

Why Measuring English Proficiency Matters in the AI Era

2026

Why Measuring English Proficiency Matters in the AI Era

ITSC Research Series

Report ITSC-2026-10

Prepared by Janna Schaeffer, PhD

English Proficiency in a Changing Workplace

The contemporary workplace is undergoing profound structural changes driven by the convergence of globalization, digitalization, and artificial intelligence (Bankins et al., 2024; Zirar et al., 2023). Advances in communication technologies have enabled organizations to recruit talent internationally, manage multinational remote teams, and collaborate across national and cultural boundaries with relative ease. Geographically distributed collaboration has become commonplace as a result of the widespread adoption of remote and hybrid work (Barry & Kane, 2023; Maurer et al., 2022). Employees may now be expected to communicate regularly with colleagues, customers, suppliers, and partners located internationally through virtual meetings, collaborative platforms, and digital communication tools. As a result, effective communication has become increasingly important for coordinating work within distributed work environments.

In parallel, a growing number of workplace activities are now completed with the help of generative AI systems, including drafting reports, summarizing complex information, conducting research, analyzing data, and supporting decision-making processes (OECD, 2025). Although some aspects of these tasks have become automated, these technologies also introduce new communication demands for employees. Employees are increasingly expected to leverage AI tools by formulating effective prompts, critically interpreting AI-generated responses, and verifying the accuracy of AI-generated information (OECD, 2023; Ting, 2026). Such dynamics suggest that the effectiveness of AI-assisted work depends not only on the capabilities of the technology but also on the communication skills of the individuals using

these tools. AI is therefore not necessarily reducing the importance of communication but rather changing the ways in which employees communicate and interact with information.

These changing communication demands are particularly relevant in global workplaces where English already serves as a common language for both professional communication and many forms of technology-mediated work. English continues to serve as a major lingua franca of global business and international cooperation (Neeley, 2012; Piekkari et al., 2014). It functions as a common medium through which multinational organizations coordinate global operations, facilitate collaboration among geographically dispersed teams, communicate with international customers and partners, and exchange technical and professional knowledge. The importance of English also extends to many of the digital and technical environments in which contemporary work occurs, including technical documentation, software-development resources, online professional communities, and AI-enabled tools (Bhuiyan et al., 2026; Botto Tobar et al., 2025).

The continued importance of English across global and increasingly technology-mediated work environments has broader implications for organizations. When employees' English proficiency does not adequately support these communication demands, language barriers can impede collaboration, limit knowledge sharing, and make coordination across teams and organizational units more difficult. As communication becomes more central to how work is coordinated, information is exchanged, and technology is used, the organizational significance of English proficiency also increases. In this context, English proficiency can be understood as more than an individual competency; in organizations operating across linguistic and geographic boundaries, it can represent a strategic organizational capability that supports communication and collaboration (Kankaanranta et al., 2018; Guillouët et al., 2024). As organizational investment in AI technologies and digital transformation grows, English language communication is also becoming increasingly relevant to how employees interact with information, technology, and one another across diverse work environments.

If English proficiency affects employees' ability to meet important workplace communication demands, organizations need reliable information about whether employees possess the

proficiency required for their roles. This raises an important question for employers, human resource professionals, and organizational leaders: how can organizations reliably measure English proficiency in order to make effective workforce decisions? Although organizations may recognize the importance of English for workplace communication, they may not have systematic methods for evaluating employees' actual proficiency. As a result, organizations may lack consistent and comparable information about whether employees' English language proficiency aligns with workplace communication demands. This measurement gap may become increasingly consequential as AI reshapes how employees produce, interpret, evaluate, and communicate information. Reliable and standardized assessment can provide organizations with evidence about English language proficiency while supporting decisions related to recruitment, development, mobility, and international collaboration. This report examines how transformations in the contemporary workplace are reshaping communication demands and considers the strategic role of English language proficiency assessment in helping organizations prepare their workforces for increasingly global and AI-mediated work.

The English Proficiency Measurement Gap

The need for consistent and accurate English language proficiency measurement has become increasingly important in contemporary, globalized workplaces (Ahamed, 2026). Although many organizations recognize English proficiency and effective communication as important workplace capabilities, they may lack reliable and systematic methods for assessing English language proficiency. Across hiring contexts, judgments about English language proficiency may therefore be based on variable or informal evidence rather than standardized measures designed specifically to assess the construct (Lockwood, 2012). Such practices can create a measurement gap between the English language proficiency organizations seek to evaluate and the evidence available to support judgments about that proficiency. In the context of this report, the measurement gap refers specifically to the disconnect between the recognized importance of English language proficiency in the workplace and organizations' capacity to generate reliable, valid, and consistent evidence about employees' actual proficiency.

Organizations may instead rely on indirect indicators of proficiency. Applicants may be asked to describe their proficiency, while their language performance during formal and informal conversations may be treated as evidence of their ability to communicate effectively in English. Other background information, such as educational and professional experience, may also be considered when gauging candidates' English language proficiency. Because such indicators are not necessarily designed or validated as measures of English language proficiency, their interpretation may not provide consistent evidence of candidates' actual proficiency (Lockwood, 2012). Available indicators may also be interpreted differently across organizations and departments, further limiting the consistency of the evidence used to make judgments about English language proficiency.

Research on pre-employment assessment has long pointed to limitations associated with informal and unstructured approaches to evaluating candidates, while research specifically examining workplace language assessment has raised concerns about the validity, reliability, and fairness of English-language recruitment assessment practices (Levashina et