References

Acheson, D., Wells, J. & MacDonald, M. (2008). New and updated tests of print exposure and reading abilities in college students. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(1), 278–89.

Afantenos, S., Asher, N., Benamara, F., Bras, M., Fabre, C., Ho-Dac, M. et al. (2012). An empirical resource for discovering cognitive principles of discourse organisation: The Annodis Corpus. Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation. Istanbul, Turkey, 2727–34.

Aijmer, K. (2008). Comparable and parallel corpora. In A. Lüdeling and M. Kytö, eds., *Corpus Linguistics: An International Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 275–92.

Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. (2011). Pragmatic markers. In J. Zienkowski, J.-O. Ostman & J. Verschueren, eds., *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 223–47.

Al-Saif, A. & Markert, K. (2010). The Leeds Arabic Discourse Treebank: Annotating discourse connectives for Arabic. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation – LREC 2010. Valletta, Malta, 2046–53.

(2011). Modelling discourse relations for Arabic. Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Edinburgh, 736–47.

Alsaif, A. (2012). Human and Automatic Annotation of Discourse Relations for Arabic [PhD thesis]. University of Leeds.

Altenberg, B. (1999). Adverbial connectors in English and Swedish: Semantic and lexical correspondences. In H. Hasselgård & S. Oksefjell, eds., *Out of Corpora*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 249–68.

Andersson, M. & Sunberg, R. (2022). Subjectivity (re)visited: A corpus study of English forward causal connectives in different domains of spoken and written language. *Discourse Processes*, 58(3), 260–92.

Andorno, C., Benazzo, S. & Dimroth, C. (2023). Contrast marking variation in Romance and Germanic languages: Crosslinguistic and intralinguistic comparison through task-elicited speech. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.22018.and

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Anscombre, J.-C. & Ducrot, O. (1977). Deux mais en français? *Lingua*, 43(1), 23–40.

Armon-Lotem, S., De Jong, J. & Meir, N., eds. (2015). *Assessing Multilingual Children: Disentangling Bilingualism from Language Impairment*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Artstein, R. & Poesio, M. (2008). Inter-coder agreement for computational linguistics. *Computational Linguistics*, 34(4), 555–96.

Asher, N. (1993). *Reference to Abstract Objects in Discourse*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Asher, N. & Lascarides, A. (2003). *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, N., Muller, P., Bras, M., Ho-Dac, L., Benamara, F., Afantenos, S. & Vieu, L. (2017). ANNODIS and related projects: Case studies on the annotation of discourse structure. In N. Ide & J. Pustejovsky, eds., *Handbook of Linguistic Annotation* (pp. 1241–64). Dordrecht: Springer.

Asher, N. & Paul, S. (2018). Strategic conversations under imperfect information: Epistemic message exchange games. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 27, 343–85.

Asr, F. T. & Demberg, V. (2012a). Measuring the strength of linguistic cues for discourse relations. Proceedings of the Workshop on Advances in Discourse Analysis and Its Computational Aspects (ADACA). Mumbai, India, 33–42.

(2012b). Implicitness of discourse relations. Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. Mumbai, India, 2669–84.

(2013). On the information conveyed by discourse markers. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics (CMCL). Sofia, Bulgaria, 84–93.

(2020). Interpretation of discourse connectives is probabilistic: Evidence from the study of *but* and *although*. *Discourse Processes*, 57, 376–99.

Azar, M. (1999). Argumentative text as rhetorical structure: An application of Rhetorical Structure Theory. *Argumentation*, 13(1), 97–144.

Babiniotis, G. (2009). Diachronie et synchronie dynamique. *La linguistique*, 45(1), 21–36.

Bai, H. & Zhao, H. (2018). Deep enhanced representation for implicit discourse relation recognition. Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics. Santa-Fe, New Mexico, 571–83.

Baroni, M. & Bernardini, S. (2006). A new approach to the study of translationese: Machine learning the difference between original and translated text. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 21(3), 259–74.

Barth-Weingarten, D. & Couper-Kuhlen, E. (2002). On the development of final though: A case of grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 345–61.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot, H. (2008). Réflexions sur l'évolution des conjonctions temporelles en français: le cas de premier que. *Linx. Revue des linguistes de l'université Paris X Nanterre*, 59, 33–46. Département de Sciences du langage, Université Paris Ouest.

Bazzanella, C., Gili Fivela, B., Miecznikowski, J., Tini Brunozzi, F., Bosco, C. & Garcea, A. (2007). Italian allora, French alors: Functions, convergences and divergences. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 6, 9–30.

Beck, I., McKeown, M., Sinatra, G. & Loxterman, J. (1991). Revising social studies text from a text-processing perspective: Evidence of improved comprehensibility. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26, 251–75.

Beeching, K. & Detges, U., eds. (2014). *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Beijering, K. (2012). *Expressions of Epistemic Modality in Mainland Scandinavian: A Study into the Lexicalization-Grammaticalization-Pragmaticalization Interface*. (Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 106) Zutphen: Wöhrmann Print Service. Available online: http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/345722167 (accessed 14/7/2022).

Benamara Zitoune, F. & Taboada, M. (2015). Mapping different rhetorical relation annotations: A proposal. Proceedings of the Fourth Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (SEM 2015). Denver, 147–52.

Benwell, B. (1999). The organisation of knowledge in British university tutorial discourse. Issues, pedagogic discourse strategies and disciplinary identity. *Pragmatics*, 9(4), 535–65.

Bergs, A. & Hoffmann, T. (2017). Special issue on cognitive approaches to the history of English: Introduction. *English Language & Linguistics*, 21(2), 193–202.

Biber, D. & Conrad, S. (2019). *Register, Genre, and Style*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickel, B. (2010). Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: A multivariate analysis. In I. Bril, ed., *Clause-Hierarchy and Clause-Linking: The Syntax and Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 51–101.

Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford/New York: Blackwell.

(2002). *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blakemore, D. & Carston, R. (1999). The pragmatics of and-conjunctions: The non-narrative cases. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11, 1–21.

(2005). The pragmatics of sentential coordination with *and*. *Lingua*, 115(4), 569–89.

Blanchard, M. (2021). Pragmatic markers in native and non-native Englishes: A study into the use of and attitudes to pragmatic markers [PhD thesis]. KULeuven.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Blochowiak, J., Grisot, C. & Degand, L. (2020). What type of subjectivity lies behind French causal connectives? A corpus-based comparative investigation of car and parce que. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 5(1), 1.

Bloom, L., Lahey, M., Hood, L., Lifter, K. & Fiess, K. (1980). Complex sentences: Acquisition of syntactic connectives and the semantic relations they encode. *Journal of Child Language*, 7, 235–61.

Blühdorn, H. (2008). Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse: Evidence from the study of connectives. In C. Fabricius-Hansen & W. Ramm, eds., *"Subordination" Versus "Coordination" in Sentence and Text: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59–85.

Blumenthal-Dramé, A. (2021). The online processing of causal and concessive relations: Comparing native speakers of English and German. *Discourse Processes*, 58(7), 642–61.

Blything, L., Davies, R. & Cain, K. (2015). Young children's comprehension of temporal relations in complex sentences: The influence of memory on performance. *Child Development*, 86(6), 1922–34.

Bolly, C., Crible, L., Degand, L. & Uygur-Distexhe, D. (2017). Towards a model for discourse marker annotation in spoken French: From potential to feature-based discourse markers. In C. Fedriani & A. Sanso, eds., *Discourse Markers, Pragmatic Markers and Modal Particles: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 71–98.

Bolly, C. & Degand, L. (2009). Quelle(s) fonction(s) pour donc en français oral? Du connecteur conséquentiel au marqueur de structuration du discours. *Lingvisticae Investigationes*, 32(1), 1–32.

Bolton, K., Nelson, G. & Hung, J. (2002). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: Research from the International Corpus of English in Hong Kong (ICE-HK). *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7, 165–82.

Bosker, H. R., Badaya, E. & Corley, M. (2021). Discourse markers activate their, "like," Cohort Competitors. *Discourse Processes*, 58(9), 837–51.

Bouwer, A. (1998). An ITS for Dutch punctuation. *Intelligent Tutoring Systems*, 1452, 224–33.

Bransford, J. & Johnson, M. (1972). Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 717–26.

Braud, C. & Denis, P. (2014). Combining natural and artificial examples to improve implicit discourse relation identification. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Dublin, Ireland, 1694–705.

Braunwald, S. (1997). The development of BECAUSE and SO: Connecting language, thought, and social understanding. In J. Costermans & M. Fayol, eds., *Processing Interclausal Relationships: Studies in the*

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Production and Comprehension of Text. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 121–37.

Breul, C. (2007). A relevance-theoretic view on issues in the history of clausal connectives. In U. Lenker & A. Meurman-Solin, eds., *Connectives in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 167–92.

Bril, I., ed. (2010). *Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy. Syntax and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

(2011). AND and WITH conjunctive strategies in some Austronesian languages: Syntax, semantics, pragmatics. *Language and Linguistics*, 12, 239–72.

Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Britton, B., Glynn, S., Mayer, B. & Penland, M. (1982). Effects of text structure on use of cognitive capacity during reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 51–61.

Brouwer, H., Fitz, H. & Hoeks, J. (2012). Getting real about semantic illusions: Rethinking the functional role of the P600 in language comprehension. *Brain Research*, 1446, 127–43.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R. (1973). *A First Language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bunt, H., Petukhova, V., Gilmartin, E., Pelachaud, C., Fang, A., Keizer, S. & Prevot, L. (2020). The ISO Standard for Dialogue Act Annotation, Second Edition. *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, May 2020, Marseille, France.

Bunt, H. & Rashmi, P. (2016). Core concepts for the annotation of discourse relations. *Proceedings 12th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantics (ISA-12)*. Portoroz, Slovenia, 45–54.

