

Chapter 1

Introduction

Chapter 1

The Background of the Study

Sometimes in competitive debate there are some beginner debaters and their teachers who throw a protest toward the adjudicators board (judges board) because they feel that they should have won the debate round that they just lost. Mainly it is because they feel that their performance was better than the opponent team, better here means they feel that they have better fluency, better pronunciation, better delivery or seeing from the perspective of the content of the argument. They feel that their argument has more statistical data quoting some experts opinion or they feel if their argument was more correct or valid if compared to the opponent team arguments that brought false explanation.

Beginners who happen to join competitive debate for the first time tend to generalize the argumentation delivery rules and debate system in competitive debate similar to public debates on TV between presidential or political candidates that usually moderated by an expert moderator from that TV station. They failed to understand the detailed rules and the uniqueness of argumentation standard of acceptance in competitive debates. In order to understand more about competitive debate, it is necessary to look at the explanation about what competitive debate is. There are several competitive debate systems that are used in debate competition, namely; Asian Parliamentary system, British Parliamentary system, Australian Parliamentary system, Lincoln and Douglas Debate, and many more, but the system that is mostly used in debate competition in Indonesia is Asian Parliamentary system (AP), and this is the competitive debate system that is going to be analyzed in this research. 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 better compared to their opponent team.

The participants of a competitive debate is vary from the beginner debate teams to the experienced debate teams. Most of the time, beginner debate teams have certain difficulty in distinguishing good argument from bad argument and they mostly still make a generalization that every debate competition will be having the same system. It is this lackness of knowledge over what an argument is and how it is supposed to be delivered and the knowledge over the difference of several types of competitive debate systems and the general assumption of type of competitive debate that they are joining in, as one of those major causes that lead those beginner debaters into the wrong perception and eventually drag these beginners down into performing a wrong debate performance or at least not maximum debate performance.

Discussing about debate performance is discussing about a verbal interaction 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 interaction, 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” is successfull to achieve the goal of each stake holders who are involved in this “conversation”. Thus the term conversational cooperation came up in this discussion.

Talking about the relation of debate and conversational cooperation, it is necessary to integrate, into this discussion, the principle of conversational cooperation that is firstly found and theorized by Grice who famous with his principle of conversational cooperation or maxim. Grice in Yule (1996) and Leech (1983) came up with four types of maxim and the analysis on how each of the maxim behave under certain conversational situation. The maxims are; maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of Relation, maxim of manner. This principle is mainly set a regulation on the way how an appropriate conversation should

be done by people who are doing the conversation, so that a discursive that happen during the conversation can be noticed and can be anticipated as preventive action or at least responded accordingly based on the necessity of the people who are doing the conversation. Up until now, since the primary focus of this research is to analyze Grice's conversational cooperative principle in competitive debates, then the question would be whether or not the argumentation logical fallacies or diversion or discursive in competitive debate could also shares equal concept like in the violation of Grice's conversational cooperative principle of maxim. This Grice's principle has widely being discussed, analyzed and even criticized by some researchers around the world as one of grounds to analyze their belief and theory.

One of the researchers was Constantine Salavastru. Salavastru has done a research on public debate perfomance and how it is related to the conversational cooperation or maxim. Generally Salavastru's research came up with an idea that "to obey the principle of maxim is a must in public debate, it is necessary to ensure the running of public debate will not meet a deadlock, or at least as an indicator to decide the winner of the public debate." (Salavastru, 2009).

The result of this research is summed up into an elaborated answer toward a question,

"How is a public debate possible?" can be answered as follows: it is possible if we use the necessary information so as to reach our purpose (maxim of quantity), if we do not deliberately make false statements (maxim of quality), if we 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).

