
Specifying the Violation of Conversational Maxims Used by the Characters in Youssef El Guindi's Play "Back of the Throat"

Dhekra Ahmed Yahya Motahar Al-Darawani¹ PhD Research Scholar, Department of English, Aligarh Muslim University, India

Yasir Hassan Ahmed Al-Qudimi² PhD Research Scholar, Department of Linguistics, Aligarh Muslim University, India

Article Received: 23/06/2024

Article Accepted: 28/07/2024

Published Online: 29/07/2024

DOI:10.47311/IJOES.2024.6.7.175

Abstract

According to Grice, conversational maxims are the fundamental rules that regulate interpersonal communication. These rules state that for such communication to be effective, it should be (a) genuine, (b) as informative as is necessary, (c) pertinent to the discussion at hand, and (d) clear, organized, and concise. In most cases, violations of these maxims are assumed to be intentional in attaining a specific goal. This research seeks to find and clarify the types of cooperative principles violated in the Back of the Throat play. In addition, it aims to discover the most violated principles in the dialogue and the reasons that lead the characters in the play to violate them. This study also attempts to explore the message that the writer wants to convey by violating principles. The descriptive qualitative method was used in this study. The source data for this study is the violation-filled utterances of the characters in the Back of the Throat play. Maxim violations are used to examine the data. The results of this study demonstrate that the characters break all four types of maxims; nevertheless, the maxim of quality obtains the highest percentage of violations, 22 (39.29 percent), compared to the other maxims. Following that are the maxims of quantity and manner, which are 20 (35.71%) and 9 (16.07%), respectively. The maxim of relation is also violated 5 (8.93 %) times.

Keywords: Violation; Grice's maxims; Play; Cooperative Principle

Introduction

Language is the most significant means by which people interact. According to Siby (2015), language is primarily a communication tool among society members. Language is used to communicate people's wants and sentiments. The study of the relationship between language and situation is called Pragmatics (Grundy, 2000). According to Leech (1983), general pragmatics is a division between the study of language in general and the study of language in particular abstraction from the context and the study of more socially specialized

language uses. To make communication more effective and successful, the speaker and the listener must cooperate by adhering to the principles proposed by Grice (1975). He categorized the maxim into four sorts, namely, the maxim of quantity (be informative as required), the maxim of quality (be truthful), the maxim of relation (be relevant), and the maxim of manner (be perspicuous).

Grice defined his theory, which is known as Grice's Cooperative Principle, as follows: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975: 26). In conversation, a violation occurs when speakers purposefully fail to apply maxims in their communication to produce misunderstanding among their listeners or to achieve other goals (Grice, 1975). As Courtyard (1985) argued, when speakers decide to violate a maxim, they may not tell the truth, they may not give as much information as they could, or they may offer vague expressions. They may have some causes for violating a maxim. So, when people disobey the maxims, they violate them. Grice (1975) gave the standards of violating maxims used as notable guidelines. These are the guidelines:

1.Quantity Violation Maxim:

Whenever a speaker uses verbiage or misses to get to the subject.

When the speaker needs to provide sufficient information.

When a speaker speaks too rapidly.

When the speaker speaks extensively.

When the speaker says the same thing over and over.

2.Quality Violation Maxim:

When the speaker tells a lie or says something that would be thought to be incorrect.

When the speaker is sardonic or sarcastic.

When the speaker denies something.

When the speaker manipulates data.

3.Relation Violation Maxim:

When the speaker's dialogue is unrelated to the issue.

When the speaker abruptly changes the subject of the conversation.

When the speaker avoids addressing a topic.

When the speaker is keeping something or a fact hidden.

When the speaker makes a causal error.

4. Manner Violation Maxim:

When the speaker employs confusing terminology.

When the speaker goes overboard.

When the speaker uses slang in front of people who are unfamiliar with it.

When the speaker's voice is not sufficiently loud.

Previous studies have investigated violations of conversational maxims, examining how speakers deliberately disregard these principles in various communicative contexts.

