CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-76267-0 - Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives
Edited by Jan P. de Ruiter
Table of Contents
More information

Contents

List of figures *page* vii
List of contributors ix
Acknowledgements xi

1 Introduction: questions are what they do 1
JAN P. DE RUITER

Part I Questions: interplay between form and function

2 Interrogative intimations: on a possible social economics of interrogatives 11
STEPHEN C. LEVINSON

3 Structures and questions in decision-making dialogues 33
JERRY R. HOBBS

4 Mobilising response in interaction: a compositional view of questions 58
TANYA STIVERS AND FEDERICO ROSSANO

5 Wordless questions, wordless answers 81
HERBERT H. CLARK

Part II The structure and prosody of questions

6 Formal features of questions 103
JERRY SADOCK

7 Some truths and untruths about final intonation in conversational questions 123
ELIZABETH COUPER-KUHLEN

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-76267-0 - Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives
Edited by Jan P. de Ruiter
Table of Contents
More information

8 Shaping the intonation of Wh-questions: information structure and beyond 146
AOJU CHEN

Part III Questions and stance

9 Beyond answers: questions and children's learning 165
STANKA A. FITNEVA

10 Navigating epistemic landscapes: acquiescence, agency and resistance in responses to polar questions 179
JOHN HERITAGE AND GEOFFREY RAYMOND

11 Epistemic dimensions of polar questions: sentence-final particles in comparative perspective 193
N. J. ENFIELD, PENELOPE BROWN, AND JAN P. DE RUITER

12 Multi-functionality of interrogatives: asking reasons for and wondering about an action as overdone 222
MIA HALONEN AND MARJA-LEENA SORJONEN

Appendix: Key to glossing symbols 238
References 239
Index 252

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-76267-0 - Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives
Edited by Jan P. de Ruiter
Table of Contents
More information

Figures

2.1 The question function space. *page* 17
2.2 The question- and assertion-function space. 17
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. 22
2.4 'Commitment slate' model of information exchange. 22
2.5 The increasing costs across the question-assertion function space. 25
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. 26
2.7 The question-to-assertion function space in Yélî Dnye. 29
3.1 Ideal structure of plan to construct schedule. 42
3.2 Stages in determining decisions from decision-making dialogues. 47
4.1 Kitchen scene 1. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010. 65
4.2 Kitchen scene 2. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010. 70
4.3 Kitchen scene 3. Reproduced, with permission, from Stivers and Rossano 2010. 74
4.4 Revised model of response relevance. 78
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. 152
8.2 Illustration of the annotation scheme used. 154
10.1 Epistemic gradients for four questions. 181
11.1 Epistemic gradient of 'assertion' ('S↑-A↓' gradient): Speaker (S) has a high commitment (Cp) to the truth of the proposition (p); Addressee (A) has a low commitment. 194

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-76267-0 - Questions: Formal, Functional and Interactional Perspectives
Edited by Jan P. de Ruiter
Table of Contents
More information

11.2 Epistemic gradient of 'information question' ('S↓-A↑' gradient): Speaker (S) has a low commitment (Cp) to the truth of the proposition (p); Addressee (A) has a high commitment. 194
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↓-A↑). 195
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). 220
11.5 Schematic diagram of how SFPs can create interrogative gradient 'S↓-A↑' either by lowering speaker's commitment (above), or raising addressee's (below). 220

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org