Ratersâ
 ${\bf \mathbb{M}}$ background as a potential source of bias in

Language Testing 30, 231-252 DOI: 10.1177/0265532212456968

Citation Report

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	The effects of accent familiarity and language teaching experience on raters' judgments of non-native speech. System, 2013, 41, 770-785.	1.7	32
2	Investigating native and non-native English-speaking teacher raters' judgements of oral proficiency in the College English Test-Spoken English Test (CET-SET). Assessment in Education, 2014, 21, 306-325.	0.7	13
3	An examination of rater performance on a local oral English proficiency test: A mixed-methods approach. Language Testing, 2014, 31, 501-527.	1.7	34
4	Comparing foreign accent in L1 attrition and L2 acquisition: Range and rater effects. Language Testing, 2014, 31, 367-388.	1.7	32
5	A prospectus for pronunciation research in the 21st century. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2015, 1, 11-42.	0.4	62
6	Evaluation by Native and Non-Native English Teacher-Raters of Japanese Students' Summaries. English Language Teaching, 2015, 8, .	0.2	3
7	Recognising English accents in the community: Omani students' accent preferences and perceptions of nativeness. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 2015, 36, 182-197.	1.0	19
8	ESL essay raters' cognitive processes in applying the Jacobs et al. rubric: An eye-movement study. Assessing Writing, 2015, 25, 38-54.	1.7	38
9	Does a Speaking Task Affect Second Language Comprehensibility?. Modern Language Journal, 2015, 99, 80-95.	1.3	73
10	Using Listener Judgments to Investigate Linguistic Influences on L2 Comprehensibility and Accentedness: A Validation and Generalization Study. Applied Linguistics, 0, , amv047.	1.1	60
11	Building a better rubric: Mixed methods rubric revision. Assessing Writing, 2015, 26, 51-66.	1.7	39
12	Investigating Differences Between American and Indian Raters in Assessing TOEFL iBT Speaking Tasks. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2015, 12, 283-304.	1.1	15
13	AGE MATTERS, AND SO MAY RATERS. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2015, 37, 623-650.	1.8	10
14	How Do Raters Judge Spoken Vocabulary?. English Language Teaching, 2016, 9, 102.	0.2	0
15	Do Native Speakers of North American and Singapore English Differentially Perceive Comprehensibility in Second Language Speech?. TESOL Quarterly, 2016, 50, 421-446.	1.5	33
16	LEXICAL PROFILES OF COMPREHENSIBLE SECOND LANGUAGE SPEECH. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2016, 38, 677-701.	1.8	56
17	Developing second language oral ability in foreign language classrooms: The role of the length and focus of instruction and individual differences. Applied Psycholinguistics, 2016, 37, 813-840.	0.8	42
18	Lexical correlates of comprehensibility versus accentedness in second language speech. Bilingualism, 2016, 19, 597-609.	1.0	24

