

A Conversational Implicature Analysis in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban

Supparawin Sommai¹ and Usa Padgate²

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาและวิเคราะห์ความหมายแฝงในบทสนทนาตามแนววจนปฏิบัติศาสตร์ใน 30 บทสนทนาของตัวละครหลักทั้ง 7 ตัวในนวนิยายของ เจ.เค. โรว์ลิง เรื่อง แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์กับนักโทษแห่งอัชคาบัน โดยใช้ทฤษฎีหลักการความร่วมมือของไกรซ์เพื่อศึกษาการละเมิดหลักการสนทนาของตัวละครหลัก นอกจากนี้การวิจัยครั้งนี้ยังอธิบายถึงวิธีที่ตัวละครหลักทั้ง 7 ตัวใช้เพื่อถ่ายทอดความหมายที่แท้จริงผ่านความหมายแฝงในบทสนทนาและวิธีที่ตัวละครอีกฝ่ายในฐานะผู้ฟังตีความความหมายที่ผู้พูดต้องการสื่อผ่านความหมายแฝงได้

ผลการวิจัยพบว่ามีความหมายแฝงทั้งหมดทั้งสิ้น 75 ข้อความ ตัวละครหลักทั้ง 7 ตัวได้กล่าวข้อความที่มีความหมายแฝงโดยมีสาเหตุมาจาก 19 สาเหตุด้วยกัน คือ เพื่อเสียดสี เพื่อประชดประชัน เพื่อยืนยันในข้อความที่พูด เพื่อการคาดการณ์ เพื่ออธิบายความ เพื่อแสดงความไม่พึงพอใจ เพื่อแสดงความสุภาพ เพื่อโน้มน้าวผู้ฟัง เพื่อตอบคำถามทางอ้อม เพื่อแสดงความไม่เห็นด้วยทางอ้อม เพื่อแสดงความคิดเห็นทางอ้อม เพื่อถามคำถามทางอ้อม เพื่อปฏิเสธทางอ้อม เพื่อเน้นความหมาย เพื่อหลีกเลี่ยงความลำบากใจ เพื่อการโกหก เพื่อเปลี่ยนหัวข้อในการสนทนา เพื่อหันเหความสนใจของผู้ฟังออกจากหัวข้อในการสนทนา และเพื่อกีดกันบุคคลที่สามออกจากการสนทนา นอกจากนี้ยังพบว่า ในการสื่อความหมายที่แท้จริงผ่านความหมายแฝงในบทสนทนาของตัวละครในฐานะผู้พูดและการตีความความหมายที่แท้จริงของตัวละครในฐานะผู้ฟังนั้นขึ้นอยู่กับ ข้อความ บริบทของสถานการณ์ พื้นความรู้ของตัวละครแต่ละตัว และความรู้ในแง่หลักการสนทนา

คำสำคัญ : ความหมายแฝงในบทสนทนา หลักการความร่วมมือ หลักการสนทนา แฮร์รี่ พอตเตอร์กับนักโทษแห่งอัชคาบัน

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this study were to pragmatically identify and analyse the conversational implicatures contained within the 30 selected dialogues of the 7 main characters in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban focusing on Grice's cooperative principle (1975) to find out whether the 7 main characters flouted or violated the conversational maxims. Moreover, the study aimed to demonstrate how the 7 main characters conveyed their intended meanings through conversational implicatures and how the others as listeners recognised the intended meanings.

The findings showed that the selected dialogues contained 75 conversational implicatures. The 7 main characters employed the conversational implicatures for 19 functions: sarcasm, irony, confirmation, guessing, clarifying, expressing dissatisfaction, politeness, conviction, indirect answers, disagreements, indirect statements, indirect questions and indirect requests, emphasizing, avoiding embarrassment, telling

¹ Graduate Student, English Major, Graduate School, Naresuan University

² Ph.D. (Literature and Film) Assit. Prof, Faculty of Humanities, Naresuan University



lies, changing the topic of the conversation, distracting the listeners from the topic of conversation and distracting the third party from the current conversation. Additionally, it was found that the ways the characters as the speakers conveyed their intended meanings and the ways the others as the listeners recognised the implicatures contained in the dialogues depended on the utterances themselves, the context of the situation, the listeners' background knowledge and the listeners' knowledge of the conversational maxims.

