

## An Outline of a Theory of Expectation<sup>1</sup>

Luiz Carlos Cagliari<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

---

The word *expectation* has been used since long time. It is a common lexical item. However, there are a few studies on its nature and functions. New perspectives on Cognitive Semantics created methodologies that allow new approaches to the theme. Language is a mirror of the mind and the language in use allows seeing how the mind functions. Expectation is closer linked to the speaker's intention and to the hearer's interpretation than to literal utterances. All communication process must be settled previously on some expectation. The speaker hopes that his hearer understands not only the literal discourse, but all untold information according to social use of the language. In this paper, the idea of expectation differs from the presuppositions, connotations and other pragmatic forms to interpret the discourse. Not only the speaker but also the hearer may create his own expectations, in the communicative process. The idea of expectation is the motivation for all kinds of thinking and speaking. It may emerge as an individual, a community, a social or a historical fact. All saying is interpreted within a frame of expectations.

---

**Keywords:** expectation, communication, cognitive semantics

### 1. Introduction

The word *expectation* is widely used in most important languages of the world. Its meaning is easily understood even by people of little education. Dictionaries give several synonyms for this word all of them easily understood. Moreover, the word *expectation* and its relative meaning appear in a variety of papers and works showing an interpretation of what the speaker or the hearer think in relation to an utterance in specific environments. Related to the idea of expectation, the languages have very common expressions like *I think that... it is my opinion about this matter... contrary to all expectations...* Since we do not make a proper theory for every word of the language, why to propose one for the idea of expectation? As a matter of fact, the study of the idea of expectations came out to be very interesting, even necessary, to explain some basic facts about the relationship between language and mind (Pinker 1995).

In spite of that, very few semanticists have developed particular researches on this topic. In the 60's and 70's, when the cognitive linguistics was emerging, the notion of *script*, *frame* and *schema* dealt with the notion of *expectation*, producing important contributions. One overview of the situation has been presented by Debora Tannen in 1979. After presenting a short history of the idea of expectation linked to the idea of frame, and her research work on the manner how English and Greek people interpret a short scene of a movie, she concludes saying:

I have shown that the notion of script, frame, and schema can be understood as structures of expectation based on past experience, and that these structures can be seen in the surface linguistic form of the sentences of a narrative.

---

<sup>1</sup>Acknowledgment: I thank CNPq for the financial support: process 304170/2013-5. I am grateful to Ana Eliza Oliveira for comments and suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> São Paulo State University (UNESP), Rodovia Araraquara-Jaú, Km 1. Araraquara, SP, Brazil. [lccagliari@gmail.com](mailto:lccagliari@gmail.com), Cel. +55 (16) 99992.9695

Furthermore, the structures of expectation which help us process and comprehend stories serve to filter and shape perception. That is why close analysis of the kinds of linguistic evidence I have suggested can reveal the expectation or frames which create them. (Tannen 1979:179).

Fillmore (1982) refers to expectation within the same Tannen's (1979) framework:

Knowing that a text is, say, an obituary, a proposal of marriage, a business contract, or a folktale, provides knowledge about how to interpret particular passages in it, how to expect the text to develop, and how to know when it is finished. It is frequently the case that such expectations combine with the actual material of the text to lead to the text's correct interpretation. Once again, this is accomplished by having in mind an abstract structure of expectations which brings with it roles, purposes, natural or conventionalized sequences of event types, and all the rest of the apparatus that we wish to associate with the notion of 'frame' (1982: 117).

Recently Cognitive linguistics gathers an impressive collection of works dealing with the relationship between mind and language. As suggestion of readings, we point out the following authors: Lakoff & Johnson 1980, Fillmore 1982, Langacker 1987, Johnson 1990, Fillmore & Atkins 1992, Searle 1992, Fauconnier 1994, Fauconnier 1999, Lakoff & Johnson 1999, Wilson & Keil 1999, Lakoff 2000, Fauconnier & Turner 2002, Kövecses 2006, Evans & Green 2006, Geeraerts & Cuyken 2007, Averbeck 2010.

