

GRICE'S CONVERSATIONAL COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN COMPETITIVE DEBATES

Teguh Adimarta³

Abstract

This study examined the similarity and difference between Grice's conversational principles and debate competition principles in the grand final of an East Java highschool debate competition. Most highschool debaters including the researcher perceived that there would be differences. Using the result of open-response questionnaires distributed to the adjudicator and 6 participants of the grand final of the competition, the researcher then interviewed and discussed the debate transcript and the result of open-response questionnaires with some triangulators from the perspective of Grice's conversational principles and competitive debate principles. The study reported that the maxims that are mostly interpreted differently in this debate are the violation of maxim of quantity and the observation of maxim of quality. This research finding also proved that the maxims that are mostly interpreted similarly in this debate are the violation of maxim of quality and the observation of maxim of quantity.

Key words: *Grice's cooperative principle, competitive debate principles.*

Introduction

There are several competitive debate systems that are used in a debate competition, namely the Asian Parliamentary system, the British Parliamentary system, the Australian Parliamentary system, the Lincoln and Douglas Debate, and many more, but the system that is mostly used in debate competitions in Indonesia is the Asian Parliamentary system (AP), and this is the competitive debate system analyzed in this study. In AP there are two teams of three speakers or debaters where each speaker has his or her own specific role in the competition. These two teams will be debating over an issue or motion and trying to make their arguments sound and better compared to their opponent team.

The participants of a competitive debate vary from beginner debate teams to experienced ones. Most of the time, beginners have difficulties in distinguishing good arguments from bad ones. They mostly think that all debate competitions have the same system. It is this lack of knowledge on argumentation differences of competitive debate systems and rules that might become one of the major causes that leads those beginners into a wrong debate performance or less favorable performance.

³ Teguh Adimarta *adalah* Dosen Bahasa Inggris di STIESIA dan Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya.

Debate performance refers to verbal interactions between two individuals or two teams. This verbal interaction should be delivered by following a shared concept that is understood by each other. In delivering verbal interactions, as the phrase “verbal interaction” suggests, a mutual cooperation between these two individuals or teams is considered quite significant to ensure the running of this “conversation,” whether it is successful to achieve the goal of each stake holder involved in this “conversation”. Thus the term conversational cooperation comes up in this discussion.

Debate and conversational cooperation integrate Grice’s principle of conversational cooperation and the debate principles. Grice’s principles that have maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner is mainly a set of regulation on the way how an appropriate conversation should be done by people who are doing the conversation.

Constatantine Salavastru did a research on public debate performance and how it was related to the conversational cooperation or maxims. In general, Salavastru’s research came up with an idea that “to obey the principle of maxim is a must in public debate...” (Salavastru, 2009).

The result of this research was summed up into an elaborated answer toward a question, “ a public debate is possible if the speakers state that necessary information, such as to reach the purpose (maxim of quantity), if the speakers do not deliberately make false statements (maxim of quality), if they produce the required proofs to persuade the others (maxim of manner), if our statements are relevant (maxim of Relation), if they are not obscure or ambiguous, if we are concise and methodical.” (Salavastru, 2009)

Salavastru also believed that to ensure the consistency of the topic being debated is crucial, that is why in every public debate there is always an expert moderator who directs the flow of the debate by giving some specific questions to be answered and debated by the debaters and as well to remind every debater when their argument is diverted from the direction of the debate. The result of the research provides a description seen from the perspective of pragmatics on how this concept generally perceived and implemented by the participants and the audience in the public debate.

The researcher noticed that this concept is likely perceived by most of beginner debaters when they decide to join a competitive debate. As a practitioner of competitive debate, the researcher see from the previous research done by Salavastru. The researcher felt if the concept that was resulted in the research of Salavastru in public debate, did not actually happen in competitive debate. For example; firstly the objective of participants of public debate to join public debate is to win the heart of the audience. The participants of public debate are usually politicians or presidential candidates who are going to run for election. In order to win the heart and the vote of the society sometimes they would be willing to

join a public debate in some tv stations to show to the audience or public on how good they could be as a candidate in the election. That is why the participants in public debate should be able to perform a debate performance that can be accepted by the general society who mostly have the same communication principle like what has been formulated by Grice in his principle of maxim.