Keywords : Conversational Implicature, Cooperative Principle, Conversational Maxims, Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban

Introduction

Reading plays an important role in second and foreign language acquisition because the majority of ESL and EFL learners rely on reading to gain knowledge and open themselves to literature and culture of the target languages' societies (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000 : 118). Ubukawa and Ishida (2003) pointed out that reading literary works is necessary for EFL learners as a way of exposure to various uses of English. They succeeded in using Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone in EFL reading classes to motivate students to learn language and culture.

Due to the widespread success of the Harry Potter series (1997-2007) written by the British author J.K. Rowling, several studies on the series have been conducted in Thailand; for example, "An Analysis of Focus and Emphasis Constructions in Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone" (Sriwisan, 2005), "Harry Potter: An Analysis of Plot and Techniques" (Puengrattamongkol, 2007), and "A study of English

Relative Clauses in Children Literature Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban" (Muangthong, 2012). The third episode, Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban, introduces a few important characters: Remus Lupin, Sirius Black and Peter Pettigrew, who reveal the riddle of the death of

Harry's parents, and who assume more and more important roles in the following books: the situation in which Peter can escape from Harry is key to the following episodes of the series. In addition, the revealed fact that Sirius is Harry's godfather and the truth that Sirius never betrayed Harry's parents encourage Harry to be even braver in facing Voldemort as well as so many perils that are to come.

Thanks to the engaging plot and intriguing narrative of Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban, the book won several awards (Locusmag, 1999, Horror, 2002, Bloomsbury, 2011 and Goodreads, 2012). Thus, Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban was deemed suitable, and thus selected as a research material in this study.

In addition, as literary works such as the Harry Potter series are popularly used as reading materials in language classrooms, understanding dialogues is very important because readers generally receive information and get to know the characters' intentions through their dialogues (Fiction-writer-mentor, n.d.). Therefore, conversational implicature, the notion in pragmatics that can explain explicit account of how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said (Levinson, 2003), must be employed to define the implied meanings in the dialogues.

Conversational implicature has been ap-



plied in several studies on literary analysis, and researchers have stated the benefits of applying conversational implicature that it could represent an individual's speaking style (Jaiyen, 2008), that flouting the conversational maxims conveyed humor to the readers of the comic strips (Dechanan, 2010; Savetamalya, 2001), that the understanding of flouting and violating the conversational maxims could help infer the real meanings of ironical utterances (Juez, 1995 and Yao, 2010), and that the use of conversational implicature in literary analysis made the readers understand the dialogues easily as well as minimising misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the implied meanings (Risdiyanto, 2011).

Furthermore, Grice's conversational implicature and cooperative principle were beneficial for ESL and EFL teaching and learning, as the theories acted as powerful tools for efficient language teaching and learning as well as for explaining implied meanings, and as useful strategies for ESL and EFL learners for inferring accurate intended meanings of language in real life (White, 2001; Jin, 2002; Fernandez and Fontecha, 2008 and Manowong, 2011)

In Thailand, Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban has been analysed only in a grammatical aspect of relative clauses (Muangthong, 2012), and the efficiency of the book's Thai translation version (Chamroensap, 2005). To provide further perspectives to the study of the linguistics of a well-known book, this present study aimed to study and analyse the conversational implicature in the 7 main characters' dialogues of the widely popular full-length English language novel Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban. Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims were employed to examine whether the characters generally observed

the conversational maxims in order to make successful communication, and whether, when the maxims were flouted or violated, it was done to achieve certain conversational purposes as the characters saw fit according to the situations.

The research findings on the pragmatic analysis of the selected fiction Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban will assist the reading and understanding of the fictional dialogues of EFL and ESL readers for literary works appreciation. Besides, the research findings will help give rise to the use of literary works as a means to teach discourse and pragmatic skills for EFL learners who lack opportunities to acquire direct access to honing their English discourse and pragmatic skills in their daily life. Furthermore, the study attempts to apply pragmatic theories to explain the conversational implicatures of fictional dialogues. By identifying and analysing the conversational implicatures, EFL and ESL readers and learners can learn how to interpret implied meanings in conversations using fictional dialogues as their conversational models.

Research Objectives

1. To examine the 30 selected dialogues of the 7 main characters in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban to find out and identify conversational implicatures contained within the dialogues.

2. To analyse the conversational implicatures by employing conversational maxims focusing on Grice's cooperative principle to find out whether the main characters flouted or violated the conversational maxims.