Novebry and Rosa (2019) attempted to discover the maxim violations and to identify why characters violate the maxims of conversation using the Maxim Violation of Grice in Situational Comedy, *The Big Bang Theory*. According to the findings, 140 violated expressions were found in 336 scenes from twelve episodes, indicating that maxim quantity violation is the most common (31.4 percent). Furthermore, the researcher discovered that the reasons for violating the maxims of conversation were to avoid disturbing the listener, build one's confidence, persuade the listener (violation of maxim quality), do inaccurate causation (violation of maxim relation), and speech is a form of communication (violation of maxim manner).

Raharja and Rosyidha (2019) tried to categorize the cooperation principle maxims and explain how DoditMulyanto breached the maxims to generate more comedy in Season 4 of *Stand-up Comedy Indonesia*. They also used the cooperation principle theory and Maxim Violation to define the sorts of maxim violation, to determine the most violated maxim, and to explain the causes that led to the violation of this maxim. This study showed that all kinds of maxims were violated: relation maxim (22 times)

Quality maxim (13 times), quantity maxim (12 times), and manner maxim (2 times).

Using Grice's theory of conversational maxim, Fahmi (2016) explored the violations of the maxim in everyday talk among the EZC students of FPBS IKIP MATARAM. Maxim of quantity was the most frequently broken maxim (30 times), followed by the maxim of quality (20 times), the maxim of manner (10 times), and the maxim of relevance (5 times). The purpose of violation was cultural and social distance elements.

Waget (2015) investigated how the *Prince and the Pauper* movie violated conversational maxims in everyday language and the transgression's objective. The author utilized Grice's cooperative principle, Goffman's Face Saving as the underpinning theory, and Leech's Politeness Principle. The characters in the movie violate all the maxims. The reasons for the violation are to deceive the counterparts, be polite, save face, avoid conversation, and self-interest talk.

Mukaro et al. (2013) examined the violation of the conversational maxim in Shona public conversations. The author used Grice's cooperative principles and Hedges as the underlying theory. The result of this study shows that maxims are violated in Shona and considered as maxim clash, opting out of a maxim, and flouting of maxims.

This research was necessary because of the lack of analysis of maxim violations in Arab American literary work post-9/11 events. After 9/11, the official agents looked for everyone who was Arab or Muslim. This period reflects the brutality inherent in the investigations; the agents accuse any Arab/Muslim

without evidence just due to their background and religion. They arrested them only by their names as the title of the *Back of the Throat* play refers to the first sounds of Khaled and Asfor, which are pronounced from the Back of the throat that Western people cannot pronounce correctly (Almostafa (2015) and Lacko (2013.)).

Back of the Throat play is a remarkable portrayal of post-9/11 American fear. El Guindi investigated the paranoid influence of the accident on both sides: American and Arab American societies. El Guindi, an Arab American, expressed his dread and worry as an Arab American who has come under the scrutiny of FBI agents because of his ethnic heritage.

This study tried to discover the violations of cooperative principles maxims by the characters in Youssef El Guindi's Play "*Back of the Throat*" to fulfill specific communication requirements and the reasons behind that.

Objectives and Research Questions:

This research discusses types of the conversational maxim of Grice (1975) used by the characters in *The Back of the Throat*. To find out why and how the characters in the play violate maxims. And to identify the most frequent violation of maxim choice used by the characters in the play.

The purpose of this study was to obtain answers to these questions:

What kinds of maxims do the characters in "*Back of the Throat*" violate?

Why do the characters violate the maxims in the play?

What are the most and the least frequently violated maxims in "*Back of the Throat*"?

Methodology

This research uses descriptive qualitative approaches in which the researcher collects all the data related to the utterance in the *Back of the Throat* play by Yussef El Guindi. This play, published by Dramatists Play Service in 2006 and consisting of sixty-nine pages, shows the dread of the Arab American population in post-9/11 America. The study's researcher is concerned with the violation of conversational maxims that occurred in the play dialogue. He used data in the form of words, phrases, sentences, and clauses of the dialogue of the play "*Back of the Throat*," which violated Grice's cooperative principle.

This paper will explain how and why this linguistic phenomenon is used; the researcher serves as the primary data collector, compiles words inductively analyzes them, and ponders the meaning of utterances.

Here are the steps for data analysis:

The researcher used a close reading strategy to read the dialogue script for Yussef El Guindi's "*Back of the Throat*" play.

Using Grice's cooperative principle, the researcher classified the data into several violation maxims.

