

How to Cite:

Zulvany, V. (2020). Macrolinguistics: texts and discourses, conversation interactions and conversation components. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 1(2), 104–116.

Macrolinguistics: Texts and Discourses, Conversation Interactions and Conversation Components

Valentine Zulvany

Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, Trondheim, Norway

Abstract---This study aims to explore macrolinguistics based on the realm of text with lexical and grammatical means. Also to analyze contrastive texts with textual characteristics, text typology, and translated texts. Some of the other things discussed are ways to analyze discourse, interactions in conversations, and know the components of conversation. Language studies continue to develop from time to time. One of the studies that cannot be separated from language is linguistic studies. The study of linguistics in a language not only covers linguistics from an internal point of view but can also be related to linguistics in general. Macro linguistics in this case is not associated with other disciplines outside of linguistics, but a linguistic study that examines speech based on situations.

Keywords---contrastive analysis, contrastive texts, discourse universe, explore macrolinguistics, grammatical, lexical, linguistic studies, text typology, traditional linguistics, translated text.

Introduction

Understanding a word, of course, cannot be separated from a situation or context that follows it. As long as humans still communicate using language, so long as macro linguistics plays its role in a communication context. Speech, in macro linguistics, is not only speech that occurs in conversation and its components, but more than that. Macro linguistics is also a study that includes grammatical and lexical in a discourse. In addition, it also looks at how the textual characteristics, text typology, and translated

© 2020 by The Author(s). 

This journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Corresponding author: Zulvany, V. | Email: valentinezulvany@ntnu.no

Manuscript submitted: 18 May 2020 | Manuscript revised: 8 July 2020 | Accepted for publication: 5 August 2020

text are viewed from the side of contrastive analysis in several languages that have similarities and even differences (Marini et al., 2008; Toledo et al., 2018).

The following paper will discuss the comparative study of linguistics at a macro level. The study focuses on the situation that occurs in an utterance, both in the form of text and in the form of a conversation. This macrolinguistic contrastive analysis also compares the situation that occurs in a particular language, with other languages. A detailed study of the discussion and how to use it in macrolinguistics will be discussed one by one in this paper.

Method

The formal system of a language given by some linguists has several terms. Saussure mentions "langue", Chomsky mentions "competence", James mentions "micro-linguistics" or "code-linguistics", the general term for this understanding is "language" or "linguistic". To gain access to the code or cipher of a language, we need to ignore some of the things that interfere with language matters. These complicating factors are called Lyon as "data idealization" or idealization of data. They suggest three ways to idealize data in linguistics, viz (Akbiyik et al., 2018; Peach & Coelho, 2016).

This regularization is also called spontaneous utterance, although it is produced by rational native speakers of a language, it is full of wrong beginnings, doubts, mixed constructions, and so on. Characterizes such things as "grammatically irrelevant conditions such as memory limitations, confusions, distractions, changes in attention and interest" (Glosser & Deser, 1991; Andreetta et al., 2012).

There are two meanings that linguists can use to standardize their data. The first is "literal meaning" which means the choice of a standard dialect for description. And the second is that standardization must have something to do with the homogeneity of the data: as long as the task of describing the language will be complicated by various things, the informants must be selected from people who use the same standard variety.

The traditional "discourse universe" or field of research for traditional linguistics is a single sentence apart from the language being described. This is considered true for structuralists and also for later transformation grammarians, in which in their grammar (symbol "sentence") is a symbol that is used repeatedly. A sentence can be decontextualized in two ways, namely by shifting from the group of sentences that precede or follow it in a text (that is, its context), or by separating it from the real-world situation in which it is used (i.e. the context of the situation).

Result and Discussion

In short, it can be said that "macrolinguistics is a kind of linguistics tasked with studying or studying "situations based on situations" or with the term "situated speech" (Marini et al., 2017; Rogalski et al., 2010). Macrolinguistics as "big" linguistics or "human" linguistics which aims to achieve a scientific understanding of how (how) human beings communicate. This should be contrasted with the aim of code linguistics ("code linguistics") to establish the general and specific features of human languages. With the antithesis of Marini et al. (2011) and Van Leer & Turkstra (1999) "competence", states firmly that the communicative competence of a speaker must be the object of language research.