3. To demonstrate how the main characters conveyed their intended meanings through conversational implicatures and how the others as listeners recognised the intended meanings.



Research Questions

1. What were the conversational implicatures contained within the 30 selected dialogues of the 7 main characters in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban?

2. How and why did the 7 main characters flout or violate the conversational maxims to achieve their conversational purposes?

3. How did the characters convey their intended meanings via conversational implicatures and how did the others as listeners recognise the intended meanings in the dialogues?

Scope of the Study

1. Thirty dialogues reflecting the flouting and violation of the conversational maxims produced by the 7 main characters: Harry Potter, Ronald Weasley, Hermione Granger, Albus Dumbledore, Remus Lupin, Sirius Black and Peter Pettigrew in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban published by Bloombury in 1999 were selected for this study.

2. Grice's theory of cooperative principle was used as a research framework in identifying and analysing the conversational implicatures in the 30 selected fictional dialogues.

Research Methodology

Research Data

The subject in the study is 30 dialogues reflecting the flouting and the violation of the conversational maxims among the 7 main characters: Harry Potter, Ronald Weasley, Hermione Granger, Albus Dumbledore, Remus Lupin, Sirius Black and Peter Pettigrew in J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban published by Bloombury in 1999.

Research Framework

Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims were employed to identify and analyse the conversational implicatures of the 30 selected fictional dialogues.

The Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) developed the concept of implicature and proposed a principle about how people use language. The concept of the cooperative principle is expressed as an expected amount of information provided in conversation as the speaker and the listener in a conversation cooperate with each other (Grice, 1975 : 45).

In short, the cooperative principle describes how people use language when they communicate. According to the principle, the listener interprets the meanings of the speaker's utterances by expecting that the speaker is being cooperative to avoid misunderstanding, and to make successful communication. However, the speaker can be deliberately uncooperative when he/she aims to convey hidden meanings through his/her utterances by flouting the conversational maxims, and when the speaker aims to tell a lie to the listener by violating the conversational maxims.

Conversational Maxims

Conversational maxims are the four sub-principles underlying the cooperative principle, that are, the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner (Grice, 1975 : 45-46 and Levinson, 2003 : 101-102).

The Maxim of Quantity: 1) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange, and 2) do not make your contribution more informative than is required



The Maxim of Quality: 1) do not say what you believe to be false, and 2) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

The Maxim of Relation: make your contributions relevant

The Maxim of Manner: 1) avoid obscurity, 2) avoid ambiguity, 3) be brief, and 4) be orderly

Grice (1975, 1989) stated that the conversational maxims can be employed to explain how people cooperate when they communicate, and can be used to identify conversational implicature, because conversational implicature occurs when the conversational maxims are flouted or violated.

Flouting the Maxims

Flouting occurs with “those contributions in which the speaker’s utterance leads the listener to understand the meaning beyond the grammatical sentence and ultimately reach the mutual goal of communication while the listener assumes that the speaker is following the Cooperative Principle” (Grice, 1967, as cited in Dechanan, 2010 : 10).

Flouting the Maxim of Quantity : the speakers give too much or too little information for purposes such as to be polite, to make jokes, etc.

Flouting the Maxim of Quality: the speakers say something that literally does not represent what they think. The speakers may flout the maxim by using figurative language such as hyperbole, metaphor, irony, banter, and sarcasm.

Flouting the Maxim of Relation: the speakers expect the listeners to be able to infer what the utterances do not literally project, and make a connection between the present utterance and the previous one (s).

Flouting the Maxim of Manner: the speakers say something obscure in an attempt to try to ex-

clude a third party from a conversation.

Violating the Maxims

The speakers violate the maxims when they know that the listeners do not know the truth and understand only the surface meaning of what is said. It can then be understood that the speakers intend to say something insincere, irrelevant, and ambiguous (Cutting, 2002 : 40-41).

Violating the Maxim of Quantity: the speakers give the listeners too little information on what is being talked about, as they do not want the listeners to have all the information.

Violating the Maxim of Quality: the speakers are not being sincere, and give the listeners the wrong information.

Violating the Maxim of Relation: the speakers want to distract the listeners by changing the topic of the conversation.

Violating the Maxim of Manner: the speakers deliberately say something ambiguous and unorganized in order to lead unclear meanings to the listeners.