Busquets, J., Vieu, L. & Asher, N. (2001). La SDRT: une approche de la cohérence du discours dans la traduction de la sémantique dynamique. *Verbum*, 13, 73–101.

Cain, K. & Nash, H. (2011). The influence of connectives on young readers' processing and comprehension of text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103, 429–44.

Canestrelli, A., Mak, W. & Sanders, T. (2013). Causal connectives in discourse processing: How differences in subjectivity are reflected in eye movements. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28(9), 1394–13.

Canestrelli, A., Mak, W. & Sanders. T. (2016). The influence of genre on the processing of objective and subjective causal relations: Evidence from eye-tracking. In N. Stukker, W. Spooren & G. Steen, eds., *Genre in Language, Discourse and Cognition*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 15–74.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Carlier, A., De Mulder, W. & Lamiroy, B. (2012). Introduction: The pace of grammaticalization in a typological perspective. *Folia Linguistica*, 46(2), 287–302.

Carlson, L. & Marcu, D. (2001). Discourse tagging reference manual. www.isi.edu/~marcu/discourse/tagging-ref-manual.pdf.

Caron, J., Micko, H. & Thüring, M. (1988). Conjunctions and the recall of composite sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 27, 309–23.

Carrió Pastor, M. (2015). A contrastive study of the variation of sentence connectors in academic English. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12, 192–202.

Cartoni, B., Zufferey, S. & Meyer, T. (2013a). Annotating the meaning of discourse connectives by looking at their translation. The translation spotting technique. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 4(2), 65–86.

(2013b). Using the Europarl corpus for cross-linguistic research. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 27, 23–42.

Celle, A. & Huart, R., eds. (2007). *Connectives As Discourse Landmarks*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cettolo, M., Girardi, C. & Federico, M. (2012). WIT: Web Inventory of Transcribed and Translated Talks. *Proceedings of the 16th EAMT Conference*. Trento, Italy, 261–68.

Champaud, C. & Bassano, D. (1994). French concessive connectives and argumentation: An experimental study in eight- to ten-year-old children. *Journal of Child Language*, 21, 415–38.

Charolles, M. & Fagard, B. (2012). En effet en français contemporain: De la confirmation à la justification/explication. *Le Français Moderne*, 80, 171–97.

Chen, P.-J. (2014). The comparison of intermediate and advanced Chinese learners' use of English adverbial connectors in academic writing. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 2, 85–92.

Cho, H. Y. & Shin J. A. (2014). Cohesive devices in English writing textbooks and Korean learners' English writings. *English Teaching*, 69, 41–59.

Clark, H. & Murphy, G. (1983). Audience design in meaning and reference. In J. F. LeNy & W. Kintsch, eds., *Language and Comprehension*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 287–99.

Cobb, T. (2003). Teaching and researching writing. *System*, 31(1), 132–36.

Çokal, D., Zeyrek, D. & Sanders, T. J. M. (2020). Subjectivity and objectivity in Turkish causal connectives? Results from a first corpus study on çünkü and için. In D. Zeyrek & U. Özge, eds., *Discourse Meaning. The View from Turkish*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 223–48.

Combettes, B. (2013). Quelques aspects de la "subordination" en ancien et moyen français. In J.-M. Debaisieux, ed., *Analyses linguistiques sur corpus: Subordination et insubordination en français contemporain*. Paris: Hermès, 99–139.

Crewe, W. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44, 316–25.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Crible, L. (2018). *Discourse Markers and (Dis)fluency: Forms and Functions across Languages and Registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(2020). Weak and strong discourse markers in speech, chat and writing: Do signals compensate for ambiguity in explicit relations? *Discourse Processes*, 57(9), 793–807.

(2022). The syntax and semantics of coherence relations: From relative configurations to predictive signals. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 27(1), 59–92.

Crible, L., Abuczki, Á., Burkšaitienė, N., Furkó, P., Nedoluzhko, A., Rackevičienė, S., Oleškevičienė, G. V. & Zikánová, Š. (2019). Functions and translations of discourse markers in TED Talks: A parallel corpus study of underspecification in five languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 142, 139–55.

Crible, L. & Cuenca, M. (2017). Discourse markers in speech: Characteristics and challenges for annotation. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 8(2), 149–66.

Crible, L. & Degand, L. (2019a). Domains and functions: A two-dimensional account of discourse markers. *Discours*, 24, 1–35.

(2019b). Reliability vs. granularity in discourse annotation: What is the trade-off? *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 15(1), 71–99.

Crible, L. & Demberg, V. (2020). When do we leave discourse relations underspecified? The effect of formality and relation type. *Discours*, 26, 1–27.

Crible, L. & Gabarró-López, S. (2021). Coherence relations across speech and sign language: A comparable corpus study of additive connectives. *Languages in Contrast*, 21(1), 58–81.

Crible, L. & Pickering, M. (2020). Compensating for processing difficulty in discourse: Effect of parallelism in contrastive relations. *Discourse Processes*, 57, 862–79.

Crible, L., Wetzel, M. & Zufferey, S. (2021). Lexical and structural cues to discourse processing in first and second language. *Frontiers in Psychology: Language Sciences*, 12, 1–16.

Crible, L. & Zufferey, S. (2015). Using a unified taxonomy to annotate discourse markers in speech and writing. *Proceedings of the 11th Joint ISO-ACL/SIGSEM Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation*. London, 14–22.

Cristofaro, S. (2003). *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crossley, S., Kyle, K. & McNamara, D. (2016). The development and use of cohesive devices in L2 writing and their relations to judgments of essay quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 1–16.

Crosson, A. & Lesaux, N. (2013). Does knowledge of connectives play a unique role in the reading comprehension of English learners and English-only students? *Journal of Research in Reading*, 36(3), 241–60.

Crosson, A., Lesaux, N. & Martiniello, M. (2008). Factors that influence comprehension of connectives among language minority children from Spanish-speaking backgrounds. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 29, 603–25.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Cuenca, M.-J. (2022). Translating discourse markers: Implicitation and explicitation strategies. In M. J. Cuenca & L. Degand, eds., *Translating Discourse Markers: Implicitation and Explicitation Strategies*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 215–46.

Cuenca, M.-J., Postolea, S. & Visconti, J. (2019). Contrastive markers in contrast. *Discours*, 25, 33p.

Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000). The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser like and quotative like. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(1), 60–80.

Danlos, L., Rysová, K., Rysová, M. & Stede, M. (2018). Primary and secondary discourse connectives: Definitions and lexicons. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 9(1), 50–78.

Daradoumis, T. (1996). Towards a representation of the rhetorical structure of interrupted exchanges. In G. Adorni & M. Zock, eds., *Trends in Natural Language Generation: An Artificial Intelligence Perspective*. Berlin: Springer, 106–24.

Das, D. & Taboada, M. (2013). Explicit and implicit coherence relations: A corpus study. *Proceedings of the Canadian Linguistic Association (CLA) Conference*.

(2018). Signaling of coherence relations in discourse, beyond discourse markers. *Discourse Processes*, 55(8), 743–70.

(2019). Multiple signals of coherence relations. *Discours*, 24.

De Beaugrande R.-A. & Dressler, U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

De Carolis, B., Pelachaud, C. & Poggi, I. (2000). Verbal and nonverbal discourse planning. *Proceedings of Fourth International Conference on Autonomous Agents, Workshop on Achieving Human-Like Behaviour in Interactive Animated Agents*. Barcelona, Spain, 4p.

De Marneffe, M.-C., Manning, C. D., Nivre, J. & Zeman, D. (2021). Universal dependencies. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(2), 255–308.

Debaisieux, J.-M. (2002). Le fonctionnement de parce que en français parlé: Étude quantitative sur corpus. In C. D. Pusch & W. Raible, eds., *Romanistische Korpuslinguistik – Korpora und gesprochene Sprache, Romance Corpus Linguistics, Corpora and Spoken Language*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 349–76.

(2016). Toward a global approach to discourse uses of conjunctions in spoken French. *Language Sciences*, 58, 79–94.

Degand, L. (2000). Contextual constraints on causal sequencing in informational texts. *Functions of Language*, 7(2), 173–201.

(2004). Contrastive analyses, translation and speaker involvement: The case of puisque and aangezien. In M. Achard & S. Kemmer, eds., *Language, Culture and Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 251–70.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2009). On describing polysemous discourse markers. What does translation add to the picture? In S. Slembrouck, M. Taverniers & M. van Herreweghe, eds., *From Will to Well: Studies in Linguistics Offered to Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen*. Ghent: Academia Press, 173–84.

(2011). Connectieven in de rechterperiferie. Een contrastieve analyse van dus en donc in gesproken taal [Connectives in the right periphery. A contrastive analysis of dus and donc in spoken language]. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 16(3), 333–48.

(2014). "So very fast very fast then": Discourse markers at left and right periphery in spoken French. In K. Beeching & U. Detges, eds., *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden: Brill, 151–78.

(2019). Causal relations between discourse and grammar: Because in spoken French and Dutch. In O. Loureda, I. Recio Fernández, L. Nadal & A. Cruz, eds., *Empirical Studies of the Construction of Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 131–50.

(2023). Form and function of discourse markers in spoken French [Keynote speech]. *International Conference on Discourse Markers: Theories and Methods*. May 26, 2023. https://dmtheoriesmethods.sciencesconf.org/.

Degand, L., Broisson, Z., Crible, L. & Grzech, K. (2022). Cross-linguistic variation in spoken discourse markers: Distribution, functions, and domains. In E. Peterson, J. Kern & T. Hiltunen, eds., *Discourse-Pragmatic Variation and Change: Theory, Innovations, Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 83–104.

Degand, L., Cornillie, B. & Pietrandrea, P. (2013). Discourse markers and modal particles: Two sides of the same coin? Introduction. In L. Degand, B. Cornillie & P. Pietrandrea, eds., *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles Categorization and Description*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–18.