#	ARTICLE Diversity Among NEST Raters: How do New and Experienced NESTs Evaluate Korean English Learners'	IF	CITATIONS
19	Essays?. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 2016, 25, 549-558. Foreign accentedness revisited: Canadian and Singaporean raters' perception of Japanese-accented	2.2	3
20	English. Language Awareness, 2016, 25, 305-317.	0.9	4
21	9. Assessing speaking. , 2016, , 131-146.		11
22	A Cross-Linguistic Investigation of the Effect of Raters' Accent Familiarity on Speaking Assessment. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2016, 13, 25-41.	1.1	20
23	A Multidimensional Scaling Study of Native and Non-Native Listeners' Perception of Second Language Speech. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 2016, 122, 470-489.	0.6	3
24	PRONUNCIATION IN FACE-TO-FACE AND AUDIO-ONLY SYNCHRONOUS COMPUTER-MEDIATED LEARNER INTERACTIONS. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2017, 39, 225-256.	1.8	16
25	Linguistic Dimensions of Accentedness and Comprehensibility: Exploring Task and Listener Effects in Second Language French. Foreign Language Annals, 2017, 50, 547-566.	0.6	34
26	Assessing C2 writing ability on the Certificate of English Language Proficiency: Rater and examinee age effects. Assessing Writing, 2017, 34, 37-49.	1.7	14
27	Linguistic correlates of comprehensibility in second language Japanese speech. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2017, 3, 199-217.	0.4	15
28	Professional and non-professional raters' responsiveness to fluency and accuracy in L2 speech: An experimental approach. Language Testing, 2018, 35, 501-527.	1.7	29
29	Evaluating CEFR rater performance through the analysis of spoken learner corpora. Language Testing in Asia, 2018, 8, .	1.0	17
30	The English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21). Language Assessment Quarterly, 2018, 15, 433-442.	1.1	4
31	Teacher-Examiners' Explicit and Enacted Beliefs About Proficiency Indicators in National Oral Assessments. , 2018, , 197-216.		1
32	Investigating L1 lay assessments of L2 French pronunciation. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2018, 4, 103-128.	0.4	2
33	Investigating the validity of oral assessment rater training program: A mixed-methods study of raters' perceptions and attitudes before and after training. Cogent Education, 2018, 5, 1460901.	0.6	6
34	Shifting Sands in Second Language Pronunciation Teaching and Assessment Research and Practice. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2018, 15, 273-293.	1.1	25
35	Pronunciation's role in English speaking-proficiency ratings. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2018, 4, 73-102.	0.4	3
36	Examining the Impacts of Rater Effects in Performance Assessments. Applied Psychological Measurement, 2019, 43, 159-171.	0.6	19

	CITATION R	EPORT	
#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
37	Can subject matter experts rate the English language skills of customer services representatives (CSRs) at work in Indian contact centre?. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2019, 16, 87-104.	1.1	2
38	Evaluating the effectiveness of the training program on direct and semi-direct oral proficiency assessment: A case of multifaceted Rasch analysis. Cogent Education, 2019, 6, 1670592.	0.6	2
39	The effect of training and rater differences on oral proficiency assessment. Language Testing, 2019, 36, 481-504.	1.7	24
40	Examining Differential Rater Functioning Using a Betweenâ€Subgroup Outfit Approach. Journal of Educational Measurement, 2019, 56, 217-250.	0.7	8
41	The Impact of Computers on Marking Behaviors and Assessment: A Many-Facet Rasch Measurement Analysis of Essays by EFL College Students. SAGE Open, 2019, 9, 215824401984669.	0.8	1
42	HOW DO SECOND LANGUAGE LISTENERS PERCEIVE THE COMPREHENSIBILITY OF FOREIGN-ACCENTED SPEECH?. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2019, 41, 1133-1149.	1.8	30
43	For a Greater Good: Bias Analysis in Writing Assessment. SAGE Open, 2019, 9, 215824401882237.	0.8	5
44	ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview – computer (OPIc). Language Testing, 2019, 36, 467-477.	1.7	12
45	Listener Background in L2 Speech Evaluation. , 0, , .		2
46	SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND SPEECH RATINGS. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2019, 41, 419-442.	1.8	28
47	The relationship between multilingual raters' language background and their perceptions of accentedness and comprehensibility of second language speech. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 2019, 22, 849-869.	1.1	6
49	THE ROLE OF ACOUSTIC CUES AND LISTENER PROFICIENCY IN THE PERCEPTION OF ACCENT IN NONNATIVE SOUNDS. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2019, 41, 179-200.	1.8	16
50	Assessing Speaking Proficiency: A Narrative Review of Speaking Assessment Research Within the Argument-Based Validation Framework. Frontiers in Psychology, 2020, 11, 330.	1.1	21
51	Rater Effects on L2 Oral Assessment: Focusing on Accent Familiarity of L2 Teachers. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2020, 17, 231-243.	1.1	3
52	Pre-service teachers' beliefs about second language pronunciation teaching, their experience, and speech assessments. Language Teaching Research, 2023, 27, 115-136.	2.1	11
53	My English sounds better than yours: Second-language learners perceive their own accent as better than that of their peers. PLoS ONE, 2020, 15, e0227643.	1.1	11
54	Exploring Japanese EFL Learners' Attitudes Toward English Pronunciation and its Relationship to Perceived Accentedness. Language and Speech, 2021, 64, 24-34.	0.6	5
55	Roles of collocation in L2 oral proficiency revisited: Different tasks, L1 vs. L2 raters, and cross-sectional vs. longitudinal analyses. Second Language Research, 2022, 38, 531-554.	1.2	12