Along the history of linguistics, the idea of expectation has been used widely, but without a good definition and with a diffuse meaning. The common approach is to link the idea of expectative to facts of the situational context or purely to lexicon. For instance, when one says "I think..." or "the meaning of *democracy* is different...". Sometimes this notion appears as a side effect of specific facts, as it can usually be seen in works dealing with pragmatic problems. When Austin (1975) defined the speech acts, the fact that the speaker intends to produce a verbal act with "juridical" implication on one hand and the fact that the hearer needs to recognize the social implication of the utterance and acknowledge the rightness and the speaker authority to say what he said, he was dealing with the notion of expectation in pragmatic terms. What plays an underlying acceptance of the speech act is the fact that speaker and hearer share the same expectations, if not, the speech act is not realized, and remaining only sounds of words.

All the process of learning, including language learning, is based on the assumption that someone knows that it is possible to teach someone else. What does he know? This reference to something he knows is a meaning took as an expectation. He knows it and he wants his listener to acquire the knowledge he wants to teach. Therefore, his action of teaching is based in the fact that it is possible to communicate, in order to facilitate for the listener to get the information in his mind with the elements communicated.

Bakhtin's (1979) approach to the discourse depends deeply on an underlying assumption of expectation as the support for all possible discourse and text. The author and the user of the language must agree with several ideas that are expectations how a discourse or a text must be produced and received. Furthermore, Bakhtin (1979) and many more after him recognize that the language learning and the communication process occur in an environment of mutual interaction between people. The underlying support to any interaction process is the share of expectations. If one is absent minded or is not involved in the process, there is no interaction. The bridge that makes possible ideas to be transported from one person to another is exactly the fact that both parts involved in the process share the same expectations. Expectation is a process that allows the realization of communication. Expectations facilitate the understanding to make possible evaluations of meanings, in order to create conditions for dialogue and discussion. Probably since the first use of the language, there were present an expectation by the first speaker in the sense that he expected to transmit relevant information that could be received and understood by the hearer.

When Chomsky (1965) refers to the speaker's intuition, that is, the knowledge of the language structure, facing its use, evaluating facts of the language as being correct or wrong, this process is justifiable because the speakers have an expectation in relation to the structure of their language (Root 1976). A pure knowledge remains in the person's mind as a repository of meanings without actions. Language is action. All action needs a previous expectation to be activated. A statement is affirmative or interrogative due to their syntactic and prosodic structure. In these cases, there is no required expectation. The language is a system and its system has a way to work.

For instance, prosody and syntagmatic structure are of fundamental importance to define a word (or morpheme, sequence of morphemes...). When a word is learned, several parameters play important roles: the sounds, the meaning, the syllables, the stress, the order of phonemes, the boundaries, etc. The whole set of parameters is the formal structure of that word.

In addition to that, it is created an expectation about its use that evaluate it as a correct member of the lexicon in specific sociolinguistic contexts. In this way, a word is not only phonemes and meanings. This is clear when something wrong happens. A word like "syntactic" is not composed of "syn" + "tactic" because it was introduced in the lexicon as a sequence of phonemes in a specific order, to which it has been added a specific meaning. Therefore, it is not allowed to segment that sequence into two parts as done above. The speaker's intuition has an expectation that the word cannot be interpreted in two parts. Of course, the fact that the first part "syn" has no deposit in the lexicon helps to understand why that segmentation was absolutely wrong. All types of comparison suggested above are dependent of expectations. If we look at an utterance, or better saying, at a discourse, the speaker's mind or the reader's mind picks up the whole meaning doing the appropriate word segmentation. It is very odd indeed to do differently. The cohesion force that keeps all the morphological elements correctly built is the base of the expectation in terms of words. The knowledge of the language system makes us be attentive to language structure and to language use. Certain words and expressions oblige right interpretations. This is the reason by which it is not acceptable to construct a sentence like "Unfortunately, I am happy today." The awkward situation allows the hearer to question the use of "unfortunately," that is, the speaker's expectations.

