

# **Chapter 5**

## **Conclusion**

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion

#### 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 13<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup>, 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

- Carlsen-Jones, M. T. (1983). *Introduction to Logic*. (R. Robbin, & J. R. Belser, Eds.) McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Copi, I. M. (1982). *Introduction to Logic: Sixth Edition*. New York, United States of America: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc; Collier Macmillan Publisher.
- 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.
- Harahap, P. (1999). *Guideline for Adjudicators*. Retrieved 6 18, 2013, from English Debating Society of University of Indonesia:  
[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCKQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdcesuunpad.files.wordpress.com%2F2006%2F11%2Fguidelinesforadjudicators.doc&ei=l6S\\_UaK8GIOyrgfXIIHgCQ&usg=AFQjCNE2DRQjHkuK2u8M9aMnBbyr-s87UQ&sig2=5vm3VcM](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCKQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdcesuunpad.files.wordpress.com%2F2006%2F11%2Fguidelinesforadjudicators.doc&ei=l6S_UaK8GIOyrgfXIIHgCQ&usg=AFQjCNE2DRQjHkuK2u8M9aMnBbyr-s87UQ&sig2=5vm3VcM)
- Harahap, P. (1999). *Guideline for Debaters*. Retrieved 6 18, 2013, from English Debating Society of University of Indonesia:  
[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCKQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdcesuunpad.files.wordpress.com%2F2006%2F11%2Fguidelinesforadjudicators.doc&ei=l6S\\_UaK8GIOyrgfXIIHgCQ&usg=AFQjCNE2DRQjHkuK2u8M9aMnBbyr-s87UQ&sig2=5vm3VcM](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCKQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdcesuunpad.files.wordpress.com%2F2006%2F11%2Fguidelinesforadjudicators.doc&ei=l6S_UaK8GIOyrgfXIIHgCQ&usg=AFQjCNE2DRQjHkuK2u8M9aMnBbyr-s87UQ&sig2=5vm3VcM)
- Harahap, P. (1999). *What is competitive Debate?* Jakarta: English Debate Society of Indonesia University.
- Hasibuan, R., & Octavianus, B. (2012). *Panduan Praktis Penyelenggaraan Kompetisi Debat Parlemen tingkat SMU*. Retrieved 6 18, 2013, from Anomali, Youth Empowerment Center.
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics; A Practical Introduction*. New York, United States: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knoblauch, H. (2005). *Focussed Ethnography*. Retrieved 08 17, 2013, from Forum: Qualitative Social Research: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/20/43>
- Leech, G. (1983). *The Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.
- McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer* (Fifth ed.). (A. E. Burvikovs, Ed.) Boston, United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- 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).

Nakano, M., & Inoue, N. (2004, June 27-30). Retrieved 2013 16, 08, from commedu:  
<http://www.commedu.net/pdf/doc04.pdf>

Northridge, C. S. (2001, January 29). *Logical Fallacies and the Art of Debate*. Retrieved 08 16, 2013,  
from <http://www.csun.edu/>: <http://www.csun.edu/~dgw61315/fallacies.html>

Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An introduction*. New York: MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall.

Quinn, S. (2005). *debating- a "free" how to*. Retrieved 08 16, 2013, from  
[www.learndebating.com/DEBATING.pdf](http://www.learndebating.com/DEBATING.pdf): <http://www.learndebating.com/DEBATING.pdf>

Ramage, J. D., & Bean, J. C. (1997). *Writing Arguments: A Rhetoric With Readings* (Fourth ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Richardson, J., Smith, A., & Meaden., S. (2012). *Thou Shalt Not Commit Logical Fallacies*. Retrieved 08 16, 2013, from Your Logical Fallacy is: <https://yourlogicalfallacyis.com/>

Russell, B. (2008). *History of Modern Philosophy*. Retrieved FEB 02, 2014, from Logical Analysis and Bertrand Russell: <http://historyofmodernphilosophy.blogspot.com/2008/07/logical-analysis-and-bertrand-russell.html>

Salavastru, C. (n.d.). *The Model of Conversational Cooperation*. Retrieved 11 04, 2012, from <http://anale.fssp.uaic.ro/texte/pub3/themodelofconversationalcooperationandpublicdebates-constantinsalavastru.pdf>

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Outline of Relevance Theory\**. Retrieved 08 16, 2013, from [http://download1.hermes.asb.dk/archive/download/H05\\_04.pdf](http://download1.hermes.asb.dk/archive/download/H05_04.pdf)

Williams, R. G. (2008, JUN 28). *Logical analysis as a qualitative method II: Conflict of ideas and the topic of illness*. (G. Williams, D. Allen, E. Elliott, D. Hughes, J. Latimer, & I. R. Jones, Eds.) Retrieved FEB 02, 2014, from Sociology of Health & Illness; Willey Online Library: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11343880/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.