Degand, L. & Crible, L. (2021). Discourse markers at the peripheries of syntax, intonation and turns. Towards a cognitive-functional unit of segmentation. In D. Van Olmen & J. Šinkūnienė, eds., *Pragmatic Markers and Peripheries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 19–48.

Degand, L. & Evers-Vermeul, J. (2015). Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers? More than a terminological issue. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 16(1), 59–85.

Degand, L. & Fagard, B. (2011). Alors between discourse and grammar: The role of syntactic position. *Functions of Language*, 18(1), 29–56.

(2012). Competing connectives in the causal domain. French car and parce que. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(2), 154–68.

Degand, L. & Hadermann, P. (2009). Structure narrative et connecteurs temporels en français langue seconde. In E. Havu et al., eds., *La*

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Langue en Contexte. Actes du Colloque Représentations du sens Linguistique IV. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 19–34.

Degand, L., Lefèvre, N. & Bestgen, Y. (1999). The impact of connectives and anaphoric expressions on expository discourse comprehension. *Document Design*, 1, 39–51.

Degand, L. & Pander Maat, H. (2003). A contrastive study of Dutch and French causal connectives on the Speaker Involvement Scale. In A. Verhagen & J. M. van de Weijer, eds., *Usage-Based Approaches to Dutch*. Utrecht: LOT, 175–99.

Degand, L. & Sanders, T. (2002). The impact of relational markers on expository text comprehension in L1 and L2. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15, 739–57.

Degand, L. & Simon, A. C. (2009). On identifying basic discourse units in speech: Theoretical and empirical issues. *Discours*, 4.

Degand, L. & Simon-Vandenbergen, A.-M. (2011). Introduction: Grammaticalization and (inter)subjectification of discourse markers. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 287–94.

Denturck, K. (2012). Explicitation vs. implicitation: A bidirectional corpus-based analysis of causal connectives in French and Dutch translations. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13(2), 211–27.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2009). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia, eds., *The New Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, 623–47.

Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

(2004). *The Acquisition of Complex Sentences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(2005). Competing motivations for the ordering of main and adverbial clauses. *Linguistics*, 43(3).

Diewald, G. (2002). A model for relevant types of contexts in grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 103–20.

(2010). On some problem areas in grammaticalization studies. In K. Stathi et al., eds., *Grammaticalization: Current Views and Issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17–50.

Dixon, R. M. W. & Aikhenvald, A. Y., eds. (2011). *The Semantics of Clause Linking: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Don, Z. & Sriniwass, S. (2017). Conjunctive adjuncts in undergraduate ESL essays in Malaysia: Frequency and manner of use. *Moderna Språk*, 111, 99–117.

Dragon, N., Berendes, K., Weinert, S., Heppt, D. & Stanat, P. (2015). Ignorieren grundschulkinder konnektoren? Untersuchung einer bildungssprachlichen komponente. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 18(4), 803–25.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Drenhaus, H., Demberg, V., Köhne, J. & Delogu, F. (2014). Incremental and predictive discourse markers: ERP studies on German and English. *Proceedings of the 36th annual conference of the cognitive science society*. Quebec, Canada, 403–08.

Ducrot, O. (1983). Puisque: Essai de description polyphonique. *Revue Romane*, 24, 166–85.

Dupont, M. (2021). *Conjunctive Markers of Contrast in English and French: From Syntax to Lexis and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dupont, M. & Zufferey, S. (2017). Methodological issues in the use of parallel directional corpora: A case study with English and French concessive connectives. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 22(2), 270–97.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

(2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge, and instruction. In R. Ellis et al., eds., *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing, and Teaching*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 3–30.

Evans, N. & Levinson, S. (2009). The myth of language universals. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 429–92.

Evers-Vermeul, J., Degand, L., Fagard, B. & Mortier, L. (2011). Historical and comparative perspectives on subjectification: A corpus-based analysis of Dutch and French causal connectives. *Linguistics*, 49(2), 445–78.

Evers-Vermeul, J., Hoek, J. & Scholman, M. (2017). On temporality in discourse annotation: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 8(2), 1–20.

Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2009). The emergence of Dutch connectives; How cumulative cognitive complexity explains the order of acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 36(4), 829–54.

(2011). Discovering domains – on the acquisition of causal connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1645–62.

Fabricius-Hansen, C. & Ramm, W., eds. (2008). *"Subordination" versus "Coordination" in Sentence and Text: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fagard, B. & Degand, L. (2010). Cause and subjectivity, a comparative study of French and Italian. *Lingvisticae Investigationes*, 33(2), 179–93.

Falkum, I. & Vicente, A. (2015). Polysemy: Current perspectives and approaches. *Lingua*, 157, 1–16.

Fedriani, C. & Sansó, A. (2017). *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ferstl, E. & von Cramon, D. (2001). The role of coherence and cohesion in text comprehension: An event-related fMRI study. *Brain Research. Cognitive Brain Research*, 11, 325–40.

Field, Y. & Yip, L. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23, 15–28.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Fischer, K. (2006a). Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: Introduction to the volume. In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (pp. 1–20). Elsevier Science Publishers.

ed. (2006b). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Emerald Group Publishing.

(2014). Discourse markers. In K. Schneider & A. Barron, eds., *Pragmatics of Discourse*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 271–94.

Fischer, O., Norde, M. & Perridon, H., eds. (2004). *Up and Down the Cline – The Nature of Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fox Tree, J. & Schrock, J. (1999). Discourse markers in spontaneous speech: Oh what a difference an oh makes. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 40(2), 280–95.

Franken, N. (1996). Pour une nouvelle description de puisque. *Revue Romane*, 31(1), 3–17.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6(2), 167–90.

(1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(7), 931–52.

(2006). On the conceptual-procedural distinction. *Style*, 40(1–2), 24–32.

(2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1(2), 293–320.

French, L. & Brown, A. (1977). Comprehension of before and after in logical and arbitrary sequences. *Journal of Child Language*, 4, 247–56.

Freywald, U. (2016). Clause integration and verb position in German – Drawing the boundary between subordinating clause linkers and their paratactic homonyms. *Linguistische Berichte*, 21, 181–220.

Frith, C. (1992). *The Cognitive Neuropsychology of Schizophrenia*. Hove: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Frith, U. (1989). *Autism: Explaining the Enigma*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gabarró-López, S. (2019). When the meaning of same is not restricted to likeness: A preliminary study from the perspective of discourse relational devices in two sign languages. *Discours*, 24.

Gast, V. (2019). An exploratory, corpus-based study of concessive markers in English, German and Spanish: The distribution of *although*, *obwohl* and *aunque* in the Europarl corpus. In O. Loureda et al., eds., *Empirical Studies of the Construction of Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 151–92.

Gast, V. & Diessel, H., eds. (2012a). *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Data-Driven Approaches to Cross-Clausal Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

(2012b). The typology of clause linkage: Status quo, challenges, prospects. In V. Gast & H. Diessel, eds., *Clause Linkage in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–36.

Gernsbacher, M. A. (1997). Coherence cues mapping during comprehension. In J. Costermans & M. Fayol, eds., *Processing Interclausal*

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Relationships. Studies in the Production and Comprehension of Text. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 3–21.

Geva, E. (1992). The role of conjunctions in L2 text comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 731–47.

Giacalone Ramat, A. & Mauri, C. (2008). From cause to contrast: A study in semantic change. In E. Verhoeven et al. eds., *Studies on Grammaticalization*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 303–20.

(2011). The grammaticalization of coordinating interclausal connectives. In B. Heine & N. Heiko, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 656–67.

(2012). Gradualness and pace in grammaticalization: The case of adversative connectives. *Folia Linguistica*, 46(2), 483–512.

Givón, T. (2009). *The Genesis of Syntactic Complexity: Diachrony, Ontogeny, Neurocognition, Evolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Godfrey, J., Holliman, E. & McDaniel, J. (1992). SWITCHBOARD: Telephone speech corpus for research and development. *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*. San Francisco, 517–20.

Goldman, S. & Murray, J. (1992). Knowledge of connectors as cohesion devices in text: A comparative study of native-English and English-as-a-second-language speakers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 504–19.

Gonsalez, D., Cáceres, M., Bento-Gaz, A. & Befi-Lopes, D. (2012). The complexity of narrative interferes in the use of conjunctions in children with specific language impairment. *Jornal da Sociedade Brasileira de Fonoaudiologia*, 24, 152–56.

Goutsos, D. (2017). A corpus-based approach to functional markers in Greek. Exploring the role of position. In C. Fedriani & A. Sansó, eds., *Pragmatic Markers, Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: New Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 125–47.

Granger, S. (2014). A lexical bundle approach to comparing languages. Stems in English and French. *Languages in Contrast*, 14(1), 58–72.

Granger, S., Gilquin, G. & Meunier, F., eds. (2015). *The Cambridge Handbook of Learner Corpus Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Granger, S., Hung, J. & Petch-Tyson, S., eds. (2002). *Computer Learner Corpora, Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Granger, S. & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15, 17–27.

Groupe lambda-L. (1975). Car, parce que, puisque. *Revue Romane*, 10, 248–80.

Grosz, B. & Sidner, C. (1986). Attention, intentions and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 12, 175–204.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Gülzow, I., Bartlitz, V., Kuehnast, M., Golcher, F. & Bittner, D. (2018). The adversative connectives aber and but in conversational corpora. *Journal of Child Language*, 45, 1212–26.

Günthner, S. (1996). From subordination to coordination? Verb-second position in German causal and concessive constructions. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 323–56.

Ha, M.-J. (2014). A corpus-based study on Korean EFL learners' use of English logical connectors. *International Journal of Contents*, 10, 48–52.

Haberlandt, K. (1982). Reader expectations in text comprehension. In J. F. Le Ny & W. Kintsch, eds., *Language and Language Comprehension*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 239–49.