Michael Burgoon and Gerald R. Miller (1985), from a rhetorical point of view, started a theory they called LET (Language Expectancy Theory) in 1970, which has been developed and published in several papers. The main goal is the use of norms the receivers of a message must take into account in order to establish an appropriate and persuasive message. Language is viewed as a set of well-established rules which is embodied in the messages to control its success in communication. So, in the discourse, it is assumed that the sender and the receiver have the same knowledge of the language. In practice, the human relationship may disrupt the rules and there may happen violations, some positives, and other negatives. Credibility is the main point in the rhetorical use of language. Since Burgoon' (1995) work several papers appeared dealing with expectations in the rhetorical process (Miller1987, Burgoon et al. 2002). The theory presented in our paper is different, because expectation is taken as the motor of all communication process. Burgoon's approach is limited to grammar and rhetorical use of the idea of expectation.

## 2. Basic Expectations

Communication implies some basic ideas: transmission, information, sharing ideas, mental bridge between peoples, linguistic interface, new content, history, context, speaker, hearer, interaction, etc. Communication is the result of a mental activity already well elaborated upon ideas people have. It is the result of a mental process to support personal thinking and language interaction in society. The primitives of any kind of expectation is the process of thinking, the system of ideas, the language, the knowledge of the other (human being – hearer, self-conscience), right to say, right to use the language in specific contexts, right to invade somebody's mind with new ideas. This shows clearly that all kinds of communication need to depart from an expectation. In other words, expectation is the underlying support to communication. All speech act, interaction process, face to face or not, all possible discourse, all act of speaking or communicating and even of thinking must start and be justified by the fact that there is an expectation playing specific role in the process. There is no speaking, hearing, understanding without the presence of an expectation.

The most basic foundation of language, that is, the intrinsic composition of thinking (ideas) and speaking (sounds), creating words and other linguistic structures must start with an expectation. All words emerge from the possibility to associate an idea with special sequence of sounds, resulting in the most basic form of communication: the language. We may state that what generates an expectation is the experience of life. Life lives of expectations, since the birthday until the death. To be alive in the world it is necessary to cope with good and evil expectations. In this way, the experiences we pass through in our lives create our expectations for our lives. This is a mental process, but most probably, it is not unique to human beings. In this sense, expectation is a kind of mental support of life for the animals.

They can easily get consciously the feeling of danger, the necessity of eating, to protect their lives and to procreate. Certainly, the cognitive side of the animal mind needs better understanding. Dogs may respond to human language as if our language would be possible for them to understand, but not to speak. However, because of the process of communication between animal and human being, what is spoken and the animal reaction are based in supposed expectations.

### 3. Creating Prototypes

The real difference between what you really know and what you think you know has to do with your expectations about the world and the life. For instance, what is your idea of *house*? In other words, what is the expectative you have about all types of houses you came across in your live in order to define one as the prototype idea of house you choose to use when you talk about *house*? Obviously you do not put in the sounds of *house* all types of house, but one, we call the prototype representation of the category of *houses* in your mind. The other ideas about houses in your memory constitute a category of "house" that your mind will use when necessary. We could name the houses in that category as secondary expectations. The difficulty arises when facing an object or an idea, we do not have a prototypic expectation to interpret the reality being material or only a thinking. In this case, the most common solution is to incorporate new information to produce a new prototypic expectation that allows keeping thinking about it without damage to communication. The worst case leaves the individual mentally immobile, opting to remain ignorant.

