

# Violet A Brown

## List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: <https://exaly.com/author-pdf/148554/publications.pdf>

Version: 2024-02-01

19  
papers

431  
citations

1163117  
8  
h-index

888059  
17  
g-index

24  
all docs

24  
docs citations

24  
times ranked

332  
citing authors

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	“Where are the . . . Fixations?” Grammatical number cues guide anticipatory fixations to upcoming referents and reduce lexical competition.. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition, 2022, 48, 643-657.	0.9	1
2	Revisiting the relationship between implicit racial bias and audiovisual benefit for nonnative-accented speech. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2022, 84, 2074-2086.	1.3	7
3	Revisiting the target-masker linguistic similarity hypothesis. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2022, 84, 1772-1787.	1.3	3
4	Speech and non-speech measures of audiovisual integration are not correlated. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2022, 84, 1809-1819.	1.3	2
5	Face mask type affects audiovisual speech intelligibility and subjective listening effort in young and older adults. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 2021, 6, 49.	2.0	47
6	An Introduction to Linear Mixed-Effects Modeling in R. Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 2021, 4, 251524592096035.	9.4	138
7	Talking Points: A Modulating Circle Increases Listening Effort Without Improving Speech Recognition in Young Adults. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2020, 27, 536-543.	2.8	13
8	Rapid adaptation to fully intelligible nonnative-accented speech reduces listening effort. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 2020, 73, 1431-1443.	1.1	28
9	Understanding Speech amid the Jingle and Jangle: Recommendations for Improving Measurement Practices in Listening Effort Research. Auditory Perception & Cognition, 2020, 3, 169-188.	1.1	19
10	Recall of Speech is Impaired by Subsequent Masking Noise: A Replication of Rabbitt (1968) Experiment 2. Auditory Perception & Cognition, 2020, 3, 158-167.	1.1	2
11	Talking points: A modulating circle reduces listening effort without improving speech recognition. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 2019, 26, 291-297.	2.8	6
12	“Paying” attention to audiovisual speech: Do incongruent stimuli incur greater costs?. Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics, 2019, 81, 1743-1756.	1.3	4
13	Noise increases listening effort in normal-hearing young adults, regardless of working memory capacity. Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 2019, 34, 628-640.	1.2	10
14	Publishing Open, Reproducible Research With Undergraduates. Frontiers in Psychology, 2019, 10, 564.	2.1	7
15	About Face: Seeing the Talker Improves Spoken Word Recognition but Increases Listening Effort. Journal of Cognition, 2019, 2, 44.	1.4	11
16	Node Ordering for Rescalable Network Summarization (or, the Apparent Magic of Word Frequency) TJ ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Overlock 10 Tf 5	0.9	0
17	What accounts for individual differences in susceptibility to the McGurk effect?. PLoS ONE, 2018, 13, e0207160.	2.5	37
18	Measuring Listening Effort: Convergent Validity, Sensitivity, and Links With Cognitive and Personality Measures. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 2018, 61, 1463-1486.	1.6	89

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Keep listening: Grammatical context reduces but does not eliminate activation of unexpected words.. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition, 2018, 44, 962-973.	0.9	6