communicative principles which speakers are expected to observe.

In addition, the Cooperative Principle includes four maxims: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner (Liu Runqing 2014, p.154). It is straightforward to meet misunderstandings if you violate one of these maxims. So it is crucial to observe the Cooperative Principle to achieve interaction and communication between Joe Biden and Donald Trump in the 2020 US Presidential election debate.

In the debate, the candidate must answer some questions from the moderator and the other candidates. They should answer the questions and respond to the other candidate's statements. Their answer should be relevant, based on the specific data, etc. In short, the way they answer the question and respond to the other candidate's statement must follow the Cooperative Principle that consists of four maxims as stated by Grice. Therefore, this study aims to explain the use of hedges for Observing the Cooperative Principle in the 2020 American Presidential election debate. Unfortunately, most researchers focus on politeness strategies such as (Maharani, 2018, Makejeve, 2017, Zakia, 2018 and Boncea, 2013) rather than hedges in Cooperative Principle. Therefore I am eager to do research on the Use of Hedges for Observing The Cooperative Principle in the Joe Biden versus Donald Trump Debate in The 2020 American Presidential Election

METHODS

Discourse analysis was used in analyzing this study. Because Discourse analysis examines language in use, rather than the psychological phenomena, such as attitudes, memory, or emotions, which are traditionally presumed to underlie talk and be revealed through it. (Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001ab). While according to Potter & Wetherell in 1987 stated that Discourse analysis, therefore, examines how certain issues are constructed in people's accounts and the variability in these accounts, and explores the rhetorical aspects and the functions of talk in the context of ongoing interaction.

This study focused on the use of hedges for observing the Cooperative Principle in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump American Presidential debate in 2020. It was observed (Quality Maxim, Quantity Maxim, Relation Maxim, and Manner Maxim) using an observation sheet.

The methods of collecting data in this research were documents and records. The instrument was an observation sheet. It was used to analyze the American Presidential debate in 2020 between Joe Biden and Donald Trump.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher got the findings from the transcribe of the American debate 2020 between Joe Biden and Donald Trump. The researcher analyzed the use of hedges for observing the Grice cooperative principle based on the 5 research questions. they are: How is the use of hedges for observing quality maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020, How is the use of hedges for observing quantity maxim in Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020, How is the use of hedges for observing relation maxim in Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020, How is the use of hedges for observing manner maxim in Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020, and How is the interlocutor's response in using hedges in the 2020 American Presidential Election.

In a debate, there are two ways of communication, they are the moderator asks questions, and the debater tries to answer the moderator's questions or respond to the opponent's opinion as best as possible. In giving an answer, a debater is sometimes unsure of the answer, so he answers using hedges. As defined by Lakoff (1973), Hedges are words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy. It means that when the speaker does not sure about his statement, he may use hedges.

Related to the cooperative principles, there are four maxims of cooperative principles proposed by Grice (in Leech, 1983: 8). They are quality maxim, quantity maxim, relation maxim, and manner maxim.

1. The use of hedges for observing quality maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020.

The quality maxim is the speaker and hearers should deliver what they believe to be the truth (Cutting, 2002: 35).

Table 1. The Form of Data Sheet for the use of hedges for observing quality maxim in Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in 2020.

No	Debater	Quality Maxim		Hedges				Occurrence
		Obey	Break	Approximators		Shields		
				Adaptors	Rounders	Plausibility	Attribution	
1.	Joe Biden	4	1					5
2.	Donald Trump	4	7					11

Table 1 shows that Joe Biden break the quality maxim four times and obey the break quality maxim once. While Donald Trump obeys the quality maxim 4 times and breaks the quality maxim 7 times.

From the data analysis of the use of hedges for observing the quality maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020, the researcher found that Donald Trump break more in the maxim of quality than Joe Biden did.

2. The use of hedges for observing the quantity maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020.

The Quantity maxim requires a speaker to deliver information in the right amount. What is meant by the correct amount is not less or more than which is needed in conversation (Cutting, 2002: 34).

Table 2. The use of hedges for observing the quantity maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in 2020.

No	Debater	Quantity Maxim		Hedges				Occurrence
		Obey	Break	Approximators		Shields		
				Adaptors	Rounders	Plausibility	Attribution	
1.	Joe Biden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	Donald Trump	0	1	0	0	1	0	1

Table 2 shows that Donald Trump breaks the quantity maxim once and he does not obey any quantity maxim. While Joe Biden neither obeys the quantity maxim nor breaks the quantity maxim.

3. The use of hedges for observing relation maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald trump debate in 2020.

The relation maxim's rule emphasizes the need to be relevant in conducting a conversation. Therefore, what is delivered in conversation should be related to that topic (Cutting, 2002: 35).

Table 3. The use of hedges for observing quantity maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in 2020.