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
56	Examining the effects of different English speech varieties on an L2 academic listening comprehension test at the item level. Language Testing, 2021, 38, 580-601.	1.7	10
57	USING TASK PRACTICE TO REDUCE SOCIAL INFLUENCES ON LISTENER EVALUATIONS OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACCENT AND COMPREHENSIBILITY. International Journal of Listening, 0, , 1-16.	0.5	1
58	Social judgement of L2 accented speech stereotyping and its influential factors. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 0, , 1-16.	1.0	12
59	Validating the Business English Writing Scale. , 2021, , 125-154.		0
60	An A–Z of Applied Linguistics Research Methods. , 2016, , .		56
61	An A–Z of Applied Linguistics Research Methods. , 2016, , 1-205.		8
62	ChapterÂ13. Look who's interacting. AILA Applied Linguistics Series, 0, , 306-324.	0.1	10
63	Stretching the boundaries. Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 2019, 29, 300-321.	0.2	2
64	Learning Korean pronunciation. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2019, 5, 13-48.	0.4	9
65	Testing the malleability of teachers' judgments of second language speech. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 0, , .	0.4	3
66	Reactions to second language speech. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2020, 6, 402-429.	0.4	7
70	ChapterÂ3. A comparison of L2 listening performance on tests with scripted or authenticated spoken texts. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 30-43.	0.1	3
71	ChapterÂ7. Listening to an unfamiliar accent. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 98-112.	0.1	2
72	ChapterÂ10. Test takers' use of visual information in an L2 video-mediated listening test. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 146-160.	0.1	4
73	ChapterÂ11. Investigating the impact of nonverbal communication cues on listening item types. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 162-175.	0.1	8
74	Chapter 9. An overview of the use of audio-visual texts on L2 listening tests. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 130-144.	0.1	4
75	Validation of rating processes within an argument-based framework. Language Testing, 2018, 35, 477-499.	1.7	55
76	Development of Second Language French Oral Skills in an Instructed Setting: A Focus on Speech Ratings. Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2017, 20, 32-50.	0.2	15

ARTICLE IF CITATIONS # Investigating cultural variability in rater judgements of oral proficiency interviews. Eesti 79 0.0 2 Rakenduslingvistika Uhingu Aastaraamat, 2014, , 269-281. Psychometric approaches to language testing and linguistic profiling – A complementary relationship?. Processability Approaches To Language Acquisition Research & Teaching, 2016, , 135-162. 0.1 An investigation into the rating tendency of Korean teachers as a non-native rater in a speaking 82 0.0 0 assessment of English. Oegukak Yeon-gu, 2017, null, 77-102. Investigating the Effect of Training on Raters' Bias toward Test Takers in Oral Proficiency Assessment : 0.1 A FACETS Analysis. Journal of Asia TEFL, 2017, 14, 687-702. ChapterÂ8. Different varieties of World Englishes. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 84 0.1 0 114-126. ChapterÂ15. A measurement model for listen-speak tasks. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 228-245. 0.1 ChapterÂ6. Reliability and sources of score variance in a strength of accent measure. Language 86 0.1 0 Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 84-95. Chapter 16. Conclusion. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 248-256. 0.1 ChapterÂ14. Investigating examiner interventions in relation to the listening demands they make on 88 0.1 5 candidates in oral interview tests. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 206-225. ChapterÂ4. Connected-speech dictations for testing listening. Language Learning and Language 0.1 Teaching, 2018, , 46-63. Chapter 2. An overview of the use of authentic, real-world spoken texts on L2 listening tests. 91 0.1 4 Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 14-28. ChapterÂ13. The degree to which it matters if an oral test task requires listening. Language Learning 0.1 and Language Teaching, 2018, , 194-204. Chapter 12. An overview of interactive listening as part of the construct of interactive and integrated 93 0.1 0 oral test tasks. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 180-192. Chapter 5. An overview of the issue of using different types of speech varieties as listening inputs in L2 94 0.1 listening assessment. Language Learning and Language Teaching, 2018, , 68-81. Assessing Pronunciation., 2019, , 287-342. 95 1 Different Rating Behaviors between New and Experienced NESTs When Evaluating Korean English Learners' Speaking. Journal of Asia TEFL, 2018, 15, 1036-1050. Comparison of Rating Tendencies between Native and Non-native Speakers in Korean Speaking Test. 97 0.2 0 Language Research, 2019, 55, 179-201. Does personality influence ratings of foreign accents?. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2020, 6, 68-95.