As long as humans communicate through language, linguistics can be the main concern in every step of the process. However, this does not mean that language itself communicates, and knowledge of the code or code is not a satisfactory condition for communication achievement, but such knowledge, is a necessary condition, as long as verbal communication cannot occur without a code or code.

One word that can cover all aspects that are non-coded or non-coded is "sensitivity", sensitivity and subtlety of feelings: the person who communicates must be able to recognize the constraints of the situation, precisely, the events of the subject speech and produce appropriate utterances. and get along with them. These constraints are socio-cultural variables that partly determine the form of successful utterances. Cahana-Amitay & Jenkins (2018) and Kintz et al. (2018), introduce six variables in classifying each particular speech event.

- Setting, is the time and place of the speech that determines its form, so the questions asked to a lecturer in the cafeteria after the lecture will be different from the questions asked in class during the lecture
- Participants (participants), consist of the addressor (director), speaker (speaker), addressee (address recipient), and audience (listener or viewers). Talking to a boss will be different from talking to a regular employee.
- Meaning (purpose). Every speech act has a purpose. As Laver points out, even Malinowski's "phatic communion" is far from being "purposeless," "meaningless." In recent times, much attention has been paid to the purposes or "communicative functions" of language, as well as to scholars of language. applied linguistics tries to create or compose national syllabus. Some of the real goals or objectives that do not fade are persuasion, ordering, suggesting, greeting, etc. It must be realized that speech acts such as persuasion may include several sentences, but are still one speech act .
- Key (key). This term is used to express the tone, manner or spirit/soul in which the speech act is performed. So advice can be given in a familiar way or in a rude

way. For example "you should save little by little for old age" with "if you don't save money, you will feel the consequences in old age".

- Content (content). It is what is discussed – the topic of conversation – also determines the choice of language. For example, someone talks about the vocabulary of science. In some societies, certain topics are taboo, such as sex.
- Channels (channels). There are two main channels for verbal communication, namely speech or writing. We both know that the form of spoken language is different from the form of written language, the form of spoken language is different from the form of written language.

The six variables can be simplified into the following series who said/says what to whom, where and when, how and why.

Macrolinguistics

Based on the previous discussion, several characteristics of macrolinguistics emerged, among others.

- More attention to communicative competence than linguistic competence in Chomsky's sense;
- There is an attempt to describe linguistic events in their extra-linguistic setting;
- The search for linguistic organizational units that are larger than a single sentence.

In general, the expansion of coverage has a dual purpose, namely:

- Vertically to enlarge linguistic units;
- Horizontally to include socio-cultural or socio-cultural backgrounds in linguistics.

This expansion of coverage can be achieved in two ways, namely:

- first, at the formal level and focuses on the problem of how sentences are structured into larger supra-sentence units or texts;
- second, which is something that is very functional and looks at the ways people use language, this is the field of discourse analysis.

The two terms, text analysis, and discourse analysis are sometimes confused. Some suggest that text analysis refers to the European tradition, and discourse analysis to the Anglo-American tradition to do the same. Another approach is to see the two as complementary; discourse analysis begins with the external framework of situations and moves inward to find formal linguistic variables that correlate with situational

variables; while text analysis begins with linguistic forms and questions in appropriate contexts. `

The difference is in line with that made by [Marini et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Marini et al. \(2005\)](#) between usage and use. Usage relates to the grammar of sentences and is an important part of learning a foreign language, especially when it involves acquiring the ability to construct correct sentences. Although important, such abilities are not sufficient to equip learners to communicate in a foreign language, but learners also need to know which sentences are appropriate in a particular context. The rules regarding use need to be obtained and understood, as well as usage. A good sentence can fit the context in two ways:

- formally appropriate, i.e. not violating the rules of textual organization
- functionally appropriate, i.e. communicating what the speaker meant.

Or vice versa, a sentence can also be formally and functionally inappropriate. Formal incompatibility with the linguistic context (i.e. cotex and cotext) results in an incohesive text, while functional incompatibility will result in disturbances in communication, namely incoherence (inconsistent speakers).

Text analysis

A text is not simply a random sequence of content-related sentences. In the text, the sentences are seen in a neat arrangement, and there are formal suggestions that mark the real nature of the relationships that exist between the sequences of sentences. These tools can be in the form of grammatical means, lexical means, or in speech they can be added with international means. Especially for the anacon, we need to identify constants and variables, and it must be remembered that it is precisely these formal means that differ from language to language, whereas the relationships that may exist between sentences may very well be universal. Therefore, the relationship between sentences will act as a "tertium comparatoris"

Lexical means

The most important among the means of lexical cohesion is synonymous relationships which are the places where lexical items enter into sentences. Synonyms are linguistic forms whose meaning is similar to or the same as other forms; The similarity applies to words, groups of words, or sentences, although generally only words are considered synonyms. Synonyms are words that have the same denotation but differ in connotation.