Haberlandt, K. & Bingham, G. (1978). Verbs contribute to the coherence of brief narratives: Reading related and unrelated sentence triples. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 17, 419–25.

Haiman, J. & Thompson, S. A., eds. (1989). *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hall, A. (2007). Do discourse connectives encode concepts or procedures? *Lingua*, 117(1), 149–74.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Hallin, A., Garcia, G. & Reuterkiöld, C. (2016). The use of causal language and filled pauses in children with and without autism. *Child Development Research*, 2016, 8535868.

Halverson, S. (2004). Connectives as a translation problem. In H. Kittel et al., eds., *An International Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 562–72.

Hamed, M. (2014). Conjunctions in argumentative writing of Libyan tertiary students. *English Language Teaching*, 7, 108–20.

Hansen, M.-B. M. (1997). Alors and donc in spoken French: A reanalysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(2), 153–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00086-0.

(2006). A dynamic polysemy approach to the lexical semantics of discourse markers (with an exemplary analysis of French *toujours*). In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Brill, 21–41.

Haselow, A. (2012). Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the negotiation of common ground in spoken discourse: Final particles in English. *Language & Communication*, *32*(3), 182–204.

(2017). *Spontaneous Spoken English: An Integrated Approach to the Emergent Grammar of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haspelmath, M. (2007). Coordination. In T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, volume 2: Complex Constructions. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–51.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Hasselgård, H. (2020). Corpus-based contrastive studies: Beginnings, developments and directions. *Languages in Contrast*, 20(2), 184–208.

Hasselgren, A. (1994). Lexical teddy bears and advanced learners: A study into the ways Norwegian students cope with English vocabulary. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 237–58.

Haugh, M. (2008). Utterance-final conjunctive particles and implicature in Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics*, 18(3), 425–51.

Hawkins, J. (2019). Word-external properties in a typology of Modern English: A comparison with German. *English Language and Linguistics*, 23(3), 701–27.

Heim, J. M. (2019). Turn-peripheral management of common ground: A study of Swabian gell. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 141, 130–46.

Heine, B. (2002). On the role of context in grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 83–101.

(2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics*, 51(6), 1205–47.

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, B., Kaltenböck, G, Kuteva, T. & Long, H. (2021). *The Rise of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hesson, A. & Shellgren, M. (2015). Discourse marker like in real time: Characterizing the time-course of sociolinguistic impression formation. *American Speech*, 90(2), 154–86.

Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning*, 12(2), 111–32.

Hobbs, J. (1983). Why is discourse coherent? In F. Neubauer, ed., *Coherence in Natural Language Texts*. Hamburg: Buske, 29–70.

Hoek, J., Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2018). Segmenting discourse: Incorporating interpretation into segmentation? *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 14(2), 357–86.

Hoek, J., Zufferey, S., Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2017). Cognitive complexity and the linguistic marking of coherence relations. A parallel corpus study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121(1), 113–31.

(2019). Linguistic marking of coherence relations: Interactions between connectives and segment-internal elements. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 25(2), 275–309.

Hopper, P. & Traugott, E. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hovy, E. & Maier, E. (1994). Parsimonious or profligate: How many and which discourse structure relations? Unpublished Manuscript.

Hu, C. & Li, Y. (2015). Discourse connectives in L1 and L2 argumentative writing. *Higher Education Studies*, 5, 30–41.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Ibáñez, R., Moncada, F., Cárcamo, B. & Marín, V. (2020). Signaling of causal relations in Spanish: Variety, functionality, and specificity. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 11(1), 40–61.

Ide, N. & Pustejovsky, J. (2017). *Handbook of Linguistic Annotation*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Iordanskaja, L. & Mel'čuk, I. (1999). Textual connectors across languages: French *en effet* vs. Russian *v samon dele*. *RASK*, 9(10), 305–47.

Irwin, J. & Pulver, C. (1984). Effects of explicitness, clause order, and reversibility on children's comprehension of causal relationships. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 399–407.

Izutsu, M. N. (2008). Contrast, concessive, and corrective: Toward a comprehensive study of opposition relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(4), 646–75.

Izutsu, M. N. & Izutsu, K. (2014). Truncation and backshift: Two pathways to sentence-final coordinating conjunctions. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 15(1), 62–92.

Janssens, L., Drooghmans, S. & Schaeken, W. (2015). 'But': Do age and working memory influence conventional implicature processing? *Journal of Child Language*, 42(3), 695–708.

Johansson, S. (1998). On the role of corpora in cross-linguistic research. In S. Johansson & S. Oksefjell, eds., *Corpora and Cross-Linguistic Research: Theory, Method and Case Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 3–24.

(2007). *Seeing through Multilingual Corpora. On the Use of Corpora in Contrastive Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kail, M. & Weissenborn, J. (1984). A developmental cross-linguistic study of adversative connectives: French 'mais' and German 'aber/sondern'. *Journal of Child Language*, 11, 143–58.

Kaltenböck, G., Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2011). On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language*, 35(4), 852–97.

Kamalski, J., Lentz, L., Sanders, T. & Zwaan, R. (2008). The forewarning effect of coherence markers in persuasive discourse: Evidence from persuasion and processing. *Discourse Processes*, 45(6), 545–79.

Kamalski, J., Sanders, T. & Lentz, L. (2008). Coherence marking, prior knowledge, and comprehension of informative and persuasive texts: Sorting things out. *Discourse Processes*, 45(4–5), 323–45.

Kamp, H. & Reyle, U. (1993). *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Modeltheoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kanno, Y. (1989). The use of connectives in English academic papers written by Japanese students. In Y. Otsu, ed., *MITA Working Papers in Psycholinguistics*, 2, 41–51.

Keenan, J., Baillet, S. & Brown, P. (1984). The effects of causal cohesion on comprehension and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 23, 115–26.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Keller, R. (1995). The epistemic weil. In D. Stein & S. Wright, eds., *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation. Linguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16–30.

Keskes, I., Benamara, F. & Belguith Hadrich, L. (2014). Learning explicit and implicit Arabic discourse relations. *Journal of King Saud University Computer and Information Sciences*, 26(4), 398–416.

Kidd, E., Donnelly, S. & Christiansen, M. (2018). Individual differences in language acquisition and processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 22(2), 154–69.

Kidd, E., Lieven, E. & Tomasello, M. (2006). Examining the role of lexical frequency in the acquisition and processing of sentential complements. *Cognitive Development*, 21, 93–107.

Kim, S. H. & Sohn, S.-O. (2015). Grammar as an emergent response to interactional needs: A study of final kuntey 'but' in Korean conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 83, 73–90.

Kleijn, S., Mak, W. & Sanders, T. (2021). Causality, subjectivity and mental spaces: Insights from online discourse processing. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 32(1), 35–65.

Kleijn, S., Pander Maat, H. & Sanders, T. (2019). Comprehension effects of connectives across texts, readers, and coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 56(5–6), 447–64.

Knoepke, J., Richter, T., Isberner, M.-B., Naumann, J., Neeb, Y. & Weinert, S. (2017). Processing of positive-causal and negative-causal coherence relations in primary school children and adults: A test of the cumulative cognitive complexity approach in German. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(2), 297–328.

Knott, A. & Dale, R. (1994). Using linguistic phenomena to motivate a set of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 18(1), 35–62.

Koehn, P. (2005). Europarl: A parallel corpus for statistical machine translation. *Proceedings of MT Summit 2005*. Phuket: Thailand, 79–86.

Köhne, J. & Demberg, V. (2013). The time-course of processing discourse connectives. *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*. Austin, 2760–65.

Köhne-Futterer, J., Drenhaus, H., Delogu, F. & Demberg, V. (2013). The online processing of causal and concessive discourse connectives. *Linguistics*, 59(2), 417–48.

Kolachina, S., Prasad, R., Sharma, D. & Joshi, A. (2012). Evaluation of discourse relation annotation in the Hindi discourse relation bank. *Proceedings of LREC 2012*. Istanbul, Turkey, 823–28.

Kong, K. (1998). Are simple business request letters really simple? A comparison of Chinese and English business request letters. *Text*, 18(1), 103–41.

König, E. (1985). On the history of concessive connectives in English. Diachronic and synchronic evidence. *Lingua*, 66(1), 1–19.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(1988). Concessive connectives and concessive sentences: Cross-linguistic regularities and pragmatic principles. In J. Hawkins, ed., *Explaining Language Universals*. Oxford & New York: Blackwell, 110–24.

(2012). Contrastive linguistics and language comparison. *Languages in Contrast*, 12(1), 3–26.

König, E. & Siemund, P. (2000). Causal and concessive clauses: Formal and semantic relation. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann, eds., *Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 341–60.

König, E. & Traugott, E. C. (1988). Pragmatic strengthening and semantic change: The conventionalizing of conversational implicature. In W. Hüllen & R. Schulze, eds., *Understanding the Lexicon*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kortmann, B. (1996). *Adverbial Subordination: A Typology and History of Adverbial Subordinators Based on European Languages*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Krezeszowski, T. (1990). *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kunz, K. & Lapshinova-Koltunski, E. (2015). Cross-linguistic analysis of discourse variation across registers. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 14(1), 258–88.

Kupersmitt, J. & Armon-Lotem, S. (2019). The linguistic expression of causal relations in picture-based narratives: A comparative study of bilingual and monolingual children with TLD and DLD. *First Language*, 39(3), 319–43.

Kyratzis, A., Guo, J. & Ervin-Tripp, S. (1990). Pragmatic conventions influencing children's use of causal constructions in natural discourse. In K. Hall et al., eds., *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley, 205–14.

Labov, W. (1972). Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society*, 1, 97–120.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Laippala, V., Kyröläinen, A.-J., Kanerva, J. & Ginter, F. (2021). Dependency profiles in the large-scale analysis of discourse connectives. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 17(1), 143–75.