#	Article	IF	Citations
99	Review of Jones, Byrnes & Halenko (2018): Successful Spoken English. Findings form Learner Corpora. International Journal of Learner Corpus Research, 2020, 6, 252-257.	0.4	0
100	Building an Oral and Written Learner Corpus of a School Programme: Methodological Issues. , 2020, , 214-242.		2
101	Rating L2 speaker comprehensibility on monologic vs. interactive tasks. Journal of Second Language Pronunciation, 2020, 6, 96-121.	0.4	15
102	TRAINING THE "EVERYDAY―LISTENER HOW TO RATE ACCENTED SPEECH. International Journal of Listening, 2024, 38, 58-78.	0.5	1
103	What is second language pronunciation proficiency? An empirical study. System, 2022, 106, 102754.	1.7	6
104	Selfâ€Assessment of Comprehensibility and Accentedness in Second Language Korean. Language Learning, 2022, 72, 806-852.	1.4	6
105	Factors that affect native English speakers' comfort levels when communicating with nonâ€native English speakers. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2022, 32, 158-174.	0.4	1
106	Impact of L2 learners' background factors on the perception of L1 Spanish speech. Foreign Language Annals, 2022, 55, 155-174.	0.6	0
107	Linguistic variables of Comprehensibility, Accentedness and Fluency in L2 Spanish: Listener type and ability level differences. Loquens, 2020, 7, e075.	0.1	1
109	Reactions to second language speech. Contemporary Discourses of Hate and Radicalism Across Space and Genres, 2022, , 125-151.	0.0	0
112	A sequential approach to detecting differential rater functioning in sparse rater-mediated assessment networks. Language Testing, 2023, 40, 209-226.	1.7	0
113	Rater Connections and the Detection of Bias in Performance Assessment. Measurement, 2022, 20, 91-106.	0.1	1
114	Investigating the effect of classroom-based feedback on speaking assessment: a multifaceted Rasch analysis. Language Testing in Asia, 2022, 12, .	1.0	3
116	Development and Validation of a Training-Embedded Speaking Assessment Rating Scale: A Multifaceted Rasch Analysis in Speaking Assessment. International Journal of Research in English Education, 2022, 7, 32-45.	0.0	0
117	Assessing Second Language Speaking Proficiency. Annual Review of Linguistics, 2023, 9, 541-560.	1.2	2
118	8 Re-examining Phonological and Lexical Correlates of Second Language Comprehensibility: The Role of Rater Experience. , 0, , .		0
119	7 Students' Attitudes Towards English Teachers' Accents: The Interplay of Accent Familiarity, Comprehensibility, Intelligibility, Perceived Native Speaker Status, and Acceptability as a Teacher. , 0, , .		0
120	Metacognition in Second Language Speech Perception and Production. Language Learning, 2023, 73, 508-542.	1.4	2

		ATION REPORT		
#	Article	IF	CITATIONS	
121	Detangling experiential, cognitive, and sociopsychological individual differences in second language speech learning: Cross-sectional and longitudinal investigations. Bilingualism, 0, , 1-14.	1.0	2	
122	The relationship among accent familiarity, shared L1, and comprehensibility: A path analysis perspective. Language Testing, 2023, 40, 723-747.	1.7	3	
123	Investigating a shared-dialect effect between raters and candidates in English speaking tests. Frontiers in Psychology, 0, 14, .	1.1	1	