A hyponym is a relation in semantics between a specific meaning and a generic meaning, or between a member of a taxonomy and a taxonomic name; for example,

between cats, dogs, and goats on the one hand and animals on the other. Cats, dogs, and goats are called hyponyms of animals. Animals are called superordinates of cats, dogs, and goats, while cats, dogs, and goats are called cohyponyms.

The jumbled text is, of course, incoherent, as long as the ideas seen in an array do not correspond to the natural sequence of cyber-events. It is precisely this kind of knowledge that makes the reader say that the text above is jumbled and muddled. The expressions between pediatrician, children's specialist, and doctor for your child are close synonyms. This indicates that the three are not freely interchangeable with each other in all contexts. The use of all three in the sentence weaves a thread to tie the three together, even where they are not a continuity in the text.

Grammatical means

[Farch \(2014\)](#) and [Field et al. \(2000\)](#), make an extensive in-depth review of the English language, and introduce the existence of four main grammatical means, viz. Language can refer to or make references/references in two ways. When I say “your house” or “your car”, I am referring to some entity or entity born in the real world: real-world references are called exophoric references and play a secondary role in textual organization. But with the help of language, it can also refer to other pieces of language: these, which are references-in-text, are called endophoric references.

The process or result of replacing a language element by another element in a larger unit to obtain a distinguishing element or explain a certain structure. The omission of words or other units whose original form can be predicted from the context of the language or context outside the language. The ellipsis effect is “to create cohesion by leaving what can be taken over from the discourse that preceded it. Comparisons don't always exist in one sentence, although this is perhaps the most economical and explicit way of expressing comparisons. The two pairs of sentences above are not related in the same way. In (i) there is no statement about comparison, does not use a comparative morpheme: comparison is already implied in it, and we must try to connect the two sentences silently. Para (ii) contains the most comparative marker but even here we must be able to understand the second sentence which takes the form.

Sentences in sequence usually show a variety of structures: of course, to train young people to write essays, the pre-teacher emphasizes how important it is to make a variety of well-ordered sentence patterns. However, experienced writers sometimes twist the maxim of variety and combine two or three sentences with parallel structures; and the effect of this method is to tie sentences together conceptually so that they are read as one cohesive textual entity (unity). Usually, the poets use this method, even considered as a political convention as well. The discussion in the previous sections has brought us into the areas of the textual Anacon. Therefore, it is good for us now to think about how to approach this textual Anacon. [Galletto et al.](#)

(2013) and Caspari & Parkinson (2000) suggest that three approaches can be used, namely textual characterization, text type, and translated texts ("translated texts").

Textual characterization

The term textual characterization refers to the collection of data on the preferences/choices shown by each language pair for the use of certain means to achieve textual cohesion. In the previous discussion in this discussed examples of textual means used in English and Indonesian. While the cultures supported by different languages may very well differ, we will usually be able to determine types in different languages that perform roughly the same function. In terms of ethnographers, through their concentration on the types of ritualistic texts or so-called artistic rituals, verbal ceremonials, and the use of special and specific speech, they tend to choose the typical as their analysis material.

Carlomagno et al. (2005) and Saling et al. (2012) suggest that there are three types of text, namely text emphasis based on content, form or attractiveness. Meanwhile, Nida distinguishes about the function of text, namely as an expressive, informative and imperative text function, and adds that the reader often totally trusts the context to determine how to interpret a particular text. In one paragraph we can find the same number of sentences that perform each of the three functions. Although it may be true that each text will predominately be informative, expressive or apperative.

The translated text is the real basis for the textual Anacon. The main limitation of this translated text is the potential for translation deviation, namely the target language text can show signs of interference from the source language. As long as the translator must be given access to the original, there is no way to prevent him from transferring his textural characteristics to the translation of the target language. If you do this, then the target language version is not authentic, i.e. it is not the original composed text as seen in that language. But at the same time we cannot prevent the translator from using certain grammatical and lexical features in the target language version just because they are contained in the source language text: they may be equally authentic in both versions.