Conversational Implicature

“Conversational implicature” is the term coined by Herbert Paul Grice, a philosopher of linguistics, in 1975 to refer to the implied meaning in conversation conveyed by the speakers and interpreted by the listeners based on the cooperative principle and the conversational maxims. Grice proposed the cooperative principle and its maxims for helping the listeners to be able to infer all possible meanings when “implicatures” resulted (Grice, 1975).

To interpret implicatures, Grice suggested that the listeners should pay attention to the speakers’ meanings (sometimes called speaker meanings



or utterance meanings). Speaker meaning is the meaning that a speaker intends to pass to a listener depending on the context and the speaker's particular intention (Birner, 2013). According to Grice (1975), the term "implicature" means the speaker's real intended meaning.

Data Collection

To collect the data, the researcher studied *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, identified and selected the dialogues with implied meanings based on Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims. The criteria for the selection of the dialogues were based on the 5 characteristics of conversational implicature: calculability, cancellability, nondetachability, nonconventionality and indeterminacy (Grice, 1975 : 57-58, 1989 : 41-50 and Birner, 2013 : 68-72). The 30 selected dialogues were presented to an English language expert to check and approve their validity and accuracy.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was presented in a descriptive format and was analysed and interpreted by the notion of pragmatics called conversational implicatures. The 30 selected dialogues among the 7 main characters in *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* were interpreted to reveal the speakers' intended meanings. Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims were employed to demonstrate how the characters conveyed their intended meanings through conversational implicatures and how the others as listeners inferred the intended meanings. The conversational implicatures of the 30 selected dialogues were identified and analysed according to the sequence orders of *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*.

Results

To answer the three research questions, the results could be concluded as follows:

Research Question One: What were the conversational implicatures contained within the 30 selected dialogues of the 7 main characters in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*?

Finding One: The findings revealed that the conversational implicatures derived from flouting and violating the conversational maxims occurred 75 times altogether: 52 utterances flouted the conversational maxims and 23 utterances violated the conversational maxims.

In the 30 selected dialogues, the flouting of the maxim of quality was found at the highest frequency (23 times), followed by the maxim of quantity (15 times), the maxim of manner (10 times) and the maxim of relation (4 times), respectively. In addition, the violation of the maxim of quality was found at the highest frequency (10 times), followed by the maxims of relation (6 times), the maxim of manner (5 times) and the maxim of quantity (2 times), respectively.

An example of the analysis and interpretation of flouting and violating the conversational maxims is provided below:

Dialogue 10

Setting: Harry, Ron and Hermione were climbing the steps to the Entrance Hall after they finished Potions.

Situation: While they were hurrying up the stairs, Hermione's bag split. Hermione asked Ron to help carry her school books.

Conversation:

Ron: Why are you carrying all these around with you?



Hermione: You know how many subjects I'm taking. Couldn't hold these for me, could you?

Ron: But-you haven't got any of these subjects today. It's only Defence Against the Dark Arts this afternoon.

Hermione: Oh, yes. I hope there's something good for lunch, I'm starving.

Conversational Implicature: Hermione was not being cooperative by flouting the maxim of quality as her question "could you?" did not require any answer. Hermione talked to Ron rhetorically using the question tag to emphasise that she needed his help. Besides, this statement flouted the maxim of manner, because Hermione did not make a direct request to Ron. Even though she needed Ron to help carry her books, Hermione used a rhetorical question tag functioning as an ironical statement instead of projecting direct request such as "Could you give me a hand?" or "Could you help me?".

In addition, Hermione was being uncooperative by violating the maxim of relation. In saying "I hope there's something good for lunch, I'm starving", she changed the topic of conversation from her study to lunch as she did not want Ron to talk about her school subjects, which would involve the question as to how she managed her study time and the fact that she had been given a Time-Tuner by Professor McGonagall. Thus, Hermione switched to the topic of lunch to distract Harry and Ron from any further inquiry about her school subjects.

Research Question Two: How and why did the 7 main characters flout or violate the conversational maxims to achieve their conversational

purposes?

Finding Two: The findings showed that the ways the characters flouted and violated the conversational maxims to achieve their conversational purposes depended on the context of their situation and background knowledge.

The flouting of the maxim of quality, which occurred at the highest frequency, happened when the characters wanted to convey the obviously contrary meanings to the literal meanings of the utterances (such as sarcasm, irony and metaphor), or to assert the obvious confirmation of the utterances (such as rhetorical questions and hyperbole).