The difference between Salavastu's research and this research was in competitive debate the participants never have any intention to try to convince the audience from the general society. The debaters of a competitive debate have to convince the adjudicator who scrutinize a and evaluates the whole debate performance from the adjudicator's expert perspective, and the debate evaluation is conducted by following the debate principle that has already been set by the debate community, as a unique and specific society. Since the standard of acceptance of communication in this specific society of debaters, especially in competitive debate, is different that's why the four categories of Gricean maxim would be interpreted, accepted, and exercised differently in the competitive debate.

Since there is no moderator in competitive debate, every diverse argument will require the ability of the debaters to notice and to response. Thus, even though the competitive debate has diverted so much and the debate becomes very messy, it can still run.

It does not mean that competitive debate does not have clear rules which could not forbid any argumentation diversion to happen. In fact the rules in competitive debate are quite strict as they are in the rules of maxim by Grice. In general, the expectation on how a conversation, or an exchange of communication (in the term of debate) should be performed, is stated in the rules of maxim as it is also stated in the rules of competitive debate. If the participants or the debaters fail to comply to those rules, for example by diverting the argument or by violating the maxim, they will likely lose the debate. But if the competitive debate rules are analyzed deeper, especially on the rules that are related to the procedure of anticipation and responses on argumentation diversions then we may see some significant differences which make, at the end, the result of the debate round become quite unpredictable. In a competitive debate, the decision to use the procedure of argument diversion or even the awareness of using the procedure of argument diversion will be up to the ability of the participant.

In a debate competition we should know that most of the time the arguments of the debaters mean more than the literal content of their statement. But even if it is so, the meaning in those arguments should still follow the guideline rules in a debate competition. In a debate competition, the debater should be very cautious to any probability that the opponent team's motivation is to manipulate the debater's way of thinking into saying a wrong argument that the opponent team expects him and lead him to.

Eventhough to commit logical fallacy or violation of maxim is forbidden in competitive debates, the debaters will do it for the sake of victory. To manipulate it to win means the time and the situation make it possible for any manipulation or the opponent's lack of ability supports their intention to manipulate the argument and to manipulate the opponent team. As stated by Northridge in his research article that "debate is not just about finding truth, it's also about *winning*. If you think a fallacious argument can slide by and persuade the judge to vote for you, you're going to make it, right? The trick is not getting caught." (2001)

Talking about debate society and the way how the debaters in debate community "communicate" to each other some researchers believe that Grice's conversational cooperative principle is not universal and cannot be accepted and implemented precisely in every society. Larkin and O'Malley state that:

There have also been objections to Grice's cooperative principle on the grounds that it does not stand up to the evidence of real language use. For example, it has been argued that conversational constraints such as those of the cooperation principle do not work because the majority of declarative sentences do not have an information-bearing function. Larkin and O'Malley (1973) in (Leech, 1983).

Furthermore, Keenan has also argued that "the maxims of the cooperative principle are not universal to language, because there are linguistic communities to which not all of them apply." Keenan (1974) in (Leech (1983) said "that no claim has been made that the cooperative principle applies in an identical manner to all societies."

Thus, the purpose of this research are 1) to find out how far Grice's conversational cooperative principle of maxims, in the term of its violation and observation, would behave differently or similarly under the culture of debate society or the communication system of competitive debate, 2) to see the uniqueness of the debate society standard of acceptance toward an argument, and 3) to contribute to the enrichment of the study under the field of pragmatics.