In a bilingual society we often see texts in pairs, in the form of traffic signs, official leaflets, press announcements, notices, etc. All of these should ideally be equivalent texts, i.e. independently produce texts in language A and language B which are functionally equivalent. Marking the language study approach as discourse means emphasizing its function. This means that the question asked about any particular part or segment of language is not only about form but also about its use: what is the speaker (or writer) trying to achieve, what exactly does he get with that particular part of the language? Three things can be done through language, namely.

- Making statements
- Issue orders
- Asking questions

Traditionally writers of foreign language teaching materials have seen these three functions as basic, [Clarke et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Ferretti et al. \(2013\)](#) observed, so statements or reports receive special attention at the expense of commands and questions. When we do things through language, we do what [Marini et al. \(2010\)](#) call speech acts. The number of speech acts that the average individual performs daily, at work, and in his spare time, makes him relate to other people, perhaps in the thousands. Some speech acts that are widely used are asking, refusing, praising, describing, forgiving, explaining, while those that are rarely used are sympathy, blame, slander.

If textual cohesion is always clearly marked in various ways, then the functions of speech acts can be marked in a certain way or implicitly. Many attempts have been made to classify these discourse markers. [Sherratt & Bryan \(2012\)](#) introduced five categories of connectives that are most often used in English scientific texts. Connecting words or connectives serve to express to the reader (or listener) the types of logical relationships felt by the writer (or speaker) between speech sequences or speech boundaries in a text.

[Li et al. \(1995\)](#) suggest that English speakers exhibit six rhetorical functions, namely: definition, classification, comparison, contrast, analysis, synthesis. Kaplan's explanations are based on the fact that speakers of a language are users of a distinctive set of rhetorical means. An alternative and broader explanation of why speakers of the same language process discourse in various ways that ensure the intelligibility or understanding that they use conventions to relate language events to context. Research or study of how language and context are related to achieving interpretation is known as pragmatics or pragmalinguistics.

[Hoffman et al. \(2020\)](#) equates pragmatics with other branches of linguistics: syntax studies sentences, semantics studies proportions, pragmatics studies linguistic acts and the context in which they are displayed. The definition of context is indeed very broad because it includes, among others, the speaker's intentions and objectives, knowledge, beliefs, hopes, or concerns of the speaker and listener, other speech acts performed in the same context, the timing of the speech, and the truth value of the ideas expressed. Communication will be successful if between the speaker and the listener there is a harmony or match between the things mentioned earlier. If this happens, then they are in a unified group by [Duong & Ska \(2001\)](#) called a colingual community which is limited as a group of individuals who can communicate with each other in a certain way that is characteristic of the group.

Marini et al. (2019) distinguish three types of events to which speech or utterances refer:

- Events A: related to the current speaker/writer;
- Events B: related to listeners/readers.

AB events: which are generally considered to be related to speakers/writers and listeners/readers. Labov shows that various interpretations are made of an utterance depending on the view of it that the listener/reader makes with reference to event A, B, or AB. So, if the speaker/writer makes a statement about event B, the listener/reader hears/reads it as a request for confirmation, which implies something like “I think I am right to believe that. It should be noted that the speaker/writer expects an affirmative answer from the listener/reader and the listener/reader knows that. Therefore, if the listener/reader wants to correct the speaker/writer, then he/she tends to do so in a way that is called authoritative. In this case, a sociolinguistic convention has taken place: B assumes that statements made by A in B's presence must point to B's authority.

Indeed, in discussions of discourse, presuppositions are an important element and in this connection, no less important are the rules of interpretation that the listener/reader must apply to utterances to recognize the speech acts they carry. This precondition appears in almost all / three rules of interpretation and production to be achieved concerning orders or orders (Marini et al., 2014). The framework in two ways that are of particular interest to contrastive scholars. He listed no less than 17 ways of applying commands in English.

Conversational interaction

So far we have assumed that communication is unilateral, in the sense of language in which there is one speaker/writer, one listener/reader, and one direction of information flow. However, it turns out that communication is often two-way and dyadic – this is precisely what characterizes a conversation or conversation. Hartmann (1985) characterizes discourse as involving not one but two simultaneous sequences of acts: a sequence of illocutionary acts and a sequence of interactive acts. The illocutionary sequence of acts typically consists of actions such as inviting, agreeing, thanking, apologizing, etc., while the interactive sequence of acts consists of actions such as opening, closing, selecting the next speaker.