### 4. Frames

In the citation presented in the beginning of this paper, Debora Tannen (1979: 179) interpret frame as expectation, showing how we understand literature through expectation, building frames. In that case, the notion of frame explains well how the listener constructs his interpretation of the novel, etc. I would say that this idea of expectation is the way the untold information from a discourse or a literary text is manipulated by the listener. Frame is understood usually as series of expectations, but it can be related to just one utterance as well. In Tannen's view, the idea of expectation associated to the notion of frame is better understood as *script* or *schema*, as suggested by her. In my view, the idea of expectation is more specific, meaning the way we build our thinking in order to speak and communicate information to other people. The relationship between frames and expectations in a sense close to the present work can be found in Evans & Green (2006). Indeed, many lexical items explicitly index a specific speech event frame, like the English expression *once upon a time*, which indexes the generic FAIRYTALE frame, bringing with it certain expectations. Speech event frames, then, are organised knowledge structures that are culturally embedded (Evans & Green 2006: 228).

### 5. Object, Objectives and Methodology

The aim of this study is to investigate how the mind create and perform the idea of expectation. To do so, the specific goals of this paper is to investigate the idea of expectation considering three language dimensions: conceptual, interpreting the language as a mirror of the mind; a language-specific level by analyzing its structure; and the communicational use of language in specific situations, that is, the interaction between speaker and listener or author and reader. This idea is common among all speakers and listeners in all languages. It is something embedded in the use of the language. It must be part of the grammar, and before that, part of the mind operations in speech. The relation between mind and language carry out things that are spoken clearly and things that remain as untold communication. Semantics has revealed a great deal of this relationship between thinking and talking. However, thinking is an inside mental experience of an individual and therefore inaccessible directly to other people.

The main objective of this study is to make explicitly what we can get when we relate language and mental work. The first thing to do is an introspective analysis of our mind, to find expectations associated to other ideas in the communicating process. It is assumed that all communicative process is totally dependent up on the linguistic framework. To think about expectation is to create a discourse about it. By analyzing this discourse, we discover the idea in the speech and in the mind. For instance, when a person says *God bless you*, we understand that this utterance express a desire. The idea of desire is an expectation not directly linked to the words *God* and *bless*. In another context, the same expression could signify "thank you", for instance, when someone receive a benefit, a tip or alms.

But that expression is understood as wishing good things to the listener. The desire is not a linguistic form of presuppositions (Ducrot 1972), neither of connotations (Lyons 1996), but of untold expectations (i.e., *I wish good things to you...*). When I say it, I know I want to transmit the greeting. On the other hand, when I say *that toy costs 20 dollars*, this utterance literally says nothing but the price. In this case, there is no expectation attached to this sentence, besides the speech act of saying something to someone (and other semantic consequences conveyed by prosody). In practice, it is difficult to imagine a linguistic situation where there exist only sounds and word meanings. The idea of frame exactly shows that we construct our communication following general and particular ideas. For instance, the frame "selling-buying" reveals all expectations the seller have to earn money, how the buyer is viewed by the seller as a possible client or not, according to the price and the type of goods; in the same way the buyer built specific expectation when come in to a shop, when he see the seller, the product, etc. The idea of frame is the best cognitive concept linked to expectations because it also explains other semantic concepts like background knowledge, cultural knowledge, linguistic knowledge etc. that play an important role in the understanding of expectations.

A second approach to the matter is more complicated. It also constitute an objective of this study to investigate the hearer's (listener's...) mind to check up if the discourse (utterance, sentence) resulted or not in the creation of the same expectation intended by the speaker. In this last case, what kind of expectation was created by the hearer? If he says something in a dialogue following the theme, something related to the untold expectations will probably be expressed in the form of comments. If he does not speak but react in some form, his behavior may be a clearly manifestation of his expectation. For instance, if someone says: *You are a thief!*...and the hearer slaps the speaker's face, it is clearly revealed that the hearer understood as an offence not as a member of a criminal gang. A simple statement arouses his fury. Another example: somebody say: *I would like to walk down to the cinema, but it looks as if it is going to rain in five minutes*. The hearer adds: *I will not lose the movie today*. The hearer said something that came out of his mind not because of what he heard, instead because of an expectation he had not to lose the film that day.