No	Debater	Relation Maxim		Hedges				Occurrence
		Obey	Break	Approximators		Shields		
				Adaptors	Rounders	Plausibility	Attribution	
1.	Joe Biden	1	5					6
2.	Donald Trump	0	26					26

Table 3 shows that Joe Biden breaks the relation maxim five times and obeys the break relation maxim once. While for Donald Trump does not obey any relation maxim and breaks the relation maxim 26 times.

4. The use of hedges for observing manner maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in 2020.

Table 4. The use of hedges for observing manner maxim in the Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in 2020.

No	Debater	Manner Maxim		Hedges				Occurrence
		Obey	Break	Approximators		Shields		
				Adaptors	Rounders	Plausibility	Attribution	
1.	Joe Biden	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
2.	Donald Trump	0	5	0	1	4	0	5

Table 4 shows that Joe Biden breaks the manner maxim once and obeys the 0 relation maxim. While for Donald Trump does not obey any manner maxim and breaks the relation maxim 5 times.

5. The interlocutor's response to using hedges in the 2020 American Presidential Election

Table 5. The interlocutor's response to using hedges in the 2020 American Presidential Election

No	The debater	Positive	Negative
1.	Joe Biden	V	
2.	Donald Trump		V

Table 5 shows that Joe Biden when he is using hedges tends to give a positive response while Donald Trump when he is using hedges tends to give a negative response.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Adebola, O. A. (2018). Cooperative Principle Maxims In Whatsapp Conversations Among Undergraduates In The Federal University Of Technology Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(10) 542-557. DoI:10.14738/assrj.510.5309.

According to Grice (in Yule, 1996: 37), the speaker must be perspicuous. It means that messages expressed during conversation should not be vague. The speaker has to deliver messages right to the point. Using a brief and precise expression can be the proper method to convey the speaker's utterances.

2. Ahmed, A.H & Majeed, M.R.(2019) A Pragmatic Investigation of Hedging in Selected English and Kurdish Parliament Debates. *Journal of the University of Garmian*.
<https://doi.org/10.24271/garmian.196222>

3. Amrolla, T. Bh & Hooshang, K. (2016). Improving Linguistic and Pragmatic Knowledge of Hedging Strategies in EFL Undergraduate Students: A Dynamic Assessment Approach. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(2), 13-12. Retrieved From <http://www.eltsjournal.org>

4. Anas, A, Faridi, A, & Fitriat, S.Wi.(2020). Expression of Attitude by both Governor Candidates of Election Debate in Pennsylvania 2018. *English Education Journal*. EEJ 10 (2) (2020) 174 – 181. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>

5. Asfina, R., Kadarisman, A.E., & Astuti, U. (2018). Hedges used by Indonesian ELT students in written and spoken discourses. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7, 650-658.

6. Barotto, A.(2017).The hedging function of exemplification: Evidence from Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*(2017). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.09.007>

7. Cutting, Joan(2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge, 2002.<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/keris/Doc?id=10016807&page=3>

8. Eklund, M.(2017). A Study of Linguistic Features Among American Voters During the 2016 Presidential Election.
9. Fraser, B. (2009) Pragmatic Competence: The Case of Hedging Boston University May 2009 bfraser@bu.edu
10. Grundy, Peter. 2008. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder education
11. Gusthini, M, Sobarna, C, & Amalia,R.M . (2018). A Pragmatic Study of Speech as an Instrument of Power: Analysis of the 2016 USA Presidential Debate.
12. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(1), 97-113, 2018
13. Hamdanur,R, Pulungan, A.H & Zainuddiin. Modality as Hedging Device in the US Presidential Election Debate. *Proceedings of The 3rd Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL)* eISSN: 2548-4613 232
14. Hani" ah, I. (2019). The use of hedging in students' research proposals at the English teacher education department UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.Thesis: UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
15. Hassan, A.S. (2020). A Pragmatic Study of Hedges In American Political Editorials. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities* <http://www.ijrssh.com> (IJRSSH) 2020, Vol. No. 10, Issue No. III, Jul-Sep e-ISSN: 2249-4642, p-ISSN: 2454-4671 60. DOI: 10.37648/Irish.v10i03.007
16. Hidayati, F & Dallyono, R. (2015). The use of hedges and boosters as a rhetorical Device in the construction of speeches. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 33(1), 53-71.
17. Hussein, N.J.(2018). A Study on Pragmatic Functions of Hedging Devices in D. H. Lawrence"s "The Blind Man". *Journal of Basra Research for Human Science*, No:4, Vol:43.Shatt Al-Arab University College
18. Hinton, M & Budzynska-Daca, A. (2019).A Comparative Study of Political Communication in Televised Pre-Election Debates in Polan and The United States of America.*Research in Language*, 2019, vol. 17:1 DOI: 10.2478/rela-2019-0002
19. Kaewrungruang, K & Yaoharee, O. (2018). The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Discourse: A Case Study of the Final 2016 United States Presidential Election Debate *rEFlections*. Vol 25, No.1, January – June 2018
20. Karlsson, S. (2017). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Race Segment of Clinton's and Trumps' first Presidential Debate. Independent degree project □ first cycle.Mid Sweden University.
21. Kartikasari, I. (2019)Comparison of Hedging Devices in Published Research Articles by Indonesian and English Native Writers: A Corpus. Based Study. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*. Volume 7, Number 2, June 2019, pp. 38–45. Available online at <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jph>. ISSN: 2338-8110 (print)/2442-3890 (electro)
22. Khalil, H.H.(2019). The Pragmatic Functions of Vague Expressions in Hillary Clinton's Debating Discourse on Iraq. 18th International Conference on Social Sciences Lisbon, 17-18 May 2019. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333234070>
23. Kholisoh and Setiawan (2018). Multifunction of Hedges Used by English Department Students: Gender Role Perspective, 2nd Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education Conference. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 222
24. Kusumaningroem, I, Rukmini, D, & Yuliasri, I.(2015). Hedges used in the United States Presidential Speeches. *English Education Journal*. EEJ 5 (1) (2015). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>
25. Lakoff, G. (1972). *Hedges: A study of meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts*. Chicago Linguistic Society Papers, 8, 183-228.
26. Laurinaityte, R. (2011). *Hedges in political discourse*. MA Paper: Vilnius Pedagogical University
27. Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles Of Pragmatics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
28. Leech, Geoffrey. 1993. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
29. Mentari, D. (2018) The Use of Hedges in the First Clinton-Trump Presidential Debate. *English Language & Literature Journal* Vol. VII No.4 / 2018English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University
30. Miššiková, G. (2008) Maxim Hedges in Literary Texts: A Translational Perspective. *Discourse and Discourse and Interaction* 1/1 2008