Using Grice's cooperative principle, the researcher identified the types of maxim violations and their dominant violation found in the play.

The researcher computed the percentage of maxim and dominant violations detected in the play using the following formula.

$$p = \frac{N}{T} * 100$$

Where P denotes the percentage of a specific sort of maxim. Violation, N: The number of times a particular maxim is violated. T: The number of distinct types of maxim violations. The writer developed conclusions based on the findings of the investigation.

Findings and Interpretation

The play unfolds exclusively within Khaled's studio in the post-September 11, 2001 era. This setting provides the backdrop for the academic interpretation of the violations about the four maxims of conversation.

Violating of quality maxim

Utterances that can be argued as violating the principle of quality are those that are not true, sarcastic, or give insufficient evidence and distort information. There are twenty-two cases in which characters in the play violated the principle of quality. Here are some examples of violations of quality Maxim.

Extract 1

BARTLETT: (*referring to the book*) *Huh. So, this is it.*

KHALED: *Another present from my mother. Her idea of a subtle hint* (p. 3)

Based on the context, Khaled broke the quality rule when Bartlett inquired about the Holy book (Quran), to which Khaled replied that it was a gift from his mother. As a result, it is assumed to be false since he is attempting to conceal the fact that he is religious to avoid the allegation.

Extract 2

Bartlett picks out and flips through porn magazines.

KHALED: *About - you know - the place of erotica in society.*

BARTLETT: *Uh-huh.... You think this is healthy? With cows?* (p. 10)

Here, Bartlett violates the quality principle, and his motivation is to distort information and accuse Khaled of animal cruelty. Western society has established stereotypes about Arab and Muslim people; they believe they are terrorists and try to portray them as such. Here, FBI agents make fun of Khaled.

Extract 3

KHALED: *I'm not a traitor.*

BARTLETT: *Do you understand me?*

BARTLETT (to Khaled): *If I hear another immigrant spew back to me shit about rights, I will fucking vomit You come here with shit, from shit countries, knowing nothing about anything and you have the nerve to quote the fucking law at me? Come at me with something you know nothing about?* (p. 27)

We can see from the data that Bartlett makes an ironic impression on Khaled's background. He attacks Khaled by saying he is from a shithole country and doesn't understand the law. By referring to Khaled's country derogatorily as a "shithole," Bartlett implies a sense of superiority and dismissiveness towards immigrants. This insults Khaled and suggests that Bartlett views Khaled's knowledge and experience as inherently inferior. Bartlett's statement, "If I hear another immigrant spew back to my shit about rights, I will fucking vomit," highlights his disdain for Khaled's attempt to assert his legal rights. This interaction vividly illustrates the prejudice and hostility Khaled faces, underscoring the broader themes of discrimination and power imbalance in the narrative.

Violation of Quantity Maxim

Contributions that are as informative as possible are considered as the quantity maxim. It is argued that someone has violated the Quantity maxim when disclosing more detail than necessary. Twenty utterances have violated this maxim; the following examples illustrate some of them.

Extract 4

BARTLETT: *No television?*

KHALED: *No. Too addictive. It's easier to remove the temptation.* (p. 2)

In this dialogue, Khaled's response to Bartlett's simple question, "No television?" provides more information than necessary, violating the conversational maxim of quantity. Khaled could have answered with a simple "No," but instead, he explained that he finds television too addictive and prefers to remove the temptation. While not strictly required to answer the question, this additional information portrays Khaled as cooperative and conscientious, indicating his willingness to work with government agents and attempt to maintain a normal lifestyle. By offering this extra detail, Khaled explains his choice and implicitly demonstrates his discipline and self-control, which might help mitigate any negative assumptions about him.

