International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 09 - Issue 11, 2026
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 63-68

Prescriptive Etiquette vs. Cognitive Expectation in Grammar and Composition

Dr. Cristina Guarneri, MFA
Montclair State University

Abstract: This article examines the theoretical, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic distinction between grammatical etiquette and grammatical expectation across spoken and written English. Drawing on generative syntax, predictive sentence-processing research, and sociolinguistic theory, the study delineates how prescriptive etiquette operates as a social marker of register and institutional decorum, whereas cognitive expectation provides the probabilistic scaffolding necessary for real-time parsing and rhetorical coherence. Through an analysis of garden-path phenomena, intentional syntactic subversion in literature, diachronic language change, cross-cultural divergences between American and international varieties of English, and pragmatic shifts in computer-mediated communication, this paper demonstrates that prescriptive norms remain perpetually subordinate to collective cognitive habits. When social conventions impede communicative efficiency, naturalized syntactic expectations inevitably reshape formal editorial standards.

Keywords: prescriptive grammar, descriptive linguistics, predictive parsing, sociolinguistics, World Englishes, digital pragmatics, composition theory

1. Theoretical Foundations in Linguistics

In linguistic theory, the distinction between **grammatical etiquette** and **grammatical expectation** mirrors the foundational divide between *prescriptivism* and *descriptivism* (Curzan 12). **Grammatical etiquette** encompasses socially constructed conventions, prestige dialects, and codified rules of usage (Trudgill 8). Conversely, **grammatical expectation** refers to the internalized syntactic patterns and predictive processing mechanisms that native speakers rely upon to generate and decode meaning (Chomsky 15).

Grammatical Etiquette (Prescriptive Norms)

- **Definition:** A codified set of sociolinguistic directives designed to signal formal education, socioeconomic status, or institutional decorum, such as proscriptions against split infinitives, stranded prepositions, or the substitution of *who* for *whom* in objective cases (Curzan 24).
- **Sociolinguistic Function:** Operates primarily as a social shibboleth rather than a structural requirement for intelligibility. Violations rarely impede semantic comprehension; instead, they register as breaches of sociolinguistic propriety (Trudgill 19).

Grammatical Expectation (Descriptive and Cognitive Patterns)

- **Definition:** The structural framework and probabilistic anticipation of subsequent lexical and syntactic elements required for coherent parsing within a given dialect, such as standard Subject-Verb-Object constituent ordering in English (Chomsky 42).
- **Cognitive Function:** Facilitates real-time linguistic parsing and mitigates semantic ambiguity. Violations disrupt syntactic integrity, resulting in ungrammaticality or severe processing breakdown (Bever 280).

2. Application to Written Discourse and Rhetoric

Within the domain of written composition, this dichotomy expands from sentence-level syntax to macro-level discourse structure. **Writing etiquette** governs stylistic polish, register, and interpersonal decorum, whereas **writing expectation** governs rhetorical coherence and genre conventions (Pinker 27).

Writing Etiquette (Register and Stylistic Decorum)

- **Epistolary and Interpersonal Conventions:** Adhering to formal salutations, measured tone, and typographic restraint establishes ethos and signals respect for the audience (Pinker 31).
- **Orthographic and Style Guide Compliance:** Strict adherence to institutional style manuals—such as the *Chicago Manual of Style* or *APA*—demonstrates scholarly rigor and editorial consistency (Curzan 45).
- **Rhetorical Consequence of Violation:** While the core proposition remains intelligible, non-compliance undermines the author's credibility, projecting informality or carelessness (Pinker 188).

Writing Expectation (Rhetorical Coherence and Genre Schemata)

- **Macro-Structural Organization:** Readers rely on predictable organizational schemata, such as deductive thesis placement, cohesive topic sentences, and chronological sequencing in procedural texts (Pinker 141).
- **Genre Conventions:** Different rhetorical situations mandate specific structural forms; empirical research papers require standardized methodology sections, whereas narrative fiction relies on causal plot progression (Pinker 153).
- **Cognitive Consequence of Violation:** Deviating from established genre schemata induces high cognitive load, disorienting the reader and obstructing information retrieval (Pinker 160).

Table 1: Comparative Taxonomy of Etiquette and Expectation in Written Discourse

Analytical Dimension	Writing Etiquette	Writing Expectation
Primary Objective	Establishing ethos, register, and sociolinguistic alignment.	Ensuring syntactic clarity, coherence, and cognitive fluency.
Governing Mechanisms	Institutional style guides, cultural norms, and prestige standards.	Psycholinguistic processing, formal logic, and genre theory.
Representative Features	Formal salutations, avoidance of colloquialisms, standardized punctuation.	Paragraph unity, logical transitions, adherence to genre conventions.
Impact of Deviation	Sociolinguistic friction (perceived lack of professionalism or rigor).	Cognitive friction (parsing failure, ambiguity, or reader fatigue).