31. Novi, A, Fitriati, S.W, & Sutopo, D.(2019). The Comparison Between Evaluative Stance of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton Realized in the Campaign Speeches of the United States Presidential Election 2016. *English Education Journal*. EEJ 9 (1) (2019) 25 – 33. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>
32. Nia, M.A. & Jalilifar, A. (2013). We believe the Iranian nation can: The manifestation of power in Iranian televised presidential debates *Language & Communication* 33 (2013) 8–25 Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect *Language & Communication* journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/langcom
33. Rabab“ ah, G & Rumman, R. (2015). Hedging in political discourse: Evidence from the speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 157-185
34. Rahmawati, R.Y . (2016). The Function of Hedging Devices Used in “ Room for Debate” Posted in New York Times Online Website. Seminar Nasional Kajian Bahasa dan Pengajarannya (KBSP) IV 2016
35. .Saedi,A & Jasim,H.T. (2013). "A Study of the Cooperative Principle and Grice’s Maxims in Lois Lowry’s *The Giver* “. Theses. Paper 1288
36. Siregar, A.J & Suastra, I.M. (2020). Women and Men Linguistic Features in the First Presidential Debate Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016. *Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, Vol. 4 No. 1, February 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24843/UJoSSH.2020.v04.i01.p01>
37. Sperber, Dan, and Wilson, Deirdre (2002). ‘Pragmatics, modularity and mindreading’, *Mind and Language* 17: 3–26. Reprinted in Wilson and Sperber 2012b: 261–78.
38. Sperber, Dan, and Wilson, Deirdre (2005). ‘Pragmatics’, in F. Jackson and M. Smith (eds), Oxford
39. Teng, Yongqing. (2015). An Analysis of Pragmatic Functions of Hedging in American Presidential Inaugural Addresses. ISSN 1799-2591. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 8, pp. 1688-1694, August 2015. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.20>
40. Vebriyanto, D.A, Mujiyanto, J, & Fitriati, S.W.(2019). Types and Functions of Hedges and Boosters in Graduate Students’ Research Articles. *English Education Journal*. EEJ 9 (4) (2019) 565 – 574. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>.
41. Wang, Y. (2010). Analyzing Hedges in Verbal Communication: An Adaptation-Based Approach. www.ccsenet.org/elt *English Language Teaching* Vol. 3, No. 3; September 2010
42. Wilamov á, S. (2005). On The Function of Hedging Devices in Negatively Polite Discourse. *BRNO Studies in English*.
43. Wolf, L.(2017). The Use of Rhetorical Devices in Selected Speeches by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump during the Electoral Campaign 2016“.Diploma Thesis, Vienna, 2017
44. Yang, J. (2019). Analysis of Hedges in English Advertising from the Perspective of Cooperative Principle. *Open Access Library Journal*, 6: e5441.<https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1105441>
45. Yayang Gita Permatasari Gunawan, Y.G.P, Fitriati, S.W, & Yuliasri, I. (2019). Students’ Gambits and Debate Structure in National University Debating Championship (NUDC) 2018 of West Java. *English Education Journal* EEJ 9 (1) 2019 1 – 10. <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej>

How to cite this article: Nur Farida Khotam. The use of hedges for observing cooperative principles in Joe Biden versus Donald Trump debate in the 2020 American presidential election. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2022; 9(12): 569-574. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20221264>
