

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-Vandenberg, 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/fof.22018.and>

- Anscombe, 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.
- Babinotis, 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.

- 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.

- 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 consécutif au marqueur de structuration du discours. *Linguisticae 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*

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- Cuenca, M.-J. (2022). Translating discourse markers: Implication and explicitation strategies. In M. J. Cuenca & L. Degand, eds., *Translating Discourse Markers: Implication 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.

- (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-Vandenberghe*. 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*

- 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-Vandenberg, 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. & Srinivas, 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 grundschulkindern konnektoren? Untersuchung einer bildungssprachlichen komponente. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 18(4), 803–25.

- 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.
- Fabricsius-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. *RELJ Journal*, 23, 15–28.

- 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*

- 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.
- Giactalone 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.

- 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](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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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 Hadrach, 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.

- (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-I, 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.

- 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*. Munich & 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.

- (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.

- (2009). Grammaticalisation et pragmatization 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 multifaceted 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.

- 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 représentations 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.

- 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.
- Otori, 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.

- (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.

- (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-Fé, 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. & Järviö, 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- (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. & Gygas, 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- (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

- 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. & Gyga, 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.