In the maxim of quantity, a speaker is expected to provide sufficient, relatively adequate, and informative information. Such information should not exceed the information needed by the interlocutor. Speech that contains information that is needed by the interlocutor can be said to violate the maxim of quantity in the Grice

Cooperation Principle. On the other hand, if the utterance contains excessive information, it can be said to violate the maxim of quantity.

Conversation component

Conversation management is how a speaker is opened, forwarded and finally closed. Like anything else, conversation has a beginning, middle and end. Opening according to Hartmann (1985) we open (and close) the conversation with a "repertoire of certain ritual exchanges which depend on cultural boundaries and can be expected to vary somewhat from society to society". The notion that opening and closing are uttered by "ritual" exchanges reminds us that some sociologists of language identify a class of verbal formulas which they call phatic communion. According to Laver, phatic communion is indexical and deictic.

Several anacon studies on conversational openings in English and German have been carried out at the University of Bochum. In this study, there is a fact that there are differences in the structure of conversation-opening in these two cognate languages. The pattern of exchange in particular in the preamble is a) or b) in English but c) or d) in German.

Conclusion

Macrolinguistics is a kind of linguistics tasked with studying or studying "situated speech" or with the term "situated speech". Hymes in Tarigan (1989: 151) introduces six variables in classifying each particular speech event, namely setting, participant, intent, tone, content, and channel. There are three main characteristics of macrolinguistics, namely attention to communicative competence, a description based on extra-linguistic background, the unit is larger than a single sentence. There are seven standards of textuality, namely cohesion, coherence, internationality, acceptability, informativity, situational, intertextuality. There are four grammatical means of textual cohesion namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and there are four lexical means of textual cohesion namely repetition, synonym, antonym, hyponym, collocation, equivalence. Contrastive text analysis consists of textual characterization, text typology, and translated text. In contrast macrolinguistic analysis, discourse analysis, conversational interactions, and components of conversation are also discussed.

References

- Akbiyık, S., Karaduman, A., Göksun, T., & Chatterjee, A. (2018). The relationship between co-speech gesture production and macrolinguistic discourse abilities in people with focal brain injury. *Neuropsychologia*, 117, 440-453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.06.025>

- Andreetta, S., Cantagallo, A., & Marini, A. (2012). Narrative discourse in anomic aphasia. *Neuropsychologia*, 50(8), 1787-1793. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2012.04.003>
- Cahana-Amitay, D., & Jenkins, T. (2018). Working memory and discourse production in people with aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 48, 90-103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2018.04.007>
- Carlomagno, S., Santoro, A., Menditti, A., Pandolfi, M., & Marini, A. (2005). Referential communication in Alzheimer's type dementia. *Cortex*, 41(4), 520-534. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(08\)70192-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(08)70192-8)
- Caspari, I., & Parkinson, S. R. (2000). Effects of memory impairment on discourse. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 13(1), 15-36. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044\(99\)00009-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0911-6044(99)00009-3)
- Clarke, N., Foltz, P., & Garrard, P. (2020). How to do things with (thousands of) words: Computational approaches to discourse analysis in Alzheimer's disease. *Cortex*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.05.001>
- Duong, A., & Ska, B. (2001). Production of narratives: Picture sequence facilitates organizational but not conceptual processing in less educated subjects. *Brain and cognition*, 46(1-2), 121-124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-2626\(01\)80047-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-2626(01)80047-6)
- Fareh, S. (2014). Macrolinguistic errors in Arab EFL learners' essays. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 923-933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.161>
- Ferretti, F., Adornetti, I., Cosentino, E., & Marini, A. (2013). Keeping the route and speaking coherently: the hidden link between spatial navigation and discourse processing. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 26(2), 327-334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2012.11.001>
- Field, S. J., Saling, M. M., & Berkovic, S. F. (2000). Interictal discourse production in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Brain and Language*, 74(2), 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.2000.2335>
- Galetto, V., Andreetta, S., Zettin, M., & Marini, A. (2013). Patterns of impairment of narrative language in mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 26(6), 649-661. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2013.05.004>
- Glosser, G., & Deser, T. (1991). Patterns of discourse production among neurological patients with fluent language disorders. *Brain and language*, 40(1), 67-88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(91\)90117-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(91)90117-J)
- Hartmann, R. R. (1985). Contrastive textology—Towards a dynamic paradigm for interlingual lexical studies?. *Language & Communication*, 5(2), 107-110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(85\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(85)90003-5)
- Hoffman, P., Cogdell-Brooke, L., & Thompson, H. E. (2020). Going off the rails: Impaired coherence in the speech of patients with semantic control deficits. *Neuropsychologia*, 146, 107516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2020.107516>
- Kintz, S., Hibbs, V., Henderson, A., Andrews, M., & Wright, H. H. (2018). Discourse-based treatment in mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of communication disorders*, 76, 47-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2018.08.001>