And Salavastru also believed that to ensure the consistency of the debate topic that is being debated is crucial, that is why in every public debate there is always an expert moderator who will be directing the direction of the debate by giving some specific questions to be answered and debated by the debaters (presidential candidate) and as well to remind every debater when their argument is diverted from the direction of the debate. The result of Salavastru research was actually enriching the field of pragmatics discussion it provides a

description seeing 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 notices that this concept is the one that is likely perceived by most of beginner debaters when they decided to join competitive debate. As a practitioner of competitive debate, this is one of the gaps that the researcher see from the previous research done by Salavastru. The researcher feels if the concept that is resulted in the research of Salavastru in public debate, does 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 candidate who are going to run for election thus in order to win the heart and the vote of the society sometimes they would be willing to join 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. And Grice has concluded if most of, if not some of, people in most of general society would have the same communication principle like he has formulated in his conversational cooperative principle. 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 has been formulated by Grice in his principle of maxim.

But in competitive debate, the participants never have any intention to try to convince the audience from the general society. The debaters of competitive debate have to convince the adjudicator who will scrutinize and evaluate 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. And since the standard of acceptance of communication in this specific society of debaters is different especially in competitive debate, that's why the four categories of

Gricean maxim would behave, interpreted, accepted, and exercised differently in the competitive debate.

Secondly, since there is no moderator in competitive debate, every diversion of argument that happens will require the ability of each debaters to notice those diversions and to respond to it. Thus even though the direction of the competitive debate has been diverted so much and the debate became so messy, but it can still run. And the decision on which team will win the debate will be depended on each debaters performance to notice those diversions and to respond to that diversion sufficiently, appropriately, and significantly.

It does not mean that competitive debate does not have any clear binding 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 participant or the debaters failed to comply to those rules, for example by diverting the argument or by violating the maxim, then the debaters will be likely going to lose the debate, that is in general. But if the competitive debate rules is analyzed deeper, especially on the rules that are related to the procedure of anticipation and responding on any discursive or diversion of argument that might happen during the conversation or debate, then we may see some significant differences which makes, at the end, the result of the debate round could become quite unpredictable. Even though the procedure of anticipation of any discursive argument has already been provided in the competitive debate rules, but since there is no moderator who usually reminding the debaters (in public debate, like that in presidential or political debate), then in 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.

Meaning, just because affirmative team in the debate competition has diverted the argument it does not mean that they are going to loose. Because it will be up to the ability of the opposition team to realize those diversions and to make a decision to anticipate and respond those diversions in the most appropriate way. Which means eventhough the procedure to respond the diversion has been done but if it was not really maximal and it can even be countered by the opponent team, then the attempt of conducting the procedure of anticipation toward the diverted argument that was brought by the opponent team will not be taken into account by the adjudicator or the judges and even the judges will give credit to the opponent team who manages to defend their argument even if it was a diverted argument. It is one of the consideration factors that will be used by the judges to decide the winner. Meaning, in the debating community and in the rules that covers the debate competition, committing logical fallacy is considered a sin that is not acceptable and not recommended to be done and risking negative consequence in term loosing the competition. But being able to defend the logical fallacy from the attack thrown by the opponent team that even makes the opponent become the team who looks as the under performed team, is somehow also acceptable and will be given credit for being able to defend their team argument in the way that is so sophisticated that makes their logical fallacy argument still looks as a very strong argument compared to the argument of the opponent team who can not give a more satisfying answer. So eventhough the stance that they take is the hard one or even the fallacy one, but in competitive debate, a debate team argumentation delivery skill in attacking the opponent team's argument and defending their own argument in such a way that makes the opponent

can not do and can not say anything is more appreciated even though the judges know if that argument possessed some logical fallacies.

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. Meanwhile seeing from the perspective of Grice, maxims that are used to guide people in interpreting an utterance in a conversation are derived from the 'cooperative principle'. In accordance to that we should know that even though the cooperative principle maybe can be utilized to interpret utterances in a conversation but it will be rather hard to expect the same result if the context is in a competitive debate. In a competitive debate, the debaters will never know if their opponent team will be using the expected standard of utterances that if being viewed from the perspective of Grice is still acceptable and following the principle of conversational cooperation or maxims. In a general conversation we could have such expectation of communication. But 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 say which could make the debater's performance becomes worse and even to some extent to smoothly divert the direction of the argument development into the development of argument that can give benefit to their team and give disadvantage to their opponent team.