Thus the major statements of problem in this research are as follows:

1. Is there any difference on how Gricean maxims are interpreted and exercised in a competitive debate seen from the perspective of Gricean conversational cooperative principle and from the perspective of competitive debate principle?
2. Is there any similarity on how Gricean maxims are interpreted and exercised in a competitive debate seen from the perspective of Gricean conversational cooperative principle and from the perspective of competitive debate principle?

Meanwhile the minor statements of problem in this research are as follows:

1. What are the maxims mostly interpreted differently?
2. What are some maxims that mostly interpreted similarly?

Methodology

This qualitative study describes the arguments violating the Grice's cooperative principles in terms of the maxims, and the debate principles in terms of matter (content), manner and method (strategy).

The following is the criteria for the arguments violating the Grice's maxims:

Table 1
Criteria for Arguments Violating Grice's Maxims

Maxim violations from the perspective of Grice	
Violation	Criteria of violation
Quality	A. The argument using false/fake data/example (un/deliberately) B. The argument did not mentioned any valid resource of the data
Quantity	A. Using too long argument that is not necessary. B. Because of the parade of the argument, it make the argument cannot be distinguished the important one from the unimportant one
Relation	A. The argument did not significantly related to the motion/the dynamic of the debate
Mannert	A. The debater makes an ambiguous argument or using logical fallacy of <i>ambiguity</i>

Table 2
Criteria for Arguments Violating the Debate Principles
in terms of Matter

Violation	Matter (content)	Manner	Method (strategy)
Maxim of Quality	<p>1) Committing logical fallacies or using any argument however incorrect the fact and the data was.</p> <p>2) Uses premises that are not true.</p>	<p>1) Sugar coat the argument using cleverly crafted language to conceal the real meaning of the argument</p>	<p>1) Only attacking the false data or questioning the source of the argument without attacking the real content of the argument is not a good strategy of argument, even this will only be considered a false rebuttal or argument.</p>
Maxim of Quantity	<p>1) Good argument should constructed using the structure of A.R.E.L (Assertion, reasoning, evidence, link back)</p> <p>2) Good argument should give deep characterization & detail description about all stake holders & aspects that are mentioned in the argumentt. Not following this structure would make it considered as insufficient argument that didn't have enough elaboration.</p>	<p>1) Using too long unnecessary words and convulated sentences to sound impressive-even if that means making their speeches difficult to understand and painful to follow</p>	<p>1) Method and matter (content and strategy) are very closely linked . Good strategy in making sufficient argument (not too long or too less) is by structuring the speech using AREL. A good structure of speech will naturally present a stronger argument. Similarly a strong argument is impossible without at least a good structure.</p>
Maxim of Relation	<p>1) Irrelevant argument is an argument that does not prove what the debate team set out to show</p>	<p>1) Regarding the way to use facts, you must bear in mind that the facts you use should be the most relevant one. Ex: Just because fact A is true it doesn't mean that it would be relevant to support argument B.</p>	<p>1) How the strategy an argument is arranged is important. Because it may implicate to consistency and relevancy. At times teams provide irrelevant point because they view each argument as random, individual, separately argument than as a holistic arguments.</p>
Maxim of Manner	<p>1) Team context should already make it clear what it is that the topic means' in terms of any unclear or ambiguous terms are relating to.</p>	<p>1) The priority of argument shouldn't be ambiguous. We should prioritize more important than less important aspects & actors who are involved in the issue, and how the problems affects the actors in the motion.</p>	<p>1) argument arrangement strategy is important.It'd be wrong to just say some individual arguments without interlinking them as a case. It'd make those arguments look ambiguous and unclear</p>

Manner and Method

Every argument of every speaker of the affirmative team and of the opposition team was categorized into the maxim of quality, quantity, manner, or relevance if violating the Grice's cooperative principles, and into matter, manner or method if violating the debate principles.

The researcher then compared the result to know which team who committed more logical fallacy or maxim violation. And then the researcher compared it to the adjudicators' decision to see if the winner that is decided by the adjudicators is the debate team who committed more or less logical fallacy or maxim violation.