3. Psycholinguistic Necessity of Grammatical Expectation

Grammatical expectation is indispensable to human communication because real-time language comprehension relies on predictive processing (Bever 284). Given the rapid pace of spoken and written discourse, the human brain cannot parse every lexical item in isolation; instead, it utilizes syntactic probability to anticipate upcoming structures (Pinker 83).

Mechanisms of Predictive Parsing

- **Processing Velocity:** Natural speech occurs at approximately 150 words per minute. Syntactic expectation enables listeners to pre-activate likely grammatical categories, allowing comprehension to keep pace with acoustic input (Pinker 85).
- **Lexical Disambiguation:** English exhibits high levels of syntactic category ambiguity, with lexemes like *run* or *plant* functioning as both nouns and verbs. Surrounding syntactic cues immediately constrain interpretation, resolving potential ambiguity before conscious awareness (Bever 291).
- **Cognitive Resource Allocation:** Automated syntactic processing frees working memory to engage in higher-order semantic integration, pragmatic inference, and critical evaluation (Pinker 92).
- **Noisy-Channel Recovery:** When confronted with acoustic interference or typographical errors, robust grammatical expectations allow the brain to reconstruct degraded input seamlessly (Bever 298).

Breakdown of Predictive Parsing

- **Garden-Path Phenomena:** Sentences such as *"The old man the boat"* exploit local syntactic ambiguities to misdirect predictive parsing. The reader initially assigns *man* as a noun phrase head, necessitating costly syntactic reanalysis upon encountering the true predicate (Bever 316).
- **Processing Overload:** Prose that systematically subverts standard syntactic expectations forces the reader out of automated processing, inducing cognitive fatigue and diminishing overall comprehension (Pinker 104).

4. Intentional Subversion for Rhetorical and Literary Effect

Authors and rhetoricians frequently manipulate grammatical expectations to achieve specific aesthetic, comedic, or persuasive outcomes. Deliberately disrupting a predictable syntactic pattern forces the reader into heightened cognitive engagement (Pinker 112).

Classic Examples of Syntactic Misdirection

- **Reduced Relative Clauses:***"The horse raced past the barn fell."* The parser initially interprets *raced* as the main finite verb rather than a passive participle, creating a jarring reanalysis at the terminal verb *fell* (Bever 316).

- **Lexical-Syntactic Shift:***"Time flies like an arrow; fruit flies like a banana."* This aphorism exploits structural parallelism to pivot *flies* from an intransitive verb to a plural noun, and *like* from a comparative preposition to a transitive verb (Pinker 88).
- **Category Ambiguity:***"The complex houses married and single soldiers and their families."* Readers initially parse *complex* as an attributive adjective modifying *houses*, until the predicate *married* forces a retroactive structural reassignment (Pinker 90).

Rhetorical Strategies

- **Comedic Subversion:** Satirists establish a conventional syntactic frame to prime a predictable semantic outcome, subsequently substituting an unexpected grammatical role to generate humor (Pinker 115).
- **Mimetic Disorientation:** In literary fiction, authors deploy fragmented syntax, parataxis, or omitted punctuation to mirror psychological distress, urgency, or stream-of-consciousness states (Crystal 74).
- **Syntactic Foregrounding:** Following a series of complex, hypotactic sentences with an abrupt, elliptical fragment disrupts rhythmic habituation, thereby foregrounding critical thematic statements (Pinker 128).
- **Poetic Inversion:** Poets utilize anastrophe—such as post-positive adjectives—to satisfy metrical constraints and defamiliarize conventional imagery (Chomsky 61).

5. The Diachronic Influence of Expectation on Etiquette

Over time, grammatical expectation actively reshapes grammatical etiquette, as widespread, naturalized usage patterns inevitably displace archaic prescriptive rules (Curzan 136). Language change is driven by the collective habits of speech communities; when a construction becomes universally expected in everyday discourse, prescriptive norms must eventually accommodate it to remain relevant (Trudgill 114).