The researcher believes that even though not all of debaters do this, but it is an inevitable fact that many debaters manipulate this flexibility in the rules of competitive debate purposely, or even sometimes unpurposely without they even realize it, but whatever the reason was, it was done for only one sole reason, which is to win the debate competition, so even though to commit logical fallacy or violation of maxim is forbidden in competitive

debates, but if the debaters feels that it is necessary to manipulate it to win the debate and if they see the time and the situation is right to do any manipulation or the opponent lackness of ability is supporting their intention to manipulate the argument and to manipulate the opponent team, then they will do it for the sake of victory.

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)

Of course those manipulative actions are also done after knowing the set of criteria that is binding the adjudicator and used by the adjudicator in deciding the winner in the debate competition, in this case, it can be considered also that the debaters manipulate and somehow “forced” the adjudicators by directing the adjudicators’ way of thinking into firstly have to follow the rules on how to adjudicate and secondly at the end of the debate, based on those rules on how to adjudicate, have to consider this particular debate team’s argumentation strategy (eventhough it possessed some logical fallacies) as better from the opponent team, or at least not worse if compared to the opponent team’s argument and makes the adjudicator have to make a tough decision into deciding them as the winner of the debate eventhough the adjudicators know if their argument is not good at all and their winning is just because of the luck that their opponent team is worse than them, or into giving more credit of appreciation to this particular debate team for their very sophisticated and convincing argumentation delivery that makes their logical fallacy argument looks as if it was a valid and strong argument that makes their opponent team can not say anything to respond to that and thus make their opponent team’s debate performance becomes under average.

And the understanding of the debaters toward the rules of adjudication that should be followed by the adjudicator in adjudicating the debate performance of the debaters is being used by the debaters to create an argument and counter argument that can persuade the adjudicator to make a decision that can make them to be the winner in a debate competition. This is one the uniqueness of the rules of competitive debate, which make the standard of acceptance of an argument in this debate society is somehow can be considered clear and strict in one way but also flexible and absurd in the other way. Debate society is one of those unique societies out there which possessed unique way of communication and unique communication (argumentation) standard of acceptance.

Talking about debate society and the way how the debaters in debate community “communicate” to each other, especially when it is viewed from the perspective of Grice's cooperative principle, even though Grice has claimed if his set of rules of maxim would be enough to cover the whole communication activity which is conducted by every speaker and hearer, but some researchers believed that it is the other way around, they believe if Grice's conversational cooperative principle is not universal and can not be accepted and implemented precisely as Grice believed in every society, just like the example of debate society and the way how they communicate in a debate competition.

This statement is supported by Larkin and O'Malley by saying 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).

Other previous researcher, Danziger also done a research on how maxim could behave, interpreted, and exercised differently under the perspective of a certain society with their own unique and specific culture in performing communication activity.:.

Gricean communication takes place when an audience recognizes an utterer's intention to communicate some specific content by producing a particular locution. This general view is discernible in Grice's wording of the maxim of Quality, which pivots on the idea of utterer “trying” to avoid falsehood. The cultural model of utterance interpretation among the Mopan Maya of Eastern Central America however, does not refer to the intentions of the utterer. For example, falsehoods are categorized by Mopan as blameworthy violations of Quality (“lying”) whether or not the utterer was aware of the falsehood at the moment of utterance. Ethnographic evidence suggests that even mutually known falsehoods are not interpreted figuratively among traditional Mopan, who do not produce or recognize fiction. But since Mopan conversation otherwise proceeds in general very much as it does in other languages, the Mopan findings suggest that intention-seeking must not in fact be necessary to most ordinary conversational interaction. (2010)

It shows on how different culture and society will perceive and exercise Grice's cooperative principle differently. As also emphasized by Leech who said “that no claim has been made that the cooperative principle applies in an identical manner to all societies.” (1983)

Indeed one of the main purpose of socio-pragmatics, is to find out how different societies operate maxims in different ways. 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 be consulted back to the standard of argumentation acceptance that has been regulated in the parliamentary debate system in competitive debate. Which can make a team who commit a logical fallacy can still have the opportunity to be accepted as the winner of the debate competition.