Lambda-l, G. (1975). "Car, parce que, puisque". *Revue Romane*, 10, 248–80.

Lamiroy, B. (1994). Pragmatic connectives and L2 acquisition: The case of French and Dutch. *Pragmatics*, 4, 183–201.

Lapshinova-Koltunski, E., Nedoluzhko, A. & Kunz, K. (2015). Across languages and genres: Creating a universal annotation scheme for textual relations. *Proceedings of LAW IX – The 9th Linguistic Annotation Workshop*. Denver, 168–77.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Lascarides, A. & Asher, N. (1993). Temporal interpretation, discourse relations and commonsense entailment. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 16(5), 437–93.

Lass, R. (1997). *Historical Linguistics and Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laviosa, S. (2009). Universals. In M. Baker and G. Saldanha, eds., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 306–10.

Le Draoulec, A. & Bras, M. (2007). Alors as a possible temporal connective in discourse. *Cahiers Chronos*, 17, 81–94.

Lee, A., Prasad, R., Webber, B. & Joshi, A. (2016). Annotating discourse relations with the PDTB annotator. *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Osaka, Japan, 121–25.

Lee, D. & Chen, S. X. (2009). Making a bigger deal of the smaller words: Function words and other key items in research writing by Chinese learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(3), 149–65.

Lee, H.-K. (2002). Towards a new typology of connectives with special reference to conjunction in English and Korean. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(7), 851–66.

Lee, K. A. (2013). Korean ESL learners' use of connectors in English academic writing. *English Language Teaching*, 25(2), 81–103.

Leedham, M. & Cai, G. (2013). Besides ... on the other hand: Using a corpus approach to explore the influence of teaching materials on Chinese students' use of linking adverbials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 374–89.

Lehmann, C. (1988). Towards a typology of clause linkage. In J. Haiman & S. Thompson, eds., *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 181–225.

(1995). *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Münich & Newcastle: Lincom Europa.

Lenker, U. & Meurman-Solin, A., eds. (2007). *Connectives in the History of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Leonard, L. B. (1998). *Children with Specific Language Impairment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Leonard, L. B. & Deevy, P. (2004). Lexical deficits in specific language impairment. In L. Verhoeven & H. Van Balkom, eds., *Classification of Developmental Language Disorders: Theoretical Issues and Clinical Implications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 209–33.

Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levshina, N. & Degand, L. (2017). Just because: In search of objective criteria of subjectivity expressed by causal connectives. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 8(1), 132–50.

Lewis, D. (2006). Discourse markers in English: A discourse-pragmatic view. In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Brill, 43–60.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2018). Grammaticalizing connectives in English and discourse information structure. In S. Hancil et al., eds., *New Trends in Grammaticalization and Language Change*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 135–57.

Li, F., Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2013). Subjectivity and result marking in Mandarin: A corpus-based investigation. *Chinese Language and Discourse*, 4(1), 74–119.

Li, F., Sanders, T. & Evers-Vermeul, J. (2016). On the subjectivity of Mandarin reason connectives: Robust profiles or genre-sensitivity? In N. Stukker, W. Spooren & G. Steen, eds., *Genre in Language, Discourse and Cognition*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 15–50.

Liu, D. (2008). Linking adverbials. An across-register corpus study and its implications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 491–518.

Louwerse, M. (2001). An analytic and cognitive parametrization of coherence relations. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12(3), 291–316.

Lyu, S., Tu, J.-Y. & Lin C.-J.C. (2020). Processing plausibility in concessive and causal relations: Evidence from self-paced reading and eye-tracking. *Discourse Processes*, 57(4), 320–42.

MacWhinney, B. (1991). *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mak, W. & Sanders, T. (2013). The role of causality in discourse processing: Effects of expectation and coherence relations. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28(9), 1414–37.

Mak, W., Tribushinina, E. & Andreiushina, E. (2013). Semantics of connectives guides referential expectations in discourse. An eye-tracking study of Dutch and Russian. *Discourse Processes*, 50, 557–76.

Mak, W., Tribushinina, E., Lomajo, J., Gagarina, N. & Sanders, T. (2017). Connective processing by bilingual children and monolinguals with specific language impairment: Distinct profiles. *Journal of Child Language*, 44, 329–45.

Mann, W. (2005). RST Web Site, from www.sfu.ca/rst.

Mann, W. & Thompson, S. (1986). Relational propositions in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 9, 57–90.

(1988). Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text*, 8(3), 243–81.

Marchal, M., Scholman, M. & Demberg, V. (2021). Semi-automatic discourse annotation in a low-resource language: Developing a connective lexicon for Nigerian Pidgin. *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Computational Approaches to Discourse*. Punta-Cana, Dominican Republic, 84–94.

Marchello-Nizia, C. (2006). *Grammaticalisation et Changement Linguistique*. Brussels : De Boeck.

(2007). Le principe de surprise annoncée. *Discours*, 1, 1–12.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2009). Grammaticalisation et pragmaticalisation des connecteurs de concession en français: cependant, toutefois, pourtant. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, LIV, 1–2, 7–20.

Marcu, D. (2000). *The Theory and Practice of Discourse Parsing and Summarization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Martin, J. R. (2001). Cohesion and texture. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton, eds., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell, 35–53.

Martinet, A. (2005) [1955]. Économie des changements phonétiques – Traité de phonologie diachronique. Paris: Maison Neuve Larose [Berne: A. Franckel].

Maschler, Y. & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton & D. Schiffrin, eds., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd Edition. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 189–221.

Matthiessen, C. (2002). Combining clauses into clause complexes: A multi-faceted view. In J. Bybee & M. Noonan, eds., *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in Honor of Sandra A. Thompson*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 235–319.

Mauranen, A. & Kujamäki, P. (2004). *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mauri, C. (2008). *Coordination Relations in the Languages of Europe and Beyond.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mauri, C. & Giacalone Ramat, A. (2012). The development of adversative connectives in Italian: Stages and factors at play. *Linguistics*, 50(2), 191–239.

Mauri, C. & van der Auwera, J. (2012). Connectives. *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McNamara, D. & Kintsch, W. (1996). Learning from texts: Effects of prior knowledge and text coherence. *Discourse Processes*, 22, 247–88.

McNamara, D., Kintsch, E., Songer, N. & Kintsch, W. (1996). Are good texts always better? Interactions of text coherence, background knowledge, and levels of understanding in learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 14, 1–43.

McRae, K., Jared, D. & Seidenberg, M. (1990). On the roles of frequency and lexical access in word naming. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 29(1), 43–65.

Meyer, B. (1975). *The Organization of Prose and Its Effects on Memory*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Meyer, B., Brandt, D. & Bluth, G. (1980). Use of top-level structure in text: Key for reading comprehension of ninth-grade students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 72–103.

Meyer, B., Young, C. & Bartlett, B. (1989). *Memory Improved: Enhanced Reading Comprehension and Memory Across the Life Span Through Strategic Text Structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Meyer, T. & Popescu-Belis, A. (2012). Using sense-labeled discourse connectives for statistical machine translation. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Hybrid Approaches to Machine Translation (HyTra)*. Avignon, France, 129–38.

Millis, K. & Just, M. (1994). The influence of connectives on sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33, 128–47.

Milner J.-C. (1992). *Ordre et Raisons de Langue*. Paris: Seuil.

Miltsakaki, E., Prasad, R., Joshi, A. & Webber, B. (2004). Annotating discourse connectives and their arguments. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Frontiers in Corpus Annotation*. Boston, 9–16.

Miltsakaki, E., Robaldo, L., Lee, A. & Joshi, A. (2008). Sense annotation in the Penn Discourse Treebank. *Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Text Processing, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 4919, 275–86.

Mírovský, J., Synková, P., Rysová, M. & Poláková, L. (2017). CzeDLex – A lexicon of Czech discourse connectives. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 109, 61–91.

Mithun, M. (1988). The grammaticization of coordination. In J. Haiman & S. Thompson, eds., *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 331–59.

Moeschler, J. (2005). Connecteurs pragmatiques, inferences directionnelles et representations mentales. *Cahiers Chronos*, 12, 35–50.

(2016). Where is procedural meaning located? Evidence from discourse connectives and tenses. *Lingua*, 175–76, 122–38.

Morera, Y., Len, J., Escudero, I. & de Vega, M. (2017). Do causal and concessive connectives guide emotional expectancies in comprehension? A double-task paradigm using emotional icons. *Discourse Processes*, 54(8), 583–98.

Mortier, L. & Degand, L. (2009). Adversative discourse markers in contrast: The need for a combined corpus approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14(3), 338–66.

Muller, C. (1996). *Dépendance et intégration syntaxique: Subordination, coordination, connexion*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Murray, J. (1995). Logical connectives and local coherence. In R. F. Lorch & E. O'Brien, eds., *Sources of Cohesion in Text Comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 107–25.

(1997). Connectives and narrative text: The role of continuity. *Memory & Cognition*, 25(2), 227–36.

Musi, E. (2016). Semantic change from space-time to contrast: The case of Italian adversative connectives. *Folia Linguistica*, 50(1), 1–30.

Nazarenko-Perrin, A. (1992). Causal ambiguity in natural language: Conceptual representation of 'parce que/because' and 'puisque/since'. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Nantes, France, 880–84.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Nippold, M., Schwartz, I. & Undlin, R. (1992). Use and understanding of adverbial conjunctions: A developmental study of adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 35, 108–18.

Nivre, J., de Marneffe, M.-C., Ginter, F., Hajič, J., Manning, C. D., Pyysalo, S., Schuster, S., Tyers, F. & Zeman, D. (2020). Universal Dependencies v2: An Evergrowing Multilingual Treebank Collection. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*. Marseille, France, 4034–43.

Noordman, L. & de Blijzer, F. (2000). On processing causal relations. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & B. Kortmann, eds., *Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 35–55.