The Results

Table of data findings compilation of maxim violation and observation from the perspective of Gricean maxim principle and debate principle

Debate Transcript Lines	Debate Principle (3M:matter, manner, method)		Gricean Maxim Principle	
	Maxim Observation	Maxim Violation	Maxim Observation	Maxim Violation
1st Affirmative Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-3		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
B. Team Split				
Line 4-7	Manner (method)	Quantity (method)		Quantity
C. Argument				
<u>1st Argument</u>				
Line 8-15		Quality (matter)		
		Quantity (manner)		Quantity
Line 16-20		Quantity (3M)		Quality
		Relation (3M)		
		Manner (3M)		
Line 20-22		Quality (matter,method)		Quality
Line 22-26		Quantity (matter)		Quality
				Relation
Line 27-44		Relation (method)	Relation	
<u>2nd Argument</u>				
Line 44-52		Quantity (matter)		Relation
Line 53-56		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
				Relation
<u>3rd Argument</u>				
Line 57-62		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
		Relation (method)		Relation
		Manner (manner)		
1st Opposition Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-7	Quantity (matter)			Quantity manner
B. Rebuttal				
<u>1st rebuttal</u>				
Line 20-22		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
		Relation (method)		Relation
<u>2nd rebuttal</u>				
Line 23-30		Quantity (matter)	Quantity	
		Relation (method)		
C. Argument				
<u>1st Argument</u>				
Line 33-41		Quantity (matter)		Quantity manner
Line 42-49		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
Line 50-54		Quantity (matter)		Quantity

Debate Transcript Lines	Debate Principle (matter, manner, method)		Gricean Maxim Principle	
	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim
	Observation	Violation	Observation	Violation
2nd Argument Line 55-62		Quantity (matter)		Quality
2nd Affirmative Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-6		Quantity (matter)	Quality	
Line 7-12		Quantity (matter)	Quality	
B. Rebuttal				
<u>1st Rebuttal</u>				
Line 21-29		Quantity (matter)	Quality	
<u>2nd Rebuttal</u>				
Line 29-34		Quantity (matter) Relation (method)		Quantity Relation
C. Argument				
<u>1st Argument</u>				
Line 35-48		Quality (matter) Quantity (matter) Relation (method)		Quality Quantity Relation
Line		Relation (method)	Quality	
Line 55-74		Manner (manner) Relation (method) Quantity (matter)	Relation	
2nd Opposition Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-5	Quantity (matter)		Quality	
B. Rebuttal				
<u>1st rebuttal</u>				
Line 5-10		Quantity (matter)		Relation
<u>2nd rebuttal</u>				
Line 14-18		Quantity (matter) Relation (method)		Quantity Relation
C. Argument				
<u>1st Argument</u>				
Line 24-43		Quantity (matter)		Quality
<u>2nd Argument</u>				
Line 41-50		Quality (matter)		Quality
<u>3rd Argument</u>				
Line 50-62		Quantity (matter)		Quantity

Debate Transcript Lines	Debate Principle (matter, manner, method)		Gricean Maxim Principle	
	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim
	Observation	Violation	Observation	Violation
3rd Affirmative Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-5	quality (matter)		quality quantity relation manner	
Line 10-18	quantity (matter) quality (matter) relation (method) manner (manner)		quantity quality relation manner	
Line 19-28		quantity (matter)	relation	
B. Rebuttal				
<u>1st Rebuttal</u>				
Line 28-43	quality (matter)		quality	
Line 44-49		relation (matter)		relation quality manner
Line 50-60	quality (matter)	quantity (matter)	quality relation manner	
Line 61-70		quantity (matter)	quality relation	
<u>2nd rebuttal</u>				
line 71-80		Quantity (matter) Quality (matter)		Quantity Quality
3rd Opposition Speaker				
A. Opening				
Line 1-4		Quantity (matter) Quality (matter) Manner (matter)		Quantity Quality Manner
B. Rebuttal				
<u>1st rebuttal</u>				
Line 9-22		Quantity (matter)		Quantity
Line 23-27		Quantity (matter) Relation (method)	Quality	
Line 28-40		quality (matter) Relation (method)		quality