Thus, the purpose of this qualitative focused-ethnography research is to find out how far Grice's conversational cooperative principle of maxim, in the term of its violation, would behave differently under the culture of debate society or the communication system of competitive debate and to see the uniqueness of the debate society standard of acceptance

toward an argument, and to as well as a contribution to the enrichment of the study under the field of pragmatics.

The Statement of the Problems

This research study is going to see the debaters performance in competitive debate by narrowing down the focus of analysis into only analyzing the violation of maxims or logical fallacies that are committed by the debaters and the reason behind it, and as well to know how the adjudicators respond toward those violations, this research will try to find out if the adjudicator will respond to those violations of maxim positively or negatively and why they respond it that way.

Thus the major statement of problem in this research is 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. How significant does the Gricean principle of maxims that are interpreted and exercised differently under the perspective of debate principle influences the adjudicator decision in deciding the winner and the looser in a competitive debate?
3. What are some maxims that mostly interpreted similarly?

4. How significant does the Gricean principle of maxims that are interpreted similarly under the perspective of debate principle influences the adjudicator decision in deciding the winner and the looser in a competitive debate?

The Objectives of the Study

In accordance to above mentioned statements of problem, hence the objectives of this study are as follows:

The major objectives in this research are as follows:

1. To find out if there is any different on how maxim is interpreted and exercised in a competitive debate if being seen from the perspective of Gricean conversational cooperative principle and from the perspective of competitive debate principle.
2. To find out if there is any similarity on how maxim is interpreted and exercised in a competitive debate if being seen from the perspective of Gricean conversational cooperative principle and from the perspective of competitive debate principle.

Meanwhile the minor objectives in this research are as follows:

1. To find out some maxims that are mostly interpreted differently.
2. To find out how significant does the Gricean principle of maxims that are interpreted and exercised differently under the perspective of debate principle influences the adjudicator decision in deciding the winner and the looser in a competitive debate.
3. To find out some maxims that mostly interpreted similarly.
4. To find out how significant does the Gricean principle of maxims that are interpreted similarly under the perspective of debate principle influences the adjudicator decision in deciding the winner and the looser in a competitive debate.

The Assumptions

The researcher assumed that some violations of maxim or logical fallacies would happen in the competitive debate, but the debaters would furnish the logical fallacy with some convincing argumentation delivery and sophisticated argumentation structures that would make the logical fallacy looks as if it is not a fallacy or at least it is not as falacy as it should looks. And the researcher also assumed that the adjudicators would have to take the winner decision based on what the guideline of adjudicators has binded him regardless the logical fallacies that are committed by this team, which makes the adjudicators possess the possibility to give the winning to the team who commit logical fallacy or violation of maxim just because this team argumentation delivery style and structure are better and more convincing than their opponent team.

The Scope and Limitation of the Study

Since the approach that was used in this research was focused-ethnography approach, then the researcher should limit the focus of this research to only analyzing about the violation of maxim, or if it is looked from the perspective of debate, the researches should be only focusing to see the logical fallacies that were committed by the debaters during the debate round and how it could give positive or negative consequences to the debaters.

Meanwhile for the object of the study, the researcher purposively chose the grandfinal debaters and the grandfinal adjudicators only. It was in order to maximalize the richness of the debate data, because as debate teams who managed to get into grandfinal round, it could be said if these debaters' debate performance would be above average and thus an above average or at least average debate performance which provides a high level of the dynamic of argumentation exchange which employed some rich using of complex argumentation strategies could be expected to be seen in this grandfinal round.

It was also to emphasize the researcher's previous explanation in the background of problem about the nature of debate society and the way how debate society communicate, especially on how an argument is accepted as the winner or the looser argument. in this case, as has been explained deeper previously, the researcher believe if this things happens everywhere in any debate competition that is organized by any debate society or community, because the researcher believe that in every competitive debate system, a system that is used by the researcher in this research, the same regulation for the debaters and the adjudicators would make every debate participant and debate adjudicators to treat the principle of maxim differently from the expectation of Grice, thus the researcher see that, as part of the system of debate society and community, this unique behaviour is assumed to be likely to happen in the grandfinal round of debate as well, thus the decision to decide to choose the adjudicators and the debate teams who would perform in the grandfinal round as the sample of data collection in this research has fulfilled the required criteria of data necessity that are needed by the researcher in order to conduct this focused-ethnography research to see how would maxim behave differently under the performance of the debaters and the adjudicators' argumentation acceptance in a competitive debate that is organized by debate society or community.