Extract 5

JEAN: *If I had him again...I know what I'd do with him—coming here to do that to us.*

BARTLETT: *Well, we don't know for sure if he's -.*

JEAN: *(interrupting)I'd say touch me, Kaled, so the bouncers can come and smash your stupid face in. Coming here to get off on me while all the time wanting to do shit to us. Wrapping your women in black and then sneaking in here and getting your rocks off. I could pluck your eyes out. I could bend your dick round and fuck you up your own ass.*

BARTLETT: *Your sentiments are understandable. But could you tell us what happened next?* (p. 63)

In response to Bartlett's inquiries, Jean violates the conversational maxim of quantity by providing excessive and uninformative details, deviating from the desired answer. Instead of focusing on the specifics of what happened, Jean unleashes a tirade filled with hatred and prejudice against Arabs. Her response is laden with violent and graphic imagery, revealing her deep-seated animosity towards Khaled and his heritage. This interaction highlights Jean's willingness to testify against Khaled despite the lack of clear evidence, driven by her prejudiced belief that all Arabs are inherently criminal and deviant. Throughout the play, Jean's responses consistently reflect the extent of her disdain for Khaled, underscoring the broader theme of racial and cultural prejudice.

Extract 6

KHALED: *I know my rights.*

BARTLETT: *What you have is the right to cooperate with your intelligence and do the right thing. Asking for a lawyer is a dumb move because it alerts me to a guilt you may be trying to hide. This further suggests that I need to switch gears and become more forthright in my questioning, which usually means I become unpleasant. This further irritates me because I'm a sensitive enough guy who doesn't like putting the screws on people, and that makes me start to build up resentment towards you for making me behave in ways I don't like. I am perhaps saying more than I should, but you should know where this is heading.* (p. 18)

Based on the preceding example, Bartlett breaks the quantity maxim by responding with an excessively lengthy and detailed reply when Khaled asserts his right to counsel. Khaled's statement, "I know my rights," is brief and straightforward, yet Bartlett's response is disproportionately long and detailed. By overloading the conversation with information, Bartlett overwhelms and intimidates Khaled. This excessive response goes beyond what is necessary for the context, thereby violating the maxim of quantity. Bartlett's reply shifts the power dynamic, creating an atmosphere of coercion and manipulation rather than fostering a straightforward and fair dialogue. By threatening Khaled and implying that requesting a lawyer indicates guilt, Bartlett undermines Khaled's legal rights and discourages him from seeking legal representation.

Violation of Manner Maxim

Concise, organized, and unambiguous Contributions are required under the maxim of manner. When a speaker employs imprecise language, exaggerates, or speaks too softly, he violates the principle of good manners. Nine characters' utterances violated the manner maxim in "Back of the Throat" play. The following examples illustrate some of them.

Extract 7

KHALED (to Beth): *No.*

BETH (to Khaled): *You all but said it.*

KHALED: *Why aren't you hearing what I'm saying?*

BETH: *It was a rape, Khaled. It was a rape multiplied by a thousand. You don't go up to the woman who just got raped and says; you know what, I think you probably deserved that because you go around flaunting your ass, so what do you expect. And if you want to make sure it doesn't happen again, then maybe you should go around in a fucking burqa.* (p. 47)

In the above example, Beth violates the maxim of manner by exaggerating her speech and characterizing what happened as rape to express her feelings toward Khaled. Her response is not clear and concise but instead hyperbolic and inflammatory. Beth's use of extreme language and metaphors distorts the situation, making it more difficult to understand and process the facts. By exaggerating her accusations and implying that Khaled is a traitor and terrorist based on her limited observations, she jumps to unfounded conclusions. This not only misrepresents the truth but also unfairly vilifies Khaled without concrete evidence, reflecting her deep-seated prejudice and hostility towards him.

Extract 8

BARTLETT: *Why don't you let me finish first?*

BETH: *That would make sense. His whole life seemed to be one big lie. I don't think he has an honest bone in his body. What did he do exactly?*

CARL: *We're just trying to get a better idea of who he is at this poin.* (p. 44)

In this example, Beth violates the maxim of manner by exaggerating in her speech when she claims that Khaled does not have a single honest bone in his body. Her statement, "His whole life seemed to be one big lie," is a hyperbolic expression of her anger and hatred towards Khaled rather than a balanced or objective assessment. By making such a sweeping and extreme generalization, Beth distorts the conversation and shifts focus from the details of Khaled's actions to her emotions and prejudices. This behavior reflects a broader theme of how, in the wake of September 11, individuals, including those close to the events, unfairly targeted Arabs based on stereotypes and unfounded suspicions. Beth's exaggeration demonstrates the tendency of well-known figures to act out of prejudice rather than seeking truth, revealing a societal inclination to judge and condemn individuals simply based on their ethnicity or religion.