Norbury, C., Gemmel, T. & Paul, R. (2014). Pragmatic abilities in narrative production: A cross-disorder comparison. *Journal of Child Language*, 41, 485–510.

Norde, M. (2001). Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. *Language Sciences*, 23(2), 231–64.

Nørgård-Sørensen, J., Heltoft, L. & Schøsler, L. (2011). *Connecting Grammaticalisation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Odlin, T. (2022). *Explorations of Language Transfer*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Oğuz, E. & Özge, D. (2020). A developmental study of Turkish connectives. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 31(2), 339–61.

Oh, S. (2005). A multi-level semantic approach to Korean causal conjunctive suffixes -(e)se and -(u)nikka: A corpus-based analysis. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10(4), 469–88.

Ohori, T. (2011). The grammaticalization of subordination. In B. Heine & H. Narrog, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 636–45.

Onodera, N. O. (2004). *Japanese Discourse Markers: Synchronic and Diachronic Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Onodera, N. & Closs Traugott, E. (2016). Periphery: Diachronic and cross-linguistics approaches. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 17(2), 163–77.

Ortega, L. (2008). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Overweg, J., Harman, C. & Hendriks, P. (2018). Temporarily out of order. Temporal perspective taking in language in children with autism spectrum disorder. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1663.

Ozono, S. & Ito, H. (2003). Logical connectives as catalysts for interactive L2 reading. *System*, 31, 283–97.

Pander Maat, H. & Degand, L. (2001). Scaling causal relations and connectives in terms of Speaker Involvement. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12(3), 211–45.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2005). Connectieven, spreker-betrokkenheid en semantische lagen Hoe daarom en dus zich gedragen in niet-declaratieve omgevingen. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 10(2), 153–85.

Pander Maat, H. & Sanders, T. (2001). Subjectivity in causal connectives: An empirical study of language in use. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12(3), 247–73.

Park, Y.-Y. (2013). Korean college EFL students' use of contrastive conjunctions in argumentative writing. *English Teaching*, 68, 55–77.

Pasch, R., Brausse, U., Breindl, E. & Wassner, U. H. (2003). *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Payne, B., Gao, X., Noh, S., Anderson, C. & Stine-Morrow, E. (2012). The effects of print exposure on sentence processing and memory in older adults: Evidence for efficiency and reserve. *Aging Neuropsychology and Cognition*, 19(1–2), 122–49.

PDTB Research Group (2008). The Penn Discourse TreeBank2.0. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Marrakech, Morocco, 2961–68.

Peterson, C. (1986). Semantic and pragmatic uses of 'but'. *Journal of Child Language*, 13(3), 583–90.

Pit, M. (2006). Determining subjectivity in text: The case of backward causal Connectives in Dutch. *Discourse Processes*, 41(2), 151–74.

(2007). Cross-linguistic analyses of backward causal connectives in Dutch, German and French. *Languages in Contrast*, 7, 53–82.

Pitler, E. & Nenkova, A. (2009). Using syntax to disambiguate explicit discourse connectives in text. *Proceedings of the ACL-IJCNLP 2009 Conference Short Papers*. Suntec, Singapore, 13–16.

Pitler, E., Raghupathy, M., Mehta, H., Nenkova, A., Lee, A. & Joshi, A. (2008). Easily identifiable discourse relations. *Proceedings of COLING*. Manchester, 87–90.

Pons Bordería, S. (2001). Connectives/discourse markers. An overview. *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Literaris*, VI, 219–43.

(2006). A functional approach to the study of discourse markers. In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Brill, 77–99.

(2008). Do discourse markers exist? On the treatment of discourse markers in Relevance Theory. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(8), 1411–34.

(2018). Paths of grammaticalization: Beyond the LP/RP debate. In S. Pons Bordería & Ó. Loureda, eds., *Beyond Grammaticalization and Discourse Markers. New Issues in the Study of Language Change*. Leiden: Brill, 334–83.

Prasad, R., Dinesh, N., Lee, A., Miltsakaki, E., Robaldo, L., Joshi, A. & Webber B. (2008). The Penn Discourse Treebank 2.0. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Marrakesh, Morocco, 2961–68.

Prasad, R., Webber, B. & Joshi, A. (2014). Reflections on the Penn Discourse Treebank, comparable corpora and complementary annotation. *Computational Linguistics*, 40(4), 921–50.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2017). The Penn Discourse Treebank: An annotated corpus of discourse relations. In N. Ide and J. Pustejovsky, eds., *Handbook of Linguistic Annotation*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1197–217.

Prasad, R., Webber, B. & Lee, A. (2018). Discourse annotation in the PDTB: The next generation. *Proceedings 14th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation*. Santa-Fe, 87–97.

Purcell, S. & Liles, B. (1992). Cohesion repairs in the narratives of normal-language and language-disordered school-age children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 35, 354–62.

Pyykkönen, P. & Järvikivi, J. (2012). Children and situation models of multiple events. *Developmental Psychology*, 48, 521–29.

Ramsey, V. (1987). The functional distribution of preposed and postposed 'if' and 'when' clauses in written discourse. In R. S. Tomlin, ed., *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 383–408.

Reboul, A. & Moeschler, J. (1998). Pragmatique du discours. De l'interprétation de l'énoncé à l'interprétation du discours. Paris: Armand Colin.

Recio Fernández, I. (2020). The Impact of Procedural Meaning on Second Language Processing: A Study on Connectives (Doctoral Dissertation, Universität Heidelberg). https://doi.org/10.11588/heidok.00028641.

Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 367–81.

Reese, B., Hunter, J., Asher, N., Denis, P. & Baldridge, J. (2007). Reference manual for the analysis and annotation of rhetorical structure (version 1.0). Technical report. Austin: University of Texas, Departments of Linguistics and Philosophy. www.researchgate.net/profile/Nicholas-Asher/publication/237563723_Reference_Manual_for_the_Analysis_and_Annotation_of_Rhetorical_Structure_Version_10/links/00b7d5328bd0e1df85000000/Reference-Manual-for-the-Analysis-and-Annotation-of-Rhetorical-Structure-.

Rehbein, I., Scholman, M. & Sanders, T. (2016). Annotating discourse relations in spoken language: A comparison of the PDTB and the CCR frameworks. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Portorož, Slovenia, 1039–46.

Renkema, J. (1996). Cohesion analysis and information flow: The case of "Because" versus "because." In C. Cremers & M. den Dikken, eds., *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233–44.

Rickards, J., Fajen, B., Sullivan, J. & Gillespie, G. (1997). Signaling, notetaking and field-independence-dependence in text comprehension and recall. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 508–17.

Robert, S. (1997). From body to argumentation: Grammaticalization as a fractal property of language (the case of Wolof ginnaaw). *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual BLS Meeting, Special Session on Syntax and Semantics in African Languages*. Berkeley, 116–27.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Rossari, C. (2006). Formal properties of a subset of discourse markers: Connectives. In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Leiden: Brill, 299–314.

Roze, C., Danlos, L. & Muller, P. (2012). LEXCONN: A French lexicon of discourse connectives. *Discours*, 10, 1–15.

Rysová, M., Synková, P., Mírovský, J., Hajičová, E., Nedoluzhko, A., Ocelák, R., Pergler, J., Poláková, L., Scheller, V., Zdeňková, J. & Zikánová, Š. (2016). *Prague Discourse Treebank 2.0*. Data/software, ÚFAL MFF UK, Prague, Czech Republic, Lindat/Clarin.

Rysová, M. (2017). Discourse connectives: From historical origin to present-day development. In K. Menzel et al., eds., *New Perspectives on Cohesion and Coherence. Implications for Translation*. Berlin: Language Science Press, 11–34.

Salameh, S., Estellés, M. & Pons Bordería, S. (2018). Beyond the notion of periphery: An account of polyfunctional discourse markers within the Val.Es.Co. model of discourse segmentation. In K. Beeching et al., eds., *Positioning the Self and Others. Linguistic Perspectives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 105–25.

Sanders, J., Sanders, T. & Sweetser, E. (2012). Responsible subjects and discourse causality. How mental spaces and perspective help identifying subjectivity in Dutch backward causal connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(2), 191–213.

Sanders, T. (2005). Coherence, causality and cognitive complexity in discourse. *Proceedings of the First International Symposium on the Exploration and Modelling of Meaning*. Biarritz, France, 105–14.

Sanders, T., Demberg, V., Hoek, J., Scholman, M., Asr, T., Zufferey, S. & Evers-Vermeul, J. (2021). Unifying dimensions in discourse relations. How various annotation frameworks are related. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 17(1), 1–71.

Sanders, T. & Noordman, L. (2000). The role of coherence relations and their linguistic markers in text processing. *Discourse Processes*, 29(1), 37–60.

Sanders, T. & Spooren, W. (2009). The cognition of discourse coherence. In J. Renkema, ed., *Discourse, of Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 197–212.

(2013). Exceptions to rules: A qualitative analysis of backward causal connectives in Dutch naturalistic discourse. *Text & Talk*, 33(3), 377–98.

(2015). Causality and subjectivity in discourse: The meaning and use of causal connectives in spontaneous conversation, chat interactions and written text. *Linguistics*, 53(1), 53–92.

Sanders, T., Spooren, W. & Noordman, L. (1992). Toward a taxonomy of coherence relations. *Discourse Processes*, 15(1), 1–35.

Sanders, T., Vis, K. & Broeder, D. (2012). Project notes on the Dutch project DiscAn. *Proceedings of the Eighth Joint ACL – ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation*. Pisa, Italy.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Santana, A., Spooren, W., Nieuwenhuijsen, D. & Sanders, T. (2018). Subjectivity in Spanish discourse: Explicit and implicit causal relations in different contexts. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 9(1), 163–91.