- Li, E. C., Williams, S. E., & Della Volpe, A. (1995). The effects of topic and listener familiarity on discourse variables in procedural and narrative discourse tasks. *Journal of communication disorders*, 28(1), 39-55. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9924\(95\)91023-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9924(95)91023-Z)
- Marini, A., Carlomagno, S., Caltagirone, C., & Nocentini, U. (2005). The role played by the right hemisphere in the organization of complex textual structures. *Brain and language*, 93(1), 46-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2004.08.002>
- Marini, A., Ferretti, F., Chiera, A., Magni, R., Adornetti, I., Nicchiarelli, S., ... & Valeri, G. (2019). Episodic future thinking and narrative discourse generation in children with Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 49, 178-188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2018.07.003>
- Marini, A., Galetto, V., Zampieri, E., Vorano, L., Zettin, M., & Carlomagno, S. (2011). Narrative language in traumatic brain injury. *Neuropsychologia*, 49(10), 2904-2910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.06.017>
- Marini, A., Gentili, C., Molteni, M., & Fabbro, F. (2014). Differential verbal working memory effects on linguistic production in children with specific language impairment. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 35(12), 3534-3542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.08.031>
- Marini, A., Martelli, S., Gagliardi, C., Fabbro, F., & Borgatti, R. (2010). Narrative language in Williams Syndrome and its neuropsychological correlates. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 23(2), 97-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2009.10.002>
- Marini, A., Spoletini, I., Rubino, I. A., Ciuffa, M., Bria, P., Martinotti, G., ... & Spalletta, G. (2008). The language of schizophrenia: An analysis of micro and macrolinguistic abilities and their neuropsychological correlates. *Schizophrenia research*, 105(1-3), 144-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2008.07.011>
- Marini, A., Zettin, M., & Galetto, V. (2014). Cognitive correlates of narrative impairment in moderate traumatic brain injury. *Neuropsychologia*, 64, 282-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.09.042>
- Marini, A., Zettin, M., Bencich, E., Bosco, F. M., & Galetto, V. (2017). Severity effects on discourse production after TBI. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 44, 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2017.03.005>
- Peach, R. K., & Coelho, C. A. (2016). Linking inter-and intra-sentential processes for narrative production following traumatic brain injury: Implications for a model of discourse processing. *Neuropsychologia*, 80, 157-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.11.015>
- Rogalski, Y., Altmann, L. J., Plummer-D'Amato, P., Behrman, A. L., & Marsiske, M. (2010). Discourse coherence and cognition after stroke: A dual task study. *Journal of communication disorders*, 43(3), 212-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.02.001>
- Saling, L. L., Laroo, N., & Saling, M. M. (2012). When more is less: Failure to compress discourse with re-telling in normal ageing. *Acta psychologica*, 139(1), 220-224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2011.10.005>

- Sherratt, S., & Bryan, K. (2012). Discourse production after right brain damage: Gaining a comprehensive picture using a multi-level processing model. *Journal of neurolinguistics*, 25(4), 213-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2012.01.001>
- Toledo, C. M., Aluísio, S. M., Dos Santos, L. B., Brucki, S. M. D., Trés, E. S., de Oliveira, M. O., & Mansur, L. L. (2018). Analysis of macrolinguistic aspects of narratives from individuals with Alzheimer's disease, mild cognitive impairment, and no cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer's & Dementia: Diagnosis, Assessment & Disease Monitoring*, 10, 31-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dadm.2017.08.005>
- Van Leer, E., & Turkstra, L. (1999). The effect of elicitation task on discourse coherence and cohesion in adolescents with brain injury. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 32(5), 327-349. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9924\(99\)00008-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9924(99)00008-8)