Extract 9

KHALED: *To be an active, informed citizen? And to have a healthy interest in - sex; that's not normal?*

BARTLETT: *No. No, this isn't normal. I have to tell you, Khaled, none of this is normal. Right about now, I will place you a few feet outside of that category. You are shaping up to be a very abnormal individual. I am frankly amazed at just how abnormal everything is in your apartment. I have actually been growing quite alarmed by what we've been finding. I'm getting that uncomfortable feeling that there's more to you than meets the eye, and not in a good way. I wouldn't be surprised if we were to turn on that computer and find plans for tunneling under the White House. Or if Carl was to walk out that door having found something very incriminating indeed.* (p. 16)

In this example, Bartlett violates the maxim of manner by making inappropriate and exaggerated comments about Khaled. Bartlett's assertion that he "wouldn't be surprised if we were to turn on that computer and find plans for tunneling under the White House" is hyperbolic and highly inappropriate. Such a statement distorts the conversation with extreme and unfounded accusations, making it difficult to maintain clarity and relevance. Bartlett further exaggerates by claiming that Khaled is not a regular person and that everything in his apartment is abnormal, unfairly characterizing Khaled as inherently suspicious and dangerous. These exaggerations reveal Bartlett's prejudice and bias, contributing to a hostile and unjust atmosphere. This behavior reflects a broader issue of unfairly targeting individuals based on stereotypes and assumptions rather than evidence.

Violation of Relation Maxim

The relation maxim demands relevance between the speaker and the listener. The violation occurs when the speaker or hearer abruptly changes, avoids the conversation topic, or hides a fact. There are five violations of the relation maxim done by different characters in the play. Here are some examples:

Extract 10

BARTLETT: Would you like a glass of water before we start? KHALED: *Am I under arrest?* ? (p. 25)

In this exchange, Khaled intentionally violates the maxim of relation by refusing to answer Bartlett's question directly. When Bartlett asks, "Would you like a glass of water before we start?" Khaled responds with, "Am I under arrest?" This response is irrelevant to the question, as Khaled deliberately shifts the focus from a simple courtesy to his legal status. By doing so, Khaled avoids engaging with the agents' attempts to probe him, redirecting the conversation to a topic he deems more crucial. This tactic highlights Khaled's apprehension and desire to assert control over the interaction, possibly to protect himself from further probing or manipulation.

Extract 11

BARTLETT: *You're the writer, you tell me.*

ASFOOR: *Assalamalaykum.*

KHALED (disoriented): *I can't remember what never happened.*

ASFOOR: *Assalam alaykum.* (p. 40)

Based on the above conversation, Asfoor violates the maxim of relation by introducing an unrelated greeting, "Assalamalaykum," into the dialogue. Bartlett's question, "You're the writer, you tell me," and Khaled's disoriented response, "I can't remember what never happened," is part of a conversation with a specific context. Asfoor's greeting, repeated twice, disrupts the flow and does not directly connect to the ongoing dialogue. This interruption emphasizes that Asfoor and Khaled do not have a familiar or coordinated interaction, aligning with the author's intent to show that they do not know each other, as supported by the statements of the FBI agents and the three ladies.

Extract 12

BARTLETT: *So, what happened next? When did you go one-on-one?*

JEAN: *Well...I began my routine—the usual. I was feeling less than on that day. I had been groped earlier and was not feeling well-disposed to the horny. But I do have a work ethic, like I said, and so I danced. I always give my best.*

(She starts to sketch in some of her moves) Even to people who turn out later to be scum who want to do us harm. Did I tell you my father was a marine? Highly decorated. My outfit, in many ways, is a salute to him. That's what he was before he joined up—a cowboy out west. At night, sometimes, he'd let me wear his medals.

BARTLETT: What can you tell us about

Khaled? (p. 62)

In the above dialogue, Jean violates the maxim of relation by providing an irrelevant and self-centered response to Bartlett's inquiry. When Bartlett asks, "So, what happened next? When you went one on one?" Jean's reply diverges significantly from the question. Instead of directly addressing the encounter with Khaled, she talks about her routine, her feelings that day, and her father's background as a marine. This digression needs to be more focused and pertinent to the subject of Bartlett's inquiry, resulting in a disorganized and off-topic response. Jean's speech fails to provide the necessary information about Khaled and instead focuses on unrelated personal anecdotes, rendering her response largely nonsensical in the context of the investigation.