Debate	Debate Principle (matter, manner, method)		Gricean Maxim Principle	
Transcript	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim	Maxim
Lines	Observation	Violation	Observation	Violation
Line 41-50		quantity (matter) quality (matter)	quality	
2nd Rebuttal				
line 50-57		quantity (matter) quality (matter)		quantity quality
line 58-71		quantity (matter) quality (matter)		quality quantity
				relation
				manner
line 71-76		relation (method) quality (matter) quantity (matter)		relation quality quantity

Note: the bold-printed maxims are maxims that share similar analysis from the perspective of debate principle and Gricean maxim principle.

Discussion

How Gricean maxims are differently interpreted and exercised in a debate from the Gricean cooperative principles and competitive debate principles.

Interpretation from the Perspective of Gricean Maxim Principle

From the perspective of Gricean maxim principles, the speakers are recommended to give sufficient information not to be considered as not less and not more than necessary.

Salavastru mentioned that “the first conversational maxim ensuing from the discriminatory action of the quantity criterion is that of *sufficiency of information to meet the purpose of the debate*. In order to reach this purpose, the interlocutors mobilize their whole pool of knowledge on the topic, and choose the means to fight: arguments, techniques, discursive means. However, not everything that is close at hand is equally useful to reach their purpose”(2009)

The second rule of Gricean maxim that is analyzed by Salavastru is an embodiment of the principle of economy: why should we use more information if we can obtain the same result with less? With respect to facilities, we could also diminish the sensation of oversaturation of ideas and points of view given by the participants’ lack of reticence in parading all that they know about the topic of the debate.”(2009)

Thus, “Violation of the above mentioned rules can lead to one's incapacity to distinguish between what is essential and what is not essential at the level of the debate topic.”(Salavastru, 2009)

It shows if in Gricean maxim principle it is not necessary for the debater to proceed delivering more and more information to enrich the analysis of the argument if the argument is already clear enough. An argument that is forced to be prolonged does not violate only the maxim of quantity, but also the maxims of relation and manner. Why? Because the focus of important issue in a prolonged-with-well-crafted-sentences argument will become blurred, ambiguous, saturated and irrelevant, and hence will violate the maxim of manner and relation.

Interpretation from the Perspective of Debate Principle

Meanwhile from the perspective of debate principle, the violation toward maxim of quantity can take place when the debater who delivers the argument only makes a short statement or assertion without even bothering to provide further elaboration and explanation about important stake holders and aspects that were mentioned in the argument.

“After the debater has an issue and identifying principles involved for the motion, building a case will be much easier. You may employ the information you gain to identify the issues or problems generating the debate. Once you decide the problems/ issues you can develop the case by producing arguments. The layers of arguments can be enriched by the inclusion of principles you have read before from your research materials. The same system can also be employed when you are preparing your negation. (Muhammadin, et al., 2009)

Stake holders analysis, from the perspective of debate principle, is the most crucial method of argumentation delivery that should be mastered and delivered by any debater when they make any claim, accusation, assertion, statement, and negation in their argument and rebuttal.

Eventhough from the perspective of non debater, a short argument could be quite clear, but from the perspective of debate principle, as long as there is not yet further explanation that can provide a clear description on the characteristic of each stake holders and their role and influence in a claim or accusation in an argument then the argument should be considered violating the maxim of quantity. Thus, from the perspective of debate principle, to observe the maxim of quantity is equal to observe the maxim of quality (with additional possibility of observing the maxim of manner and relation as well).

Any failure in delivering a satisfactory amount of stake holders characterization analysis as an important instrument to prove the claim or accusation, will make the argument become vulnerable. It could be labeled as an argument whose validity of its content become no longer reliable to be trusted anymore. In conclusion it could also lead to another violation of other maxims, such as maxims of quality, manner, and relation.

