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2.1 The question function space.  
2.2 The question- and assertion-function space.  
2.3 Common-ground model of information flow: Carnaps (measured information in $) flows into the common ground from the answerer’s supply, while the social value in Goffmans (€) is owed by questioner to questionee.  
2.4 ‘Commitment slate’ model of information exchange.  
2.5 The increasing costs across the question-assertion function space.  
2.6 Matching falling intonation in polar declarative question and answer. The blue (bottom) trace shows the pitch contour, the yellow (top) trace the intensity.  
2.7 The question-to-assertion function space in Yéli Dnye.  
3.1 Ideal structure of plan to construct schedule.  
3.2 Stages in determining decisions from decision-making dialogues.  
4.1 Kitchen scene 1. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010.  
4.2 Kitchen scene 2. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010.  
4.3 Kitchen scene 3. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010.  
4.4 Revised model of response relevance.  
8.1 Stylised versions of intonation contours used in the Wh-questions in Haan’s (2001) corpus. Reproduced from Haan’s Figures 4.3 and 4.4, (pp. 116–117). The boundary tones are depicted as a rise for the sake of illustration.  
8.2 Illustration of the annotation scheme used.  
10.1 Epistemic gradients for four questions.  
11.1 Epistemic gradient of ‘assertion’ (‘$\downarrow\text{A} \downarrow$’ gradient): Speaker (S) has a high commitment (Cp) to the truth of the proposition (p); Addressee (A) has a low commitment.
11.2 Epistemic gradient of ‘information question’ (‘$S↓\cdot A↑$’ gradient): Speaker (S) has a low commitment (Cp) to the truth of the proposition (p); Addressee (A) has a high commitment.

11.3 Information questions can be pragmatically invoked by lowering the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition (above), or by raising the addressee’s (below), in each case beginning from a position of symmetry, and bringing about an interrogative gradient (S↓\cdot A↑).

11.4 Schematic diagram of how SFPs can lower speaker’s commitment, either by raising it from an existing state of unknowing (above) or lowering it from a prior state of greater certainty (below).

11.5 Schematic diagram of how SFPs can create interrogative gradient ‘S↓\cdot A↑’ either by lowering speaker’s commitment (above), or raising addressee’s (below).