The characters in the play also committed multiple violations of the maxim. The example below demonstrates this.

Extract 14

BARTLETT: *I can go with that. (To Khaled) Peace be with you. (The closet doors slide open, revealing Asfoor entering the room)*

ASFOOR: *You...you help me, yes? You and me, private class. I have...I need to - to learn. Quickly. Yes? When I first came to this country - I did not know how to speak. How...even to say anything. How is one word best placed with what word next? Yes? But in my head? It is a river of beautiful speech, like in Arabic. Arabic is. It is the way into my heart. But everywhere, when I open my ears, the first thing, everywhere now is English. You cannot get away from it. Even back home, before I came, I heard it more and more from people who do not speak it. I must learn a language that is everywhere. Language that has fallen on our heads and made us like - like children again, Khaled...I know how to inspire. I know how to inspire.*

Asfoor broke the quantity and relation maxim at the end of the play when he came while Khaled was bent down. Asfoor began to speak excessively, making irrelevant remarks about Khaled's condition. Yussef El Guindi reiterated that they had no previous relationship, contrary to the claims of the agents and three women. It is possible to interpret Asfoor's breaking of the quantity and relation maxim at the play's end as a purposeful narrative decision by playwright Yussef El Guindi to address a more profound theme in the wake of the 9/11 attacks.

Breaking the rule of quantity, Asfoor talks too much and divulges more details than are pertinent or essential for the intended circumstance. He deviates from the norm by making unrelated comments regarding Khaled's health. The overabundance of information and viewpoints that follow a terrible incident such as the 9/11 attacks, which can be difficult for people to absorb and make sense of, could be represented by this excessive speech.

Additionally, Asfoor obstructs the expected flow of communication between himself and Khaled by breaking the relation maxim. Rather than attending to Khaled's urgent wants or worries, he dives into irrelevant subjects, such as their alleged lack of prior relationship. This departure from the expected conversational norms draws attention to the potential for interpersonal relationships and trust to break down after a catastrophe.

Asfoor's persona, characterized as a symbol of serenity, education, and dreaming, may counter the chaotic and disorderly world that followed 9/11. His transgression of communication best practices highlights the difficulties people encounter while attempting to navigate and comprehend the complicated post-event reality when uncertainty, disagreement, and disinformation are commonplace. The author could be making a statement on how hard it is to remain connected, clear-headed, and empathetic during tough times through Asfoor's behavior.

Discussion

Based on the results of the data analyses, several violations of cooperative principles were found in the script of *Back of the Throat* by Yussef El Guindi. The total number of violations was fifty-six. They are as follows:

Table 1. The result of the Maxim violation

Kinds of Violation Maxim	Khaled	Bartlett	Carl	Asfoor	Beth	Jean	Shelly	Frequ &Percent
Maxim of Quality	3	8	4	-	2	5	-	39.2
Maxim of Quantity	12	2	-	2	-	4	-	35.7
Maxim of Manner	-	3	1	-	4	-	1	16.0
Maxim of Relation	2	-	1	1	-	1	-	8.9
Total	17	13	6	3	6	10	1	56 (100)

This article examined the various ways and forms in which Grice's conversational maxims are violated. Through a comprehensive study and assessment of research problems related to the cooperative principle, it has been determined that the characters in Youssef El Guindi's play, *Back of the Throat*, violated all four maxims of the cooperative principle: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. According to the study's findings, as shown in the table above, the play contained fifty-six instances of maxims violation. The maxim of quality had the highest percentage of violations, with 22 instances (39.29 percent). This was followed by the maxims of quantity and manner, with 20 (35.71 percent) and 9 (16.07 percent) instances, respectively. The fewest violations occurred with the maxim of relation, which was breached only five times (8.93 percent).

Khaled, the main character, violated the maxim of quality by concealing his religious beliefs and ability to speak Arabic to avoid interrogation. Since the events of 9/11, Arabs and Muslims have been subjected to detainment and accusations of involvement in the attacks. In the play, the agents and three female characters accused Khaled of being a terrorist and having an affair with Asfoor, both of which were deemed violations of the maxim of quality.