Regarding the flouting of the maxim of quantity, the characters usually provided too much or too little information than they were required. The characters flouted the maxim of quantity on purposes for guessing, clarifying, expressing dissatisfaction, politeness, conviction, and indirect answers, avoiding embarrassment and emphasising.

Moreover, the characters often said something obscure, ambiguous, brief and unorganised to flout the maxim of manner in order to express disagreements, indirect statements, and indirect requests as well as in an attempt to exclude a third party from a conversation. The flouting of the maxim of manner reflected the unwillingness of the characters to deliver a straightforward message. Although the characters believed that their brief utterances were clear enough, the brief utterances could be unclear and ambiguous for the listeners.

Also, some utterances were irrelevant because their literal meaning did not correspond to the context. These utterances flouted the maxim of relation by expressing indirect statements, indirect questions and sarcasm.



In terms of violation, the maxim of quality was violated the most often by the characters through expressions of insincerity and intentions to give wrong information. They intended to tell lies on purposes for keeping secrets, avoiding embarrassment and avoiding guilts.

The maxim of relation was violated when the characters' utterances were irrelevant to the current topic of the conversation in order to distract the listeners from that particular topic.

Furthermore, the characters violated the maxim of manner by deliberately giving ambiguous utterances. They wanted to convey unclear meanings to the listeners because they did not want the listener to have clear messages of what they had said.

Lastly, the maxim of quantity was violated when the characters gave too much or too little information on the topic of the conversation. It was because they did not want the listeners to know all the information.

Research Question Three: How did the characters convey their intended meanings via conversational implicatures and how did the others as listeners recognise the intended meanings in the dialogues?

Finding Three: The findings revealed that the ways the characters as the speakers conveyed their intended meanings and the ways the others as the listeners recognised the implicatures found in the dialogues depended on the utterances themselves, the context of the situation, the background knowledge and knowledge of the conversational maxims.

In this study, 5 kinds of figurative language were used by the characters to convey their intended meanings by flouting the maxim of quality:

rhetorical question, sarcasm, metaphor, hyperbole and irony. To convey the implicatures through the maxim of quantity, the characters provided less or more information than they were required. Additionally, the intended meanings were carried via the flouting of the maxim of manner when the characters gave obscure, brief, ambiguous and unorganised utterances. The characters also conveyed their intended meanings through the flouting of the maxim of relation by giving obviously irrelevant utterances to the listeners.

The listeners' tasks were to interpret the intended meanings of the speakers based on the utterances, the situation where the utterances took place, the background information and the knowledge of conversational maxims. The listeners interpreted the implicatures when they realised that the speakers flouted the conversational maxims. For some implicatures, the utterances themselves and the situational contexts were enough for the listeners to infer the intended meanings. Background information and the sense of conventional meanings were also beneficial for the listeners to draw the inferences of the utterances in an attempt to calculate the speakers' meanings. Lastly, the listeners made use of the specific shared knowledge between the speakers and the listeners in order to arrive at the intended meanings when the speakers gave irrelevant, ambiguous and unorganised utterances. The listeners of such utterances might not be able to infer the speakers' meanings immediately; however, they usually recognised that the given utterances were irrelevant and obscure, and could interpret the inferences of the utterances later on.

In the violation of the conversational maxims, the speakers' intended meanings were hardly recognised by the listeners. According to the find-



ings, the violation of the maxims occurred when the speakers deliberately intended to lie. The maxim of quality, which was violated the most often, was violated when the speakers intended to convey insincere utterances to the listeners by giving wrong information. The speakers gave uninformative utterances via the violation of the maxim of quantity. The speakers gave too little information as they did not want the listeners to know all the truth. On the other hand, the speakers gave too much information to convince the listeners to believe what they had said. Besides, the maxim of manner was violated when the speakers intended to say obscure, ambiguous, insufficient and unorganised utterances in order to distract the listeners from the topic of the conversation. Even though the speakers gave some information, they already knew that the information was insufficient for the listeners to figure out the truth. Finally, the speakers intended to violate the maxim of relation by deliberately changing the topic of the conversation. The speakers said irrelevant utterances because they intended to distract the listeners from what was discussed to divert the listeners from finding out the truth.