Moreover, in a debate competition, all debaters are being forced by the urge to win the debate with any means if it is necessary. Every sentence and word in an already clear argument can be twisted around by a team to make it an advantage to their team and disadvantage to the opponent team. Thus, making a not-yet-clear argument will make it easier for the opponent team to use it to attack the logical analysis of another team's argument. To attack an opponent team using its previous argument is the most devastating strategy in a debate competition.

Here is the argument example taken from the debate transcript and how debate principle and Grice principle has different perspective:

Lines	First Rebuttal
25	Now coming to the rebuttal point to opposition side. First, when they believe that actually on how the smoker tolerance exist on how all of society has right to choose to be a smoker, we think that actually yes indeed tolerance exist, yes indeed they has right to choose to smoke or not, but the problem is that, how this smoker didn't ever has tolerance toward the another people that are not smoke in the front of them, on how that they are smoke they are getting harm is not a problem, but the problem is that, there are passive smoker, they are not smoke but they get the potion from this kind of smoker.

Different Interpretation toward the violation of maxim of quantity and observation of maxim of quality.

The argumentation analysis from the perspective of Debate Principle

The word "tolerance" that was originally came from the first speaker of the opposition team was also being used by this debater (the second speaker of the affirmative team) to respond to the idea of tolerance from the first speaker of the opposition team. Unfortunately, the way how the response was being delivered is just too shallow. This debater only attacks the idea of tolerance on the surface level. The second speaker of the affirmative team should have provided elaboration on the philosophical level by explaining the definition of tolerance, its criteria, its characterization, its purpose, intention and objective. Then the debater can continue the explanation by giving elaboration on the description of the primary stake holder in this motion, which is the active and passive smokers,. The debater should have given deeper explanation about the characteristic of each stake holder and the expectation of each stake holder toward the opposite stake holder (active smoker to passive smokers and vice versa). After that the debater can describe the activity that has been done by the active smokers toward passive smokers and the activity that has been done by passive smokers toward active smoker and then give explanation why each activity that is done by each stake holder can be classified into the activity that fulfills or does not fulfill the criteria of tolerance.

So in a debate competition, a debater does not simply state argument here and there and expects if a short statement would be enough. AREL (assertion, reasoning, evidence, link back) should always be employed in every attempt of delivering arguments.

Thus, from the perspective of the debate principle, in the term of matter, the argument violated the maxim of quantity.

The argumentation analysis from the perspective of Gricean Principle

From the perspective Gricean maxim principle, this argument did give direct portrayal of the problem that is related to a smoking activity that we could find in the real condition of Indonesia.

Most of people in Indonesia, especially the smokers or the active smokers rarely show any tolerance toward passive smokers, even if the government has already made smoking rooms in many places. Those active smokers still frequently do smoking activity near passive smokers. It makes non smoker society or passive smokers to suffer a similar disease like the one suffered by active smokers. It shows how actually it is true that the active smokers do not have tolerance at all.

So, this explanation has already proven that the claim of the first speaker of the opposition team who said the Indonesia society that has already established a sufficient amount of tolerance toward the activity of smoking is actually wrong.

Since from the perspective of Gricean maxim principle the argument has given the real depiction upon the condition of smoking in Indonesia, thus this argument can be classified as an argument that observed the maxim of quality.

How Gricean maxims are similarly interpreted and exercised in a debate from the Gricean cooperative principle and competitive debate principle

Here is the argument example taken from the debate transcript and how debate principle and Grice principle share a similar perspective.