The characters in the play violated Grice's maxims for several reasons, including lying, distorting information, mocking Arab and Islamic backgrounds, exaggerating the anger and hostility of Western peoples, providing uninformative information to express hatred and prejudice against Arabs, and using unusual language that confuses them. Additionally, the writer uses these violations to reflect a deeper desire for peace, equal rights, and education. By highlighting the negative impacts of violating these conversational norms, the writer underscores the importance of honest, clear, and respectful communication as a foundation for understanding and equality.

Furthermore, the study suggests additional reasons for the violations based on the above analysis. Characters may break the maxims to manipulate perceptions, deflect attention from their actions, or maintain power dynamics within conversations. These violations also expose the characters' prejudices and biases, reflecting broader societal issues. The writer's deliberate use of these violations critiques how prejudice, misinformation, and emotional biases hinder effective communication and understanding, ultimately advocating for a more equitable and empathetic society.

Conclusion and Suggestions

The analysis of Youssef El Guindi's play, *Back of the Throat*, reveals frequent violations of Grice's conversational maxims, reflecting the complex communication dynamics of Arab Americans in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. The fifty-six instances of maxims violations, particularly the maxim of quality, demonstrate a tendency among characters to withhold or distort information, likely as a defense against increased suspicion and scrutiny. Violations of the quantity maxim suggest

expressions of hostility and grievance, serving as a means for characters to assert their agency and resist stereotypes and institutional marginalization. Conversely, the fewer breaches of the relation maxim indicate a deliberate effort to maintain relevance and interpersonal connection despite pervasive mistrust.

These violations are not mere communicative disruptions but rather reflect broader socio-political dynamics, illustrating how traumatic events like 9/11 shaped the negotiation of identity, power relations, and resistance among marginalized communities. The study provides valuable insights into the intricacies of communication dynamics in a post-9/11 context, making it a significant supplemental resource for linguistics education. Furthermore, it highlights a notable gap in scholarly research on Arab American literary works post-9/11, emphasizing the need for further discourse analysis to fully understand and illuminate these narratives' linguistic and sociocultural intricacies. Through this analysis, we gain a deeper appreciation of the interplay between language, identity, and power in literature and its reflection on real-world issues faced by Arab Americans in a highly surveilled and prejudiced environment

References

- Almostafa, M. (2015). Re-thinking the Stereotypes and Violence Against Arabs and Arab Americans in El Guindi's *Back of the Throat* and Shamieh's *The Black Eyed*. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 10(4), 41–50.
- Coulthard, M., & Conklin, C. N. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- El Guindi, Y. (2006). *Back of the Throat*. Dramatists Play Service Inc.
- Fahmi, R. (2018). An analysis of Grice's maxims violation in daily conversation. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 91–97.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, *Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics* Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press Inc. London: Arnold.
- Jaafar, E. (2018). The dramatic representation of Islamophobia in Youssef El Guindi's *Back of the Throat*. *Al-Ustath Journal*.
- Lacko, I. (2013). Freedom Stuck in the Throat: Youssef El Guindi's *Back of the Throat* through the Prisms of an Individual Conflict and a Polarized Society. *From Theory to Practice* 2013, 257.
- Leech, G. (1983). *The Principle of Pragmatics* London: Longman.
- Mukaro, L., Mugari, V., & Dhumukwa, A. (2013). Violation of conversational maxims in Shona. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture*

(*JCLC*), 2(4), 161-168.

- Novebry, A., & Rosa, R. N. (2019). An Analysis of Maxim Violation in Situational Comedy the Big Bang Theory Season 11. *English Language and Literature*, 8(1).
- Raharja, A. U. S., & Rosyidha, A. (2019). Maxim of cooperative principle violation by DoditMulyanto in Stand-up Comedy Indonesia Season 4. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(1), 62-77.
- Sirbu, A. (2015). The significance of language as a tool of communication. *Scientific Bulletin" Mircea cel Batran" Naval Academy*, 18(2), 405.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Waget, A. (2015). Violations of Grice's maxims in The Prince and the Pauper movie. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 18(1), 1–10.