Saussure, L. de (2011). On some methodological issues in the conceptual/procedural distinction. In V. Escandell-Vidal, M. Leonetti & A. Ahern, eds., *Procedural Meaning: Problems and Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, 55–79.

Scheffler, T. (2005). Syntax and semantics of causal denn in German. *Proceedings of the 15th Amsterdam Colloquium*. Amsterdam, 215–20.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, W., Körkel, J. & Weinert, F. (1989). Domain-specific knowledge and memory performance: A comparison of high- and low-aptitude children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(3), 306–12.

Scholman, M. & Demberg, V. (2017). Crowdsourcing discourse interpretations: On the influence of context and the reliability of a connective insertion task. *Proceedings of the 11th Linguistic Annotation Workshop*. Valencia, Spain, 24–33.

Scholman, M., Demberg, V. & Sanders, T. (2020). Individual differences in expecting coherence relations: Exploring the variability in sensitivity to contextual signals in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 57, 884–61.

Scholman, M., Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2016). Categories of coherence relations in discourse annotation: Towards a reliable categorization of coherence relations. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 7(2), 1–28.

Scholman, M., Pyatkin, V., Yung, F., Dagan, I., Tsarfaty, R. & Demberg, V. (2022). Design choices in crowdsourcing discourse relation annotations: The effect of worker selection and training. *Proceedings of the 13th Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Marseille, France, 2148–56.

Scholman, M., Rohde, H. & Demberg, V. (2017). "On the one hand" as a cue to anticipate upcoming discourse structure. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 97, 47–60.

Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse markers. *Lingua*, 107(3–4), 227–65.

Schumann, J., Zufferey, S. & Oswald, S. (2021). The linguistic formulation of fallacies matter: The case of causal connectives. *Argumentation*, 35(3), 361–88.

Schwab, J. & Liu, M. (2020). Lexical and contextual cue effects in discourse expectations: Experimenting with German 'zwar... aber' and English 'true/sure... but'. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 11, 74–109.

Schwenter, S. (2002). Discourse markers and the PA/SN distinction. *Journal of Linguistics*, 38(1), 43–69.

Segal, E., Duchan, J. & Scott, P. (1991). The role of interclausal connectives in narrative structuring: Evidence from adults' interpretations of simple stories. *Discourse Processes*, 14(1), 27–54.

Shi, J. (2017). A corpus-based study of contrastive/concessive linking adverbials in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 14, 17–25.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T., eds. (2012). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Simon, A.-C. & Degand, L. (2007). Connecteurs de causalité, implication du locuteur et profils prosodiques: le cas de car et de parce que. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 17(3), 323–41.

Šliogerienė J., Valūnaitė Oleškevičienė G. & Asijavičiūtė, V. (2015). Discourse relational devices of contrast in Lithuanian and English. *Edukologija*, 23(2), 92–100.

Smith, R. & Frawley, W. (1983). Conjunctive cohesion in four English genres. *Text*, 3(4), 347–74.

Sparks, R., Patton, J., Ganschow, L. & Humbach, N. (2012). Do L1 reading achievement and L1 print exposure contribute to the prediction of L2 proficiency? *Language Learning*, 62, 473–505.

Sparks, R., Patton, J., Ganschow, L., Humbach, N. & Javorsky, J. (2006). Native language predictors of foreign language proficiency and foreign language aptitude. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 56, 129–60.

Spenader, J. (2018). Children's comprehension of contrastive connectives. *Journal of Child Language*, 45, 610–40.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Harvard University Press.

Spooren, W. (1997). The Processing of Underspecified Coherence Relations. *Discourse Processes*, 24(1), 149–68.

Spooren, W. & Degand, L. (2010). Coding coherence relations. Reliability and validity. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 6(2), 241–66.

Spooren, W. & Sanders, T. (2008). The acquisition of coherence relations: On cognitive complexity in discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(12), 2003–26.

Spooren, W., Sanders, T., Huiskes, M. & Degand, L. (2010). Subjectivity and causality: A corpus study of spoken language. In J. Newman and S. Rice, eds., *Empirical and Experimental Methods in Cognitive/Functional Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 241–55.

Stanovich, K. & West, R. (1989). Exposure to print and orthographic processing. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24(4), 402–33.

Stanovich, K., West, R. & Harrison, R. (1995). Knowledge growth and maintenance across the life span. The role of print exposure. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(5), 811–26.

Stede, M. (2002). DiMLex: A lexical approach to discourse markers. In A. Lenci & V. Di Tomaso, eds., *Exploring the Lexicon – Theory and Computation*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1–15.

Stede, M. & Heintze, S. (2004). Machine-Assisted rhetorical structure annotation. *COLING 2004: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Geneva, Switzerland, 425–31.

Stede, M., Scheffler, T. & Mendes, A. (2019). Connective-Lex: A web-based multilingual lexical resource for connectives. *Discours*, 24, 1–38.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Stede, M. & Umbach, C. (1998). DIMLex: A lexicon of discourse markers for text generation and understanding. *Proceedings of the Joint 36th Meeting of the ACL and the 17th Meeting of COLING*, 1238–42.

Steffani, S. & Nippold, M. (1997). Japanese speakers of American English: Competence with connectives in written language. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 40, 1048–55.

Stukker, N. & Sanders, T. (2012). Subjectivity and prototype structure in causal connectives: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(2), 169–90.

Stukker, N., Spooren, W. & Steen, G. (2016). *Genre in Language, Discourse and Cognition*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Sweetser, E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taboada, M. (2009). Implicit and explicit coherence relations. In J. Renkema, ed., *Discourse, of Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 125–38.

Taboada, M. & de los Ángeles Gómez-González, M. (2012). Discourse markers and coherence relations: Comparison across markers, languages and modalities. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 6, 17–41.

Taboada, M. & Mann, W. (2006a). Rhetorical Structure Theory: Looking back and moving ahead. *Discourse Studies*, 8(3), 423–59.

(2006b). Applications of Rhetorical Structure Theory. *Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 567–88.

Tanghe, S. (2016). Position and polyfunctionality of discourse markers: The case of Spanish markers derived from motion verbs. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 93, 16–31.

Tapper, M. (2005). Connectives in advanced Swedish EFL learners' written English – preliminary results. *The Department of English: Working Papers in English Linguistics*, 5, 116–44.

Tazegül, A. (2015). Use, misuse and overuse of 'on the other hand': A corpus study comparing English of native speakers and learners. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 2, 53–66.

Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Trabbasso, T., Secco, T. & van den Broek, P. (1984). Causal cohesion and story coherence. In. H. Mandl, N. Stein and T. Trabasso, eds., *Learning and Comprehension of Text*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Traugott, E. (1986). On the origins of "AND" and "BUT" connectives in English. *Studies in Language*, 10(1), 137–50.

(1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. *Oral presentation at International Conference of Historical Linguistics XII*. Manchester. www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf.

(2012). Intersubjectification and clause periphery. *English Text Construction*, 5(1), 7–28.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2017). 'Insubordination' in the light of the Uniformitarian Principle. *English Language & Linguistics*, 21(2), 289–310.

(2022). *Discourse Structuring Markers in English. A Historical Constructionalist Perspective on Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traugott, E. & König, E. (1991). The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited. In E. Traugott & B. Heine, eds., *Approaches to Grammaticalization, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 189–219.

Traugott, E. & Trousdale, G. (2010). *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Traxler, M., Bybee, M. & Pickering, M. (1997). Influence of connectives on language comprehension: Eye-tracking evidence for incremental interpretation. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 50A(3), 481–97.

Traxler, M. J., Sanford, A. J., Aked, J. P. & Moxey, L. M. (1997). Processing causal and diagnostic statements in discourse. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory, and Cognition*, 23(1), 88–101.

Tribushinina, E., Dubinkina, E. & Sanders, T. (2015). Can connective use differentiate between children with and without SLI? *First Language*, 35, 3–26.

Tribushinina, E., Mak, W., Andreiushina, E., Dubinkina, E. & Sanders, T. (2015). Connective use in the narratives of bilingual children and monolingual children with SLI. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 20(1), 98–113.

Tsai, W. & Chang, C. (2008). 'But I first. and then he kept picking': Narrative skill in Mandarin-speaking children with language impairment. *Narrative Inquiry*, 18, 349–77.

Tskhovrebova, E., Zufferey, S. & Gygax, P. (2022). Individual variations in the mastery of connectives from teenage years to adulthood. *Language Learning*, 72(2), 412–55.

Tskhovrebova, E., Zufferey, S. & Tribushinina, E. (2022). French-speaking teenagers' mastery of connectives: The role of vocabulary size and exposure to print. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 43(5), 1141–63.

Tuggy, D. (1993). Ambiguity, polysemy, and vagueness. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 4(3), 273–90.

Uçar, S. & Yükselir, C. (2017). A corpus-based study on the use of the logical connector 'thus' in the academic writing of Turkish EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 64–72.

Urgelles-Coll, M. (2010). *The Syntax and Semantics of Discourse Markers*. London: Continuum.

Uygur-Distexhe, D. & Degand, L. (2015). C bien alors. Contraintes communicatives sur la périphérie droite en conversations spontanées. Le cas du face-à-face, du chat et du SMS. *Cahiers de lexicologie*, 106(1), 171–87.

Valūnaitė Oleškevičienė, G., Karaciejūtė, V., Gulbinskienė, D. & Annamalai, N. (2022). Lithuanian discourse markers in parallel corpus for teaching translation awareness. *Pedagogika*, 145(1), 117–34.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

van den Bosch, L., Segers, E. & Verhoeven, L. (2018). Online processing of causal relations in beginning first and second language readers. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 61, 59–67.

van Eemeren, F. & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragma-dialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Olmen, D. & Šinkūnienė, D. (2021). *Pragmatic Markers and Peripheries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

VanPatten, B. & Smith, B. (2022). *Explicit and Implicit Learning in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Silfhout, G., Evers-Vermeul, J. & Sanders, T. (2015). Connectives as processing signals: How students benefit in processing narrative and expository texts. *Discourse Processes*, 52(1), 47–76.