The violation of the conversational maxims did not lead to effective communication as the speakers intended to tell lies, and thus, the listeners could not interpret the speakers' meanings at the time that the utterances took place. The listeners could infer the intended meanings when the truth was revealed later. However, if the listeners already knew the truth, they could immediately interpret that the speakers intended to give them wrong information.

Discussion

According to the findings, the characters deliberately flouted and violated the conversational maxims to convey their intended meanings as well as to serve their conversational purposes. These findings supported the findings of Juez (1995), Angels (2007), Jaiyen (2008), Tupan and Natalia (2008), Sudlapa (2010), Yao (2010), Risdianto (2011), and Fitri (2013). The findings also confirmed the use of figurative language in creating the conversational implicature by flouting and violating the conversational maxims which supported the studies of Juez (1995), Sudlapa (2010), Yao (2010), Risdianto (2011) and Fitri (2013). All categories of figurative language found in this study (irony, rhetorical question, hyperbole, sarcasm and metaphor) flouted the maxim of quality. Besides, the findings were in accordance with the studies of Dechanan (2010) and Hu (2012) in proving that sometimes the authors deliberately made their characters flout or violate the conversational maxims to create humor. In terms of violating the conversational maxims, the findings corresponded to those of Tupan and Natalia (2008). The characters violated the conversational maxims not only to tell lies, but also to prevent the listeners from responding and from asking further questions, to exclude the third party from the conversation, and to convince the listeners to believe in what they had said.

Moreover, the ways that the characters carried and interpreted the implied meanings observed Grice's 5 characteristics of the conversational implicature: 1) calculability: the listeners interpreted the implied meanings based on the utterances, the contexts of the situations, background knowledge and the knowledge of the conversational maxims,



2) cancellability: the speakers could cancel the implied meanings by adding some words, and the implicature would change in other situations, 3) non-detachability: the speakers could not find another way to say the same things without conveying the intended meanings in the utterances at the moment of speaking, 4) nonconventional: the listeners could not find the intended meanings in a dictionary, and 5) indeterminacy: the listeners could interpret the implied meanings in different ways depending on their contexts and shared knowledge.

Thanks to the pragmatic analysis and interpretation of the conversational implicature based on Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims, this study could assist the reading and understanding of the fictional dialogues for deeper appreciation of literary works, especially for ESL and EFL readers because misinterpretation and misunderstanding of pragmatic meanings might cause confusion and incomprehension in reading. Furthermore, the ways that the characters flouted and violated the conversational maxims to achieve their conversational purposes could raise the readers' awareness in everyday communication. Successful communication is closely related to the concept of the cooperative principle: the speakers should be cooperative by saying something brief, true, relevant and clear. Hence, this study helped the readers be more aware of conversational implicature when other people were being uncooperative to them in the real communication.

In terms of the application for ESL and EFL teaching, literature has been used as pedagogical means in language classes as reading activities, vocabulary and expression exercises, grammar and structure assignments and dictionary usage activities (Ubukawa and Ishida, 2003). This study

encouraged the use of literary works as a means to teach discourse and pragmatic skills as it has been proved that fictional dialogues could be applied as conversational models to demonstrate the interpretation of conversational implicature. Additionally, this study proved that Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims could be applied to explain implied meanings of fictional dialogues, which was also in accordance with Fernandez and Fontecha's study (2008).

According to Manowong (2011), Thai learners of English lacked pragmatic competence and performed poorly in the interpretation of conversational implicature. Thus, pragmatic teaching is an essential issue to be incorporated in EFL classrooms in Thailand. Taguchi (2003), Eslami-Rasekh (2005), and Nguyen, Pham, and Pham (2012) proved that explicit pragmatic teaching could develop the ESL and EFL learners' ability to figure out pragmatic meanings. Hence, the explicit analysis and interpretation of conversational implicatures in this study could be applied as a means to enhance pragmatic teaching.

The results of this study suggested that the knowledge of the conversational maxims could be employed to create teaching materials to enhance ESL/EFL instructions. Consequently, the researcher believes that this study could enhance the use of literary works in pragmatic teaching as well as provide a deeper understanding of conversational implicatures in fictional dialogues to ESL and EFL readers and learners. Besides, it is hoped that the attempt to apply pragmatic theories, Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims to explain the conversational implicatures would be able to assist ESL and EFL readers and learners to learn how to interpret implied meanings in conversations

as well as to develop ESL and EFL learners' pragmatic competence.