Mechanisms of Prescriptive Evolution

- **Institutionalization of Vernacular Norms:** As listeners increasingly anticipate natural phrasing, rigid adherence to obsolete etiquette begins to sound pedantic. Stranded prepositions (*"Who are you speaking with?"*) align so strongly with modern English syntax that pied-piping (*"With whom are you speaking?"*) often registers as overly formal or stilted (Pinker 198).
- **Register-Dependent Adaptation:** Expectations shift dynamically across communicative contexts. Colloquial contractions and elliptical syntax satisfy expectations in informal digital correspondence, whereas formal academic prose demands full syntactic realization (Crystal 62).
- **Prioritization of Clarity over Dogma:** When strict adherence to prescriptive dogma generates awkward or ambiguous phrasing, communicative clarity prevails. Modern style guides largely permit split infinitives (e.g., *"to boldly go"*) because adverbial placement immediately preceding the lexical verb optimizes prosodic rhythm and semantic precision (Pinker 204).
- **Pronominal Evolution:** The widespread adoption of epicene singular *they* emerged from a collective expectation for a seamless, gender-neutral third-person pronoun. As cognitive acceptance solidified, major editorial authorities formally codified it into standard academic etiquette (Curzan 168).

Prescriptive Resistance and Sociolinguistic Friction

- **Hypercorrection:** Overzealous adherence to perceived etiquette frequently violates natural grammatical expectations. Constructions such as *"between you and I"* arise when speakers misapply the nominative case rule of compound subjects to prepositional objects, where native syntax strictly expects the objective *me* (Trudgill 76).
- **Institutional Gatekeeping:** Specialized domains, such as jurisprudence and traditional academia, occasionally retain archaic prescriptive conventions despite their divergence from contemporary usage, utilizing them as markers of institutional authority and disciplinary membership (Curzan 58).

6. Cross-Cultural Variation: American vs. International English

Across global English varieties, **grammatical etiquette** diverges significantly due to regional style manuals, colonial histories, and cultural attitudes toward hierarchy (Kachru 84). Conversely, **grammatical expectation** remains structurally unified at its core, differing primarily in localized dialectal patterns and syntactic preferences (Trudgill 142).

Divergences in Grammatical Etiquette (Regional Norms and Prestige)

- **Institutional Authorities:** American etiquette is decentralized, governed by manuals such as *Chicago*, *AP*, and *MLA*, which prioritize pragmatism, brevity, and directness (Curzan 48). British and

Commonwealth standards frequently defer to historical institutions—such as *Oxford*—which preserve conservative punctuation and formal register (Trudgill 145).

- **Orthographic and Punctuation Conventions:** American etiquette mandates double quotation marks with terminal punctuation placed inside (*"like this."*), alongside the serial comma. Commonwealth and international etiquette typically favors single quotation marks with logical punctuation placed outside (*'like this'*.), omitting the serial comma unless required to resolve ambiguity (Pinker 284).
- **Politeness and Deference Markers:** In South Asian, East Asian, and many African varieties of English, grammatical etiquette emphasizes formal deference and honorific phrasing, such as *"Kindly do the needful"* or *"Respected Sir"* (Kachru 92). In contemporary American discourse, these constructions violate workplace etiquette, registering as archaic or overly subservient compared to direct imperatives (Kachru 95).

Divergences in Grammatical Expectation (Dialectal Syntax)

- **Collective Noun Concord:** American speakers expect singular verb agreement for collective nouns (*"The government is deciding"*). British, Australian, and New Zealand speakers naturally expect notional plural agreement when conceptualizing the entity as a group of individuals (*"The government are deciding"*) (Trudgill 148).
- **Tense and Aspect Preferences:** American English favors the simple past for recent completed actions (*"Did you eat yet?"*), whereas Commonwealth varieties expect the present perfect (*"Have you eaten yet?"*) (Trudgill 151).
- **Prepositional and Valency Patterns:** Regional expectations govern prepositional selection, such as American *"different than"* and *"on the weekend"* versus British *"different from/to"* and *"at the weekend"* (Trudgill 154). Similarly, outer-circle varieties such as Indian English routinely expect transitive valency for verbs like *"discuss about"* or *"order for,"* which can induce minor parsing friction for inner-circle listeners (Kachru 104).

Table 2: Cross-Cultural Comparison of Etiquette and Expectation in Global Englishes

Dimension	United States (American English)	International / Commonwealth English
Governing Ethos	Pragmatism, brevity, and democratic plain style.	Tradition, nuance, and institutional continuity.
Collective Nouns	Singular expectation (*"The committee has decided"*).	Plural expectation (*"The committee have decided"*).
Past Actions	Simple past (*"She just left"*).	Present perfect (*"She has just left"*).
Quotation Etiquette	Double quotes; punctuation inside (*"word,"*).	Single quotes; logical punctuation outside (*'word'*,).
Global Lingua Franca (ELF)	Treated as a domestic standard benchmark.	Stripped of localized idioms to prioritize cross-cultural clarity.

English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

In global contexts where English functions as a contact language among non-native speakers, **cognitive expectation supersedes traditional etiquette** (Kachru 130). International interlocutors routinely omit purely ornamental prescriptive distinctions—such as *who/whom* or the morphological subjunctive—while avoiding region-specific idioms, such as *"table a motion,"* which carries opposite meanings in American and British parliamentary procedure, to ensure universal intelligibility (Crystal 128).

