**Coherence**
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**2. Local and Global Coherence Scoring**

Global coherence – the relation of each sentence to the overall topic

Local coherence – the relation of adjacent sentences to each other

**1. Four-Point Global Coherence Rating Scale (Wright & Capilouto, 2012; Wright, Koutsoftas, Fergadiotis, & Capilouto, 2010)**

4 – The utterance is overtly related to the stimulus as defined by mention of actors, actions, and/or objects present in the stimulus, which are of significant importance to the main details of the stimulus. In the case of procedural descriptions and reactions when a designated topic acts as the stimulus, overt relation is defined by provision of substantive information related to the topic so that no inference is required by the listener.

3 – The utterance is related to the stimulus or designated topic but with some inclusion of suppositional or tangential information that is relevant to the main details of the stimulus; *or* substantive information is not provided so that the topic must be inferred from the statement. In recounts, appropriate elaborations that are not essential but are related to the main topic are scored a 3.

2 – The utterance is only remotely related to the stimulus or topic, with possible inclusion of inappropriate egocentric information may include tangential information or reference some element of the stimulus that is regarded as non-critical.

1 – The utterance is entirely unrelated to the stimulus or topic; the utterance may be a comment on the discourse or tangential information is solely used.

**2. Five-Point Coherence Coding Scale (Glosser & Deser, 1990; Van Leer & Turkstra, 1999**)

Each utterance receives a score of 1-5 for Global Coherence:

1 – no relation at all to the topic, unintelligible, or comment on the discourse

3 – possible relation to the topic

5 – concrete information related to the topic

Each utterance receives a score of 1-5 for Local Coherence:

1 – radical topic shift, unintelligible utterance, comment on the discourse

3 – slight topic shift or referentially vague

5 -- relation through continuation, elaboration, repetition, subordination or coordination of ideas from the preceding utterance