Summary of the Findings

This study was conducted to figure out the conversational implicatures in 30 selected dialogues among the 7 main characters in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims were used as frameworks to identify and analyse the data focusing on the flouting and violating of the conversational maxims. As a result of the pragmatic analysis of the 30 dialogues, Grice's theories were proved useful in explaining the conversational implicatures of fictional dialogues. It could be seen that, to convey the implied meanings, the maxim of quality was flouted at the highest frequency, followed by the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner and the maxim of relation respectively. Moreover, the maxim of quality was violated at the highest frequency, followed by the maxim of relation, the maxim of manner and the maxim of quantity respectively.

The findings also revealed that the characters of the 30 selected dialogues created the conversational implicatures for a variety of functions: sarcasm, irony, confirmation, guessing, clarifying, expressing dissatisfaction, politeness, conviction, indirect answers, disagreements, indirect statements, indirect questions and indirect requests, emphasizing, avoiding embarrassment, telling lies, changing the topic of the conversation, distracting the listeners from the topic of conversation and distracting the third party from the current conversation.

Besides, the characters created the conversational implicatures to serve their conversational purposes. Hence, the characters did not always

observe the cooperative principle when they communicated; however, the others as the listeners could infer the implied meanings based on the utterances, the literal meanings of the utterances, the contexts, background knowledge and the knowledge of the conversational maxims. In order to understand the fictional dialogues, the readers should consider not only the grammatical structures and literal meanings of words, but also the conversational implicatures in the characters' utterances. Consequently, it could be concluded that the cooperative principle and the conversational maxims played a vital role in creating conversational implicatures, and these pragmatics theories could assist the reading and understanding of the fictional dialogues of ESL and EFL readers for deeper appreciation of literary works. Additionally, the theories and fictional dialogues could be applied as teaching tools to teach discourse and pragmatic skills for ESL and EFL learners.

Recommendations for Further Studies

This study has shown that the application of Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims to identify conversational implicatures could help raise an awareness of employing genuine language materials in language classrooms. For further studies, data should be collected from other fictional sources; for examples, novels and plays. Moreover, other pragmatic theories such as neo-Grice theory and relevance theory which could be applied to the analysis should be employed.

Additionally, the use of idioms is one of the aspects that could be considered. The correlation between the characters' speaking styles and their behavioral characteristics as well as the correlation between the characters' speaking styles and their



cultures are other aspects that should be considered for further studies. Further studies on other pragmatic theories and literary aspects would be interesting as they could enhance the use of literature in language teaching and could be applied to improve ESL and EFL learners' pragmatic skills.

Acknowledgements

With the successful completion of this thesis, I would like to thank and express my sincere gratitude to Assistant Professor Dr. Usa Padgate, my thesis advisor, for her productive suggestions and her patient proofreading towards the completion of this thesis. Additionally, I am greatly grateful to the thesis co-advisors, Associate Professor Dr. Watana Padgate and Dr. Pornrawee Thunnithet, for their beneficial comments.

Besides, wholehearted thankful appreciation is given to my family and relatives for their great understanding, supportability, and encouragement throughout to the perfect end of this thesis.

References

- Angels, E. (2007). *The Implied Meanings of the Flouting Maxims in "Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire" Movie*. Master thesis, M.A., Petra Christian University, Surabaya. Indonesia.
- Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Singapore: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bloomsbury (2011). *Awards*. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from <http://harrypotter.bloomsbury.com/author/awards>
- Celce-Murcia, M. and E. Olshtain, (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamroensap (2005). *A Translation Analysis of J.K. Rowling's "Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban" from English into Thai*. Master thesis, M.A., Thammasat University, Bangkok.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Dechanan, A. (2010). *Conversational Implicature in the "Blondie and Dagwood" Comic Strips*. Independent Study, M.A., Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the Pragmatic Awareness of Language Learners. *English Language Teachers Journal*, 59(3), 199-208.
- Fernandez, B. M. and A. F. Fontecha, (2008). The Teachability of Pragmatics in SLA: Friends' Humour Through Grice. *Porta Linguarum*, 10, 31-43.
- Fitri, K. N. (2013). *The use of Figurative Language in "the Devil Wears Prada" film*. Retrieved January 28, 2013, from <http://ejournal-s1.undip.ac.id/index.php/engliterature/article/view/1270>
- Grice, P. H.(1967). *Logic and Conversation*, Published as Chapter 2 of *Studies in the Way of Words*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. In Dechanan, A. (2010). *Conversational Implicature in the "Blondie and Dagwood" Comic Strips*. Independent Study. Chiang Mai University : Chiang Mai.
- (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Retrieved March 30, 2013, from <http://www.princeton.edu/~harman/Courses/PHI534-2012-13/Lepore/Grice-Logic.pdf>.
- (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Retrieved March 30, 2013, from <http://www.princeton.edu/~harman/Courses/PHI534-2012-13/Neale/NealeOnGrice.pdf>