Modern Semantics has been focusing on the way the mind works. A new linguistic field called Cognitive Semantics is responsible for the development of such studies (Suárez 2010). Meaning has been interpreted from different points of view and explained with different approaches which relate language to thinking. From the seventieth of last century until today, the researchers came across to series of labels used by linguists, psychologists, neuroscientists, who contributed significantly to our knowledge of how we think and how the brain and the mind works. Old themes mixed up with new ones, the theoretical apparatus was renewed, and new explanations for old themes appeared, creating the new Semantics. The good results brought to explain the cognitive process and the relation between brain, mind, and language has consolidated the researches on cognitive Semantics. Textbooks and Handbooks are available to give a general view on the development of the field. Specific topics received special attention with notable descriptive studies, such as metaphor, metonyms, frames, scripts, blending, integrating networks, encyclopedic knowledge, categorization, focus, prototypes, imageticschemata, mental spaces, iconicity, dominium, some grammatical constructions like time and space, among others. We can say that we have a new and powerful methodology, a new tool to investigate thinking and language. On the other hand, we are still collecting selected studies to improve what has been done so far. The present study takes into consideration the new approach to describe the semantics and the grammar in general, but without trying to fit our ideas intro specific labels or linguistic trend. What we get as a result is general descriptions, examples, and possible and desirable interpretations for the idea of expectations (expectancy).

## 6. Linguistic Evidences for Expectations

The first and principal evidence that expectations exist can be found in our conscience. The reason by which we think is a desire searching for something in our mind. This process of thinking is supported by necessary expectations. In this case, we hope we will get some idea or a set of organized ideas. Even more amazing is the fact that we can communicate what we thought to somebody else, who can appropriate our ideas and think as we did. As an essential component of the mind and therefore of the language, it should be natural that we could find tips, hints, words, expressions in speech that signal to the presence of an expectation. As a matter of fact, the discourse, the dialogue, and even simple statements have words and expressions that are in the speech exactly to say to the hearer that the speaker is introducing an expectation with his speaking. Now we focus on the dimension of expectation coded in language.

Below there are a few examples found in everyday conversation:

- 1) *I think* that you understood my message.
- 2) The teacher has the *expectation* of good papers by the students.
- 3) John *believes* that Mary went swimming.
- 4) *Probably* tomorrow it will rain.
- 5) You will *find* that chapter a bit confused.
- 6) *If* you support the school, your kids will have better education.
- 7) *When* you come, please, bring a bottle of wine.
- 8) What do you do in your holidays?
- 9) I am waiting for John to come with Mary.
- 10) Beauty is in the eyes of beholder.

In 1), the verb to *think* denotes that the speaker's expectation is formulated in the sentence. In 2), the word *expectation* is expressed. In 3), the believer is defined by someone who has expectations which can be realized or not. In 4), the adverb *probably* means a doubt, and a doubt is created in function of expectations. In 5) the verb to *find* is a statement presupposed by an expectation. In 6) and 7), the conjunctions *if* and *when* are categories introductory of expectations. 8) All kinds of questions are formulated expecting that the hearer provides an answer. In 9) the expression *I am waiting for...* means that the speaker has an expectation about what he is waiting for. In 10), all types of proverbs, sayings, magical formulae, expression such as *Best wishes* are uttered with the intention that something will be happened. In this category we can include expression of desire: *I wish you be a nice kid*", etc.

Besides the word *expectation*, one of the most important words that signal the process of mental expectation is *intention*. In the examples

- (11) My intention is to travel next summer.
- (12) Her intention was to get a better job in New York, when she arrived from Texas.

In (11), the semantic content referring to travel is less important than the idea that the travel is something I intend to do. In (12), the hearer is commenting on the girl's intention. How he got that information is not expressed. The statement goes directly to the speaker's mind, interpreting what happened in a determined occasion. Knowing that, the hearer's conclusion allowed him to say what the girl's intention was. The expectation theory is so powerful that licences the intromission of somebody in another people's mind. Of course, the girl may deny saying that she was not sure about getting a better job in New York. Talking about expectations in a discourse is a way to introduce a different level of argumentation. Then, the literal meaning is no more the most important linguistic fact.