Van Veen, R. (2011). *The Acquisition of Causal Connectives. The Role of Parental Input and Cognitive Complexity*. Amsterdam: LOT Publications.

Van Veen, R., Evers-Vermeul, J., Sanders, T. & Van den Bergh, H. (2009). Parental input and connective acquisition in German: A growth-curve analysis. *First Language*, 29, 267–89.

(2013). The influence of input on connective acquisition: A growth curve analysis of English *because* and German *weil*. *Journal of Child Language*, 40(5), 1003–31.

Véronis, J. & Guimier, E. (2006). Le traitement des nouvelles formes de communication écrite. In G. Sabah, ed., *Compréhension des langues et interaction* (pp. 227–48). Paris: Lavoisier.

Véronis, J. & Langlais, P. (2000). Evaluation of parallel text alignment systems: The arcade project. In J. Véronis, ed., *Parallel Text Processing*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer, 369–88.

Versley, Y. (2010). Discovery of ambiguous and unambiguous discourse connectives via annotation projection. *Proceedings of Workshop on Annotation and Exploitation of Parallel Corpora*. Tartu, Estonia, 83–92.

Verstraete, J.-C. (2004). Initial and final position for adverbial clauses in English: The constructional basis of the discursive and syntactic differences. *Linguistics*, 42(4), 819–53.

(2007). *Rethinking the Coordinate-Subordinate Dichotomy. Interpersonal Grammar and the Analysis of Adverbial Clauses in English*. Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Vinay, J.-P. & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of French and English. A Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vincent, D. (2005). The journey of non-standard discourse markers in Quebec French: Networks based on exemplification. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 6(2), 188–210.

Visapää, L., Kalliokoski, J. & Sorva, H., eds. (2014). *Contexts of Subordination: Cognitive, Typological and Discourse Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

Volodina, A. & Weinert, S. (2020). Comprehension of connectives. Development across primary school age and influencing factors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(814), 1–15.

Waltereit, R. (2006). The rise of discourse markers in Italian: A specific type of language change. In K. Fischer, ed., *Approaches to Discourse Particles* (Vol. 1, pp. 61–67). Elsevier Science Publishers.

Xiao, R. & Dai, G. (2014). Lexical and grammatical properties of translational Chinese: Translation universal hypotheses reevaluated from the Chinese perspective. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 10(1), 11–55.

Wang, Y.-F. & Tsai, P.-H. (2007). Textual and contextual contrast connection: A study of Chinese contrastive markers across different text types. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10), 1775–815.

Wasow, T. (1997). End-weight from the speaker's perspective. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 26(3), 347–61.

Wasow, T. (2002). *Postverbal Behavior*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Webber, B., Joshi, A., Miltsakaki, E., Prasad, R., Dinesh, N., Lee, A. & Forbes, K. (2006). A short introduction to the Penn Discourse TreeBank. *Copenhagen Studies in Language*, 32(9).

Webber, B., Prasad, R., Lee, A. & Joshi, A. (2019). The Penn Discourse Treebank 3.0 Annotation Manual. https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/docs/LDC2019T05/PDTB3-Annotation-Manual.pdf

Weinreich, U., Labov, W. & Herzog, M. (1968). Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In U. Weinreich et al., eds., *Directions for Historical Linguistics. A Symposium*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 95–195.

Wen-hui, S. & Pao-chuan, T. (2015). Narrative coherence of Mandarin-speaking children with high-functioning autism spectrum disorder: An investigation into causal relations. *First Language*, 35(3), 189–212.

Wetzel, M., Crible, L. & Zufferey, S. (2022). Processing clause-internal discourse relations in a second language. A case study of specifications in German and French. *Journal of Second Language Studies*. Published online ahead of print.

Wetzel, M., Zufferey, S. & Gygax, P. (2020). Second language acquisition and the mastery of discourse connectives: Assessing the factors that hinder L2-learners from mastering French connectives. *Languages*, 5(3), 35.

Wetzel, M., Zufferey, S. & Gygax, P. (2022). How robust is discourse processing for native readers? The role of connectives and the coherence relations they convey. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(13), 822151.

Wilson, D. (2011). The conceptual-procedural distinction: Past, present and future. In V. Escandell-Vidal, M. Leonetti & A. Ahern, eds., *Procedural Meaning: Problems and Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, 3–31.

Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (1993). Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua*, 90(1), 1–25.

Xiang, M. & Kuperberg, G. (2015). Reversing expectations during discourse comprehension. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 30(6), 648–72.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

(2014). Lexical and grammatical properties of translational Chinese: Translation universal hypotheses reevaluated from the Chinese perspective. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 10(1), 11–55.

Xiao, H., Li, F., Sanders, T. & Spooren, W. (2021). Suǒyǐ 'so', they are different: An integrated subjectivity account of Mandarin RESULT connectives in conversation, microblog and newspaper discourse. *Linguistics*, 59(4), 1103–42.

Xu, X., Chen, Q., Panther, K.-U. & Wu, Y. (2018). Influence of concessive and causal conjunctions on pragmatic processing: Online measures from eye movements and self-paced reading. *Discourse Processes*, 55(4), 387–409.

Xu, Y., Malt, B. & Srinivasan, M. (2017). Evolution of word meanings through metaphorical mapping: Systematicity over the past millennium. *Cognitive Psychology*, 96, 41–53.

Yang, W. & Sun, Y. (2012). The use of cohesive devices in argumentative writing by Chinese EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Linguistics and Education*, 23, 31–48.

Yoon, J.-W. & Yoo, I. W. (2011). An error analysis of English conjunctive adjuncts in Korean college students' writing. *English Teaching*, 66(1), 225–44.

Zafar, S. & Meenakshi, K. (2012). Individual learner differences and second language acquisition: A review. *Journal of Language and Teaching Research*, 3(4), 639–46.

Zamel, V. (1984). Teaching those missing links in writing. In S. McKay, ed., *Composing in a Second Language*. Cambridge: Newbury House, 110–22.

Zeyrek, D. (2014). On the distribution of the contrastive-concessive discourse connectives ama 'but/yet' and fakat 'but' in written Turkish. In P. Suihkonen & L. J. Whaley, eds., *On Diversity and Complexity of Languages Spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 251–74.

Zeyrek, D., Demirşahin, I. & Sevdik Çallı, A. (2013). Turkish Discourse Bank: Porting a discourse annotation style to a morphologically rich language. *Dialogue and Discourse*, 4(2), 174–84.

Zeyrek, D., Mendes, A., Grishina, Y., Kurfalı, M., Gibbon, S. & Ogrodniczuk, M. (2020). TED Multilingual Discourse Bank (TED-MDB): A parallel corpus annotated in the PDTB style. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 54(2), 587–613.

Zhang, R. (2014). Overuse and underuse of English concluding connectives: A corpus study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5, 121–26.

Zhou, Y. & Xue, N. (2012). PDTB-style discourse annotation of Chinese text. *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the ACL*. Jeju Island, Korea, 69–77.

(2015). The Chinese Discourse TreeBank: A Chinese Corpus Annotated with Discourse Relations. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 49(2), 397–431.

Zikánová, S., Mladová, L., Mírovský, J. & Jínová, P. (2010). Typical cases of annotators' disagreement in discourse annotations in Prague

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012

dependency treebank. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. Valetta, Malta, 2002–06.

Zufferey, S. (2010). *Lexical Pragmatics and Theory of Mind. The Acquisition of Connectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

(2012). 'Car, parce que, puisque' revisited: Three experiments on French causal connectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(2), 138–53.

(2014). Givenness, procedural meaning and connectives: The case of French puisque. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 62(1), 121–35.

(2016). Discourse connectives across languages. Factors influencing their explicit or implicit translation. *Languages in Contrast*, 16(2), 264–79.

(to appear). Discourse markers in a contrastive perspective. In M.-B. Mosegaard-Hansen & J. Visconti, eds., *Manual of Discourse Markers in Romance Languages*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Zufferey, S. & Cartoni, B. (2012). English and French causal connectives in contrast. *Languages in Contrast*, 12(2), 232–50.

(2014). A multifactorial analysis of explicitation in translation. *Target*, 26(3), 361–84.

Zufferey, S. & Degand, L. (2017). Annotating the meaning of discourse connectives in multilingual corpora. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 13(2), 399–422.

(forthcoming). Connectives in French. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 2nd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 1–9.

Zufferey, S. & Gygax, P. (2016). The role of perspective shifts for processing and translating discourse relations. *Discourse Processes*, 53(7), 532–55.

(2017). Processing connectives with a complex form-function mapping in L2: The case of French "en effet". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1198.

(2020a). "Roger broke his tooth. However, he went to the dentist": Why some readers struggle to evaluate wrong (and right) uses of connectives. *Discourse Processes*, 57, 184–200.

(2020b). Do teenagers know how to use connectives from the written mode? *Lingua*, 234, 102779, 1–12.

eds., (2023). *The Routledge Handbook of Experimental Linguistics*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Zufferey, S., Mak, W., Degand, L. & Sanders, T. (2015). Advanced learners' comprehension of discourse connectives: The role of L1 transfer across on-line and off-line tasks. *Second Language Research*, 31, 389–411.

Zufferey, S., Mak, W. & Sanders, T. (2015). A cross-linguistic perspective on the acquisition of causal connectives and relations. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 7(1), 22–39.

Zufferey, S., Mak, W., Verbrugge, S. & Sanders, T. (2018). Usage and processing of the French causal connectives 'car' and 'parce que'. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 28(1), 85–112.

Zwaan, R. & Rapp, D. (2006). Discourse comprehension. In M. Traxler & M. Gernbacher, eds., *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*. London: Academic Press, 725–64.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 18:37:15, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966573.012