- Goodreads (2012). **Best Books Ever**. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from http://www.goodreads.com/list/show/1.Best_Books_Ever
- Goodreads (2012). **The Book was Better than the Movie**. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from http://www.goodreads.com/list/show/429.The_BOOK_was_BETTER_than_the_MOVIE
- Horror E.D. (2002). **Past Bram Stoker Nominees & Winners**. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from <http://www.horror.org/stokerwinnom.htm#1999>
- Hu, S. (2012). An Analysis of Humor in The Big Bang Theory from Pragmatic Perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(6), 1185-1190.
- Jaiyen, D. (2008). **Analysis of Character Dialogue in Sam Gok Literature by Chaoprayapraklang (HON): A Pragmatics Approach**. Master thesis, M.A., Kasetsart University, Bangkok.
- Jin, S. L. (2002). Interpreting Conversational Implicatures: A study of Korean Learners of English. *The Korean TESOL Journal*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Juez, L. A. (1995). Verbal irony and the Maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 8, 25-30.
- Levinson, S.C. (2003). **Pragmatics**. (15th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manowong, S. (2011). **The Study of Ability to Interpret Conversational Implicature in English of Thai EFL Learners**. Retrieved December 25, 2012, from http://iafor.org/acll_split/ACLL2011_0106.pdf
- Muangthong, W. (2012). **A Study of English Relative Clauses in Children Literature Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban**. Independent Study, M.A., Naresuan University, Phitsanulok.
- Nguyen, T. T, TH. Pham, and M. T. Pham, (2012). The Relative Effects of Explicit and Implicit Form-focused Instruction on the Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416-434.
- Puengrattanamongkol, M. (2007). **Harry Potter : An Analysis of Plot and Techniques**. Master Thesis, M.A., Naresuan University, Phitsanulok.
- Risdianto, F. (2011). A Conversational Implicature Analysis in Oscar Wilde's Short Story "Happy Prince". *Register*, 4(2), 209-226.
- Rowling, J.K. (1999). **Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban**. London: Bloombury.
- Savetamailya, S. (2011). **Conversational Implicature in the Column Laugh! it's the Best Medicine in Reader's Digest: Pragmatic study**. Chiang Mai : Faculty of Humanities Journal, Chiang Mai University.
- Sriwisan, S. (2005). **An Analysis of Focus and Emphasis Constructions in Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone**. Master thesis, M.A., Nareasuan University, Phitsanulok.
- Sudlapa, S. (2010). **An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Film Dialogues**. Master Thesis, M.A., Ramkhamhaeng University, Bangkok.
- Taguchi, N. (2008). The Role of Learning Environment in the Development of Pragmatic Comprehension: A Comparison of Gains Between EFL and ESL Learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(4), 423-452.
- The Locus Index of Science Fiction**. (1999). retrieved December 16, 2012, from <http://www.locusmag.com/index/yr1999/b38.htm>



- Tupan, A. H. and H. Natalia, (2008). The Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done by the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives. **Literature and Language Journals**, 10(1), 63-78.
- Ubukawa, E. and Y. Ishida. (2003). **Using Children's Literature in the EFL Reading Classroom**. Retrieved December 21, 2012, from <https://gair.media.gunmau.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10087/7308/1/2003-ubukawa.pdf>
- White, R. (2001). Adapting Grice's Maxims in the Teaching of Writing. **ELT Journal**, 55(1), 62-69.
- Writing Dialogue**. (2012). Retrieved November 20, 2012. from <http://www.fiction-writers-mentor.com/writing-dialogue.html>
- Yao, Q. (2010). Contribution of Cooperative Principle To the Interpretation of Irony. **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**, 1(6), 852-857.