Lines	First Argument
20	smokers itself. And from the economic sector, we see that in the status quo right now, a lot of middle low family here is tend to buy cigarette in the daily need that it make the bad condition of our economical condition

The analysis from the perspective of debate principle

The argument is generalizing and simplifying the analysis of economic sector and its relation to the purchasing of cigarette product by low middle families. There is no further explanation how it can affect the economical condition of our country. Furthermore, there is no explanation why this argument is focusing only on low middle families when it is about smoking, why not also about midle and upper class families who can also buy the cigarette. If this argument is intended to create benefits for the society in the term of health by limiting the consumption of cigarettes, then why to give the benefits of health only to low class

families? Are middle and upper class families not considered as part of Indonesian citizens as well?

The analysis from the perspective of Gricean principle

This claim contains a statement that has already been known by everyone in the real life. Thus making such reckless argument will only make everyone, whether you are a debater or non debater to reject that claim, since seen from the perspective of average reasonable person, that statement is not describing the real condition in the real life.

Thus, the researcher decided to put this argument under the category of violation of maxim of quality, seeing from the perspective of Gricean maxim principle and debate principle (in the term of matter or the content of the argument and method or the strategy in delivering the argument).

Summary and Conclusion

This study showed that Grice's conversational cooperative principle which consists of a set of rules of maxims could not cover whole communication activities as conducted by every speaker and hearer in the debate competition held on September 13th – 15th, 2013 at Politeknik Negeri Malang (POLINEMA). Grice's conversational cooperative principle is not universal and cannot be accepted and implemented precisely as what Grice believed.

In the competition any decision on whether or not an argument in competitive debates should be considered as a violation or an observation (obey) of the principle of maxim should refer back to the standard of argumentation acceptance that has been regulated in the parliamentary debate system in a competitive debate. Even some experts, like what has been mentioned in the previous chapters, criticized that there are several principles in the Grice's principle that raised some significant questions. Most of the questions were about the inconsistency of Grice's principle when being contended with some other societies and the way how they communicate and interact to each other. It is because the way how they communicate is not following the principle of Grice's maxim.

This study found that eventhough the Grice's principles and the debate principles had similarities, yet undeniably, Grice's conversational cooperative principle of maxim, in the term of its violation and observation, behaved differently under the culture of debate society or the communication system of competitive debate. This principle should also be based on the uniqueness of the debate society standard of acceptance toward an argument.

In conclusion, the researcher humbly expects that the result of this study would provide significant contribution to enrich the study of pragmatics, especially in the field of the maxims and competitive debate.

Suggestion

An important suggestion that the researcher can give for future researcher in the field of debate competition is, it is better for the next researcher to do the research on debate team who have high skills of English and only make little grammatical mistakes. It is to ease the burden of the researcher in doing the research and in analyzing the argument.

The researcher is aware that there's nobody including the researcher is perfect, thus the researcher should open himself for any constructive feedback from any other future researchers or debaters out there who could provide a significant improvement toward this research, especially in the maxim interpretation and analysis that can be accepted by every practitioner of Grice maxim principles and debate principles.

Bibliography

- Danziger, E. (2010, July 13). On trying and lying: Cultural configurations of Grice's Maxim of Quality. (I. Kecskes, Ed.) *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 7 (2), pp. 199–219.
- Leech, G. (1983). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Muhammadin, F. M., Sekarsari, V., Pido, M. F., Puteri, K. H., Fadillah, R. D., Denistia, K., et al. (2009). *Handbook for Parliamentary Debating* (Vol. 2). Jogjakarta: JDF (Jogja Debating Forum).
- Northridge, C. S. (2001, January 29). *Logical Fallacies and the Art of Debate*. Retrieved 0816, 2013, from <http://www.csun.edu/http://www.csun.edu/~dgv61315/fallacies.html>
- Salavastru, C. (2009). *The Model of Conversational Cooperation*. Retrieved 11 04, 2012, from <http://anale.fssp.uaic.ro/texte/pub3/themodelofconversationalcooperationandpublicdebates-constantinsalavastru.pdf>
- Woods, J., & Walton, D. (1982). *ARGUMENT: The Logic of The Fallacies*. Canada: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. (H. Widdowson, Ed.) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.