When we analyze dialogues of all sorts, narratives, conversation, etc. it is impossible to carry on the discourse without expressing some expectations. The process is so familiar and so common that we do not pay attention. The reason for this linguistic behavior is the belief that without expectation there would be no proper communication.

## 7. Subjects

Taking expectations as a mental process, the implementation of particular ideas associated to expectations can be set primarily in the people's mind. They do not need to be always revealed. On the other hand, when an individual thinks, (s)he needs the language. We are able to think only in the presence of a language system. The process of thinking in silence can be labeled as a soliloquy, a mental monologue, or even a dialogue with the speaker talking to himself. Nobody needs to express with words what he thinks. But what he says is always the external manifestation of what he thought.

Another language behavior occurs when the speaker wants to communicate any information to somebody else, that is, to the hearer (listener, reader). The message must have a purpose and this fact is based on expectations the speaker have in relation to the comprehension of the message by the hearer. When the speaker asks a question, he expects that the hearer will understand the message and that he will get an answer. These facts illustrate clearly the presence of expectations in the dialogue. The hearer may not understand, may not answer for all possible reasons. Communication may be badly disrupted. This does not invalidate the expectations the speaker had on that occasion.

The process of expectation may start in the hearer's mind as well. When we are going to talk to somebody, the fact that we decided to meet someone for conversation implies an expectation about the meeting and what we are going to hear. What he will say to me? Will it satisfy my doubts? Facing any kind of message, the hearer knows that an expectation will be attached to the message. So he must be prepared to hear what he expected to find or something unusual. Frustration is a typical case of expectation that is not accepted by the hearer. To be grateful to someone is the expression motivated by expectations.

The process of expectation involving the speaker and the hearer are highly complex. It needs to be better understood in a more comprehensive research.

There is another subject that plays an important role in the realization of expectations. It is the society, the community. The historical thinking creates expectations in future generations. Present generations act in function of historical and social expectations. The religions and believes of all sorts are good examples that people really have expectations in their lives. Fashion, social rules, traffic signals and similar things exist in function of rules and expectations. If an individual disregards the norms he will be seen as an odd person, even an outlaw. Of course, all these expectations are constructed in time by the history. If you live in society you are supposed to observe a great deal of norms, because the society expects that things run that way.

## 8. Conclusion: a theory of expectation

There are three *modus operandi* in the Cognitive Semantics for processing the hidden meanings in the language. The first is the expression of presuppositions; the second is the discovery of connotations and the third is the mental process of expectations. Presupposition is framed by linguistic expressions. Some words have a special meaning associated to them which impose to the hearer some previous knowledge in order to understand some utterances. For instance, in *John stopped smoking*, the speaker takes for granted the fact that the hearer knows that John was habitually a smoker. This obligatory knowledge comes from the use of the verb *stopped*. A person stops smoking if he smoked before. Connotation is some meaning in an utterance that is not literally expressed by any word or linguistic construction, but it emerges from his knowledge of the world, about life, costumes, society, history... (for instance: *John has only male friends*... brings to conversation that John is gay). Therefore, it is a typical pragmatic interpretation of language. Connotation may be denied, but presupposition may not be denied. In relation to expectations, we have both processes: it comes out with some special words in a typical way, like the presuppositions, or it is created in people's mind for any kind of reasons, similarly to connotations. Differently from connotations, expectations are a desired part of the meaning. Denying connotations are excuses, but denying expectations is ignoring a mental process required by the rules of language.