7. Contemporary Shifts in Digital and Professional Discourse

Rapid evolution in computer-mediated communication (CMC) and shifting cultural paradigms are accelerating the transition from informal expectation to codified etiquette (McCulloch 14). As readers increasingly expect concise, conversational, and inclusive prose, editorial standards continue to recalibrate (Crystal 89).

Pragmatic Shifts in Digital Punctuation

- **The Pragmatic Period:** Within synchronous messaging platforms, line breaks have largely supplanted terminal punctuation as the expected boundary marker. Consequently, deploying a period at the end of a brief utterance (e.g., *"Fine."*) carries a pragmatic implicature of hostility or abruptness, inverting traditional orthographic etiquette (McCulloch 110).

- **Paralinguistic Compensation:** Because textual communication lacks prosodic and facial cues, readers expect typographic modifiers—such as exclamation points or emojis—to convey affability. An unadorned *"Thanks"* in collaborative digital workspaces may be perceived as curt, elevating *"Thanks!"* to a standard marker of collegial politeness (McCulloch 124).

Editorial Revisions in Major Style Guides

- **Codification of Singular They:** Driven by societal expectations for inclusive and accurate representation, leading lexicographical and editorial institutions have formally endorsed singular *they* for both generic and non-binary referents (Curzan 172).
- **De-capitalization of Technological Terms:** As terms like *internet* and *web* transitioned from novel proper nouns to ubiquitous infrastructural utilities, reader expectations shifted, prompting major style manuals to standardize lowercase orthography (Crystal 94).
- **Initial Coordinating Conjunctions:** Beginning sentences with *and* or *but*, historically proscribed in elementary pedagogy, is now widely accepted across journalistic and scholarly prose to enhance rhetorical flow and cohesion (Pinker 216).

Lexical and Syntactic Drift in Formal Registers

- **Semantic Bleaching of Literally:** Frequent deployment of *literally* as an emphatic intensifier has altered listener expectations in conversational English. While formal academic prose still restricts the term to its strict denotative sense, major dictionaries now document its figurative usage as an established lexical development (Curzan 149).
- **Attrition of Whom:** Outside of fossilized formulaic expressions (e.g., *"To whom it may concern"*), the inflected objective pronoun *whom* has largely vanished from spoken English expectations. Contemporary professional style increasingly favors *who* across all syntactic positions to avoid perceived affectation (Pinker 224).

8. Conclusion

Ultimately, the interplay between **grammatical etiquette** and **grammatical expectation** illustrates the dual nature of human language as both a cognitive faculty and a social institution (Chomsky 15; Trudgill 8). While **expectation** provides the foundational psycholinguistic scaffolding necessary for rapid parsing, lexical disambiguation, and structural coherence (Bever 284), **etiquette** regulates the sociolinguistic surface of discourse, signaling register, cultural alignment, and institutional ethos (Curzan 24).

As demonstrated across diachronic shifts, cross-cultural varieties, and emerging digital media, these two forces exist in a state of dynamic equilibrium rather than permanent opposition (McCulloch 14; Kachru 84). Although prescriptive etiquette frequently attempts to codify and stabilize usage, it remains perpetually subordinate to the collective cognitive habits of the speech community (Curzan 136). When social conventions impede clarity or diverge too sharply from naturalized predictive patterns, grammatical expectation inevitably reshapes etiquette to preserve communicative efficiency (Pinker 204). Consequently, mastery of both spoken and written composition requires not merely the rote memorization of prescriptive rules, but a sophisticated rhetorical awareness of when to satisfy predictive cognitive expectations and when to adhere to—or strategically subvert—sociolinguistic decorum (Pinker 27).

Declarations:
Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Works Cited

[1]. Bever, Thomas G. "The Cognitive Basis for Linguistic Structures." Cognition and the Development of Language, edited by John R. Hayes, John Wiley & Sons, 1970, pp. 279–362.
[2]. Chomsky, Noam. Syntactic Structures. Mouton, 1957.
[3]. Crystal, David. Internet Linguistics: A Student Guide. Routledge, 2011.
[4]. Curzan, Anne. Fixing English: Prescriptivism and Language History. Cambridge UP, 2014.
[5]. Kachru, Braj B. The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-native Englishes. Pergamon Press, 1986.
[6]. McCulloch, Gretchen. Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language. Riverhead Books, 2019.

[7]. Pinker, Steven. The Sense of Style: The Thinking Person's Guide to Writing in the 21st Century. Viking, 2014.
[8]. Trudgill, Peter. Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society. 4th ed., Penguin Books, 2000.