And this is inline with McMillan statement which stated that, "Internal sampling is concerned with the people, times, and documents that will be selected once the site is determined." (2008).

The researcher selects those individuals, times, and documents that will provide the greatest amount of information. Remember, the goal of any qualitative study is to generate depth of description and understanding. Consequently, it is better to select a few entities for in-depth study rather than a large number that would be studied only superficially.

And as for the venue of the debate competition, as stated by McMillan that, “entry into the research site is essentially the same as in an ethnography. A site should be selected after visiting several possibilities. This gives the researcher a better idea about which site will provide the needed information. It is important that the site be fully accessible for the researcher, and that the individuals at the site cooperate fully.” (2008).

In accordance with that statement, thus the researcher decides that the site that is chosen to be the site of the research is MASTER, Malang High School Debate Tournament (MASTER) competition is an annual high school debate tournament organized by Malang Debating Union (MDU). MASTER 2013 itself is hosted by Politeknik Negeri Malang (POLINEMA) on September 13th - 15th , 2013.

The Significance of the Study

Since every year the participation of high school students in English debate competition has been gaining popularity, it undeniably brings in into the debate competition a lot of number of new faces of debaters who unfortunately have different expectation with the standard of expectation of debate community on what kind of good debate performance that should be performed by them.

in this case, Grice has succeeded in doing a very great research by defining and then classifying the categorization of the communication performance of the majority of people in this world in performing their conversational activity under the four categories of maxim. In debate competition (as part of form of communication), as has been predicted and expected by Grice, these new debaters who happen to be the representative of non-debaters-people out there who newly join the society of debaters, undeniably still brings in the common people's standard of expectancy like what can be seen in the Grice's formulation on the principle of

maxim in the conversational performance. Which unfortunately makes these new debaters to perform different standard of expectancy in the debate competition.

It does not mean that the Grice's cooperative principle of conversation or maxim not compatible at all to be applied in the community of debaters with their debate competition activity, it is just that the application of maxim is kind of different, because actually it would be more about how the principle of maxim, as has been formulated by Grice, would be interpreted and exercised differently by the debate community in their debate competition. So each name of the four category of conversational principle that Grice formulated is still there and still can be used by the researcher as the basic of this research discussion, but the way how Grice's principle of maxim is interpreted and exercised in debate community has been significantly different with the original version of the principle of maxim that was formulated by Grice.

The lackness of knowledge of these new debaters over this different standard of acceptance between Grice's principle and debate principle makes them to perform a not maximal performance, which at the end of the day frustrated them and sadly discouraged most or some of them to not continue their participation in some other upcoming debate competitions. Their decision to not participating in any other debate competitions anymore is a sad decision for debate community who expect that the debate competition that they held would be able to attract more and more new participants into debating world which at the end of the day could lead into the improvement of debate proliferation for non debater society out there to finally also join debate and want to be involved into debate community's further activities. But if there are some new debaters feel discouraged to join the other debate competitions in the future, then it will be going to be backstabbing with the objective of debate community to proliferate debate in the society.

Thus to still motivate these new debaters to not feels discouraged and still deciding to join the other debate competitions in the future by feels motivated to also studying further and deeper about the standard of expectancy of debate competition under the principle of debate society is the primary significany of this research. The researcher as part of debate community sincerely hope that the discussion in this research could provide a clear description for the non debater society out there to be able to see the different between the standard of expectancy that is expected by the Grice principle of maxim in the society out there and the standard of expectancy on the way how the principle of Grice's maxim could behaved, interpreted and exercised differently under the expectancy of debate community.

The other objective of this study is to enrich, give contribution and suggestion in the field of competitive debate performance and in the field of pragmatics, especially in the study of cooperative principle, in this research the researcher would like to investigate how maxim would behave and treated differently in the society of debating community, especially in the competitive debates.