This short overview of the idea of expectation leads to a specific theory in the field of Cognitive Semantics, we may label a Theory of Expectation. Similarly, to other cognitive theories, this one defines special process of interpreting how we think and how we speak. Investigating the relationship between thinking and speaking, we came across to the conclusion that all thinking must start with an expectation generated in the speaker's mind. This initial frame is completed with the linguistic structure of what he will speak. Expectation plus framed speech allows the speaker to communicate something to another people. In this process, the speaker works with the expectation that the hearer will understand what he said within the frame of intelligibility shared by both of them. With this consideration, it is possible to claim that all communicative process is based on expectation. Linguistically, the speech is framed with expectations plus linguistic matter, processed accordingly to the linguistic structure of the language used in the process of communication. Going much further, it could be said that the origin of the language emerged when a human being decided to create an expectation, to communicate an idea to another human being, at the same time starting the process of building a linguistic system which became a language by the spread use among the member of the social community.

An outlook of the theory contemplates some special ideas and parameters, as shortly presented as follow:

### A) – *In relation to the speaker*

1. The beginning of all kinds of communication, including linguistic communication, starts with an expectation. Expectation plus verbal framework based on specific language constitute the frame of the message.

2. The experience of living in the world induces to the creation of words. Since this experience is multiform, the mind needs to categorize, choosing one of the forms to be the representative of a class. The corresponding word is interpreted as the prototype of the category in current speech. The way members of a category becomes prototypes is established by expectations in the speaker's mind.

3. Once defined the prototype in the speaker's mind, the word attached to it by the language system incorporate the other members of the category as secondary expectations that will play a role only when necessary.

4. Expectation plays a part in the linguistic game together with semantic phenomena of untold ideas, hidden in the message, but easily accessible through linguistic elements present in the discourse, such as presuppositions, connotations and other pragmatic interpretation of untold ideas, but necessary to complement the message and to allow the process of communication. However, expectancy is a cognitive process different from other forms of untold expression in the discourse.

5. An expectation may remain in the speaker's mind, being deduced by historical and social knowledge of the hearer life, or may be conveyed by some linguistic words and expressions that function as introductory signals meaning that what follows must be interpreted as an expectation from the mind of the speaker. In this case, the utterance reveals explicitly the expectation.

6. The proposed theory complements the structure of the semantic frames and goes further supporting all use of the language and making possible all kinds of communication.

#### B) – *In relation to the hearer*

7. The hearer behavior in terms of expectation and language structure is the same in general.

8. The hearer does not need to accept the speaker's proposal of expectation embedded in the discourse. This may happen because he did not realize that the communication came with an untold attached expectation, or because he discarded the evident expectation in favor of another one, he created in his mind. The hearer may contest, discard and refuse the speaker expectation that he thinks came with the message since it is not acceptable. The expectation is not property of the speaker neither of the hearer, however it is essential to frame any message in the communication process.

9. The hearer is allowed to interpret the message in another expectation frame that will be the untold support of the meaning according to him. This may conflict with the speaker's expectation frame and produce a semantic disruption in the discourse.

10. The process of understanding the meaning of a text in reading has a special frame that englobe the literal meaning of the words, usually associate with the prototype meaning in the reader's mind, the untold information, carried out by pragmatic processes and the reader's expectations to complete the meaning of the text in his mind. This is one of the reasons by which each reader understands a text differently from another, in some respect. They do not understand with the exact frame. This approach to a literary text, like poetry, short stories and novels, indicates that it is difficult to generalize the comprehension of a text.

#### C) – *In relation to the notion of frame*

Although I have not detailed the following questions, it seems obviously that the idea of expectation shares other cognitive notions such as frame (TANNEN, 1979), script (SCHANK, KASS, 1988), idealized cognitive models (LAKOFF) and Fillmore's (1982) prototype background, knowledge of the world and life. The notion of frame and expectation gives support to the idea of blending (FAUCONNIER, 1994). However, the idea of expectation has peculiarities, it emerges in the mind, motivated by the act of thinking, it may stay forever in the mind or it may be expressed via language, when desired or necessary for a good communication.