The Theoretical Framework

Ideally, when having a conversation, people are not trying to confuse, trick, or withhold relevant information from each other. Therefore, they should provide an appropriate amount of information, tell the truth, be relevant, and try to be as clear as they can. In this case, the speaker conveys his intention, and at the same time the listener receives it. Related to this, the speaker and the listener involved in the conversation have to speak cooperatively and mutually accept one another to be understood in a particular way. Otherwise, it can lead to misinterpretation. Therefore, people should obey the principle to enhance effective communication proposed by Paul Grice. But in the everyday conversation, people do not always applying the rules of Grice's maxims all the time. Because every conversation should

be unique and based on the contextual background where the conversation take place, either from the perspective of society or culture.

Some cultures in the world have different way in practicing their way of communication. American tends to talk directly when they want to reject something, while English, Canadian, Japanese, Javanese tends to talk politely and most of the time try to avoid unnecessary conflict by use as polite and as indirect sentences as possible, so that the rejection will not sounds as bad as it might meant, or if it is possible they will make the rejection sentence to not sounds like rejection at all which will be viewed as too often violating Grice's maxims of manner, quality, and quantity. It shows how Gricean maxim interpreted and exercised differently by following the unique standard of communication in a certain society.

It is also in accordance to Sperber & Wilson and Keenan argumentation that "there are problems about where the maxims come from. Are they universal? If so, why? Are they culture-specific? If so, in what respects?" (Sperber & Wilson, 1986) and (Keenan, 1974) in (Leech, 1983)

Thus the critique and the questions over the universality of maxim has finally contended with the nature of debate competition's unique attitude, even though rules has been set to ensure that there will be no logical fallacy is used to manipulate the argument but yet, as stated by Northridge,

That Debate is, fortunately or not, an exercise in persuasion, wit, and rhetoric, not just logic. In a debate format that limits each debater's speaking time, it is simply not reasonable to expect every proposition or conclusion to follow precisely and rigorously from a clear set of premises stated at the outset. Instead, debaters have to bring together various facts, insights, and values that others share or can be persuaded to accept, and then show that those ideas lead more or less plausibly to a conclusion. Logic is a useful tool in this process, but it is not the only tool -- after all, "plausibility" is a fairly subjective matter that does not follow strict logical rules. (Northridge, 2001)

All of these interesting theories will be utilized as the platform and the milestone of the researcher in conducting this research to see how the Gricean maxim or cooperative principle of conversation could behave, interpreted, and exercised differently under the unique standard of expectancy and acceptance of communication activity in a debate competition seeing from the perspective of debate community.

The Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding, some key terms for this study are as follow:

1. *Debate*. Debating is about developing an individual's communication skills. It is about assembling and organizing effective arguments, persuading and entertaining an audience, and using the language to convince people that the speaker's arguments outweigh the opponent's. Debating is not about personal abuses, irrational attacks or purely emotional appeals. A debate usually involves two sides talking about a topic (often called a *motion*). As a competition, teams of debaters attempt to show the adjudicators that they have the best debating skills. Motion, also known as topic, is a full propositional statement that determine what a debate shall be about. In the debate, the Affirmative team must argue to defend the propositional statement of the motion, and the Negative team must argue to oppose it. (Harahap, What is competitive Debate?, 1999).
2. *Competitive Debate*. Debate competition that clashing two debate teams as affirmative team and opposition team where the battle of argument and rebuttal between each team will be evaluated and judged by board of adjudicator at the end of debate the adjudicators will decide the winner.
3. *Debate Team*. In debate competition there are two teams, affirmative and opposition team, each team consist of three individuals as 1st, 2nd and 3rd speaker. Each speaker should bring an elaborative argument and strong rebuttal or respond toward the opponent team's argument and rebuttal.