## References

- Abreu, Antônio Suárez (2010). *Linguística Cognitiva: uma visão geral e aplicada*. São Paulo. Ateliê Editorial.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Averbeck, Josh (2010). Irony and Language Expectancy Theory: Evaluations of Expectancy Violation Outcomes. In: *Communication Studies* Vol. 61, No. 3. Routledge. 356–372. DOI: 10.1080/10510971003776147.



- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovitch (1979). *Estetika Slovesnogo Tvortchestva*. Mascou: Iskustvo. (Portuguesetranslation: *Estética da criação verbal*. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Fontes. 1992).
- Burgoon, M. (1995). Language expectancy theory: elaboration, explication and extension. In: Berger, C. R. /M. Burgoon, (eds.) *Communication and Social Influence Processes*. Michigan State University USA, 29-51.
- Burgoon, M.; G. R. Miller (1985). An expectancy Interpretation of language and persuasion. In: Giles, H / R. St Claire, (eds.). *Recent Advances in Language Communication and Social Psychology*. London. Lawrence Erlbaum. 199-229. [ISBN 1452261598, 9781452261591]
- Burgoon, M.; Denning, V.P.; Roberts, L. A. (2002). Language and Persuasion in Dillard, J.P.; Pfau, M. *The Persuasion Handbook Developments in Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications, California, USA 117-136.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ducrot, Oswald (1972). *Dire et ne pas Dire*: principes de semantique linguistique. Paris. Hermann.
- Evans, Vyvyan; Green, Melanie (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics*: an introduction. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles (1994). *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge. MIT Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles (1999). *Mapping in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fauconnier, Gilles; Mark Turner (2002). *The Way we Think*: conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. New York: Basic Books.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1982). *Frame Semantics*. In: Linguistic Society of Korea (eds.). *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul. Hanshin, 111-137. [[http://brenocon.com/Fillmore%201982\\_2up.pdf/access 27/11/2015](http://brenocon.com/Fillmore%201982_2up.pdf/access%2027/11/2015)].
- Fillmore, Charles J.; B. T. Atkins (1992). Toward a frame-based lexicon: the semantics of risk and its neighbours. In: *Frames, Fields and Contrasts*. Lehrer, A. / E. F. Kittay (eds.). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum. 75-102.
- Geeraerts, Dick; Cuyken, Hubert (ed.) (2007) *The Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Giles, H.; Street, R. L. (1994) Communication Characteristics and Behaviour. In Knapp & Miller (eds.) *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. 2nd Edition Sage Publications, California USA, 103-161.
- Johnson, Mark. (1990). *The Body in the Mind*: bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2006). *Language, Mind and Culture*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford. Stanford University Press. 2 v.
- Lakoff, George; Mark Johnson (1980). *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George; Mark Johnson. (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh*: the embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought. New York. Basic Books.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach (2000). *The Language War*. London. The University of California Press, Ltd.
- Lyons, John (1996). *Semantics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, G. R. (1987). Persuasion, In Berger; Chafee (eds.) *Handbook of Communication Science*. Sage Publications, California USA. 446-483.
- Pinker, Steven (1995) *The Language Instinct*: how the mind creates language. New York. Harper Perennial.
- Root, Michael D. (1976) Speaker Intuitions. In: *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*. Vol. 29, No. 4. Springer. , p. 221-234.
- Searle, John (1992). *The Rediscovery of the Mind*. Cambridge, Mass. A Bradford Book / The M.I.T. Press.
- Tannen, Deborah. (1979). What's in a Frame? surface evidence for underlying expectations". In: Roy Freedle, Roy (ed.). *New Directions in Discourse Processing*. Norwood, NJ. Ablex, 137-181.
- Tannen, D. (1995). *Talking from 9 to 5*: how women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit and what gets done at work. London. Virago Press.
- Wilson, Robert A.; Keil, Frank C. (ed.) (1999) *The MIT Encyclopaedia of Cognitive Sciences*. Cambridge, MA. The MIT Press.