4. *Adjudicator.* When two debate teams competing each other, the debate is adjudicated and evaluated by a debate jury or some debate juries which consist of odd number of jury, this jury is called adjudicator. Every adjudicator is usually a senior debater who already has a lot of debate competition experience and usually has an outstanding or at least good debate performance among the other debaters. This debate expertise and experiences make these individuals are trusted to be debate adjudicator. But just by being a senior debater does not make this individual to be a debate adjudicator, in fact every senior or junior debater who would like to be an adjudicator should undergone an accreditation test every year in at least one national debate competition, even senior adjudicator who already had many adjudication experience in many debate competition should also have this test, this system is to ensure the quality of every adjudicator is maintained.
5. *Contextualization or opening in a competitive debate speech.* “What is contextualization? It is basically a bunk of affirmative team’s case setup that clarifies a certain points in the debate. Contextualization explains the —history¶ of the motion. Motion does not pop up with no reason right? There is a reason why the motion of _TH Supports Ban on Pornography¶ exists. Contextualization examines the motion, and more, operates surgery to the motion so both sides have clear views on the definition and parameter which ease the further argumentations and responses.” (Muhammadin, et al., 2009)
6. *Team split in a competitive debate speech.* “Given the duration of the debate, it is best to have 2 to 4 arguments to support your point of view. These arguments should be divided between the 1st and the 2nd speaker. So, some arguments are explained by the 1st speaker and the rest are explained by the 2nd speaker. This division is called a **team split.**” (Muhammadin, et al., 2009)

7. *Rebuttal in a competitive debate speech.* “Rebuttals are responses towards the other team’s arguments. Rebuttals should prove that the other team’s arguments are not as important as they claim to be. As with arguments, mere accusations do not equal good rebuttals. It is not enough to say that the other team’s arguments are inferior, good rebuttals should also explain the reasoning and evidence of why those arguments are inferior.” (Muhammadin, et al., 2009)
8. *Grice’s Conversational Cooperative Principle.* It is a principle that is theorized by Grice to explain and discuss in deep analysis about how a conversation works under some specific situation and condition, this theory enriches the study of pragmatic.
9. *Observation of maxim.* Observation of maxim is a term which is used to indicate if the speaker obey the principle of maxim in doing the conversation, either consciously or unconsciously.
10. *Violation of maxim.* In the contrary, violation of maxim is a term which is used to indicate if the speaker violate the principle of maxim in doing the conversation, either consciously or unconsciously.

The Organization of the Study

The chapter one of this research proposal will introduce the research in the term of giving a clear description over the background of the problem that triggered the researcher to conduct this research, it is about the problem that lies behind the claim of the universality of Grice’s conversational cooperation principle of maxim and how it looks contradictory to the way how the principle of maxim is treated in the debate competition by the debating society, which raise some questions in this research about what are the maxims that mostly violated or logical fallacies committed by debating society in a debate competition, why they are doing that and how significant the result of committing those logical fallacies or maxim violation

toward the result of debate competition that the debaters join in, and the last but the least, this chapter one also explains the reason behind the selection of the population and sample and the selection of violation of maxim or argumentation logical fallacies into the focus in this focused-ethnography research in order to focussing the direction of the research.

Meanwhile the chapter 2 of this research proposal will provide a more detailed discussion over some related studies and related theories that is utilized as the platform in conducting this very research. Some of the theory that is firstly discussed are the theory of Grice's conversational cooperative principle and what are the expectation of this principle when there is any communication activity takes place. And then the second theory will be about debate and some general description about the rules in debate competition and more importantly some description about the criteria logical fallacies and some detailed explanation about the procedure that can be taken by the debaters when they encounters those logical fallacies and how to prevent logical fallacies being done by them or being done by the opponent team which might cause some disturbance in the dynamic of the debate. And lastly about the uniqueness of the standard of acceptance of argument among debate society and adjudicators in a debate competition, , eventhough it is never been recommended, but it can be employed by the debaters to manipulate their argument into winning the debate in tricky way.

The chapter three provide a deeper elaboration about how the research will be done and some theories that supporting the research methodology that is used in this research proposal. Specifically about the detail of the research instrument and research procedures step by step.

And finally the chapter four will be about data discussion and data finding, then to sum up the whole thing, the researcher provides the conclusion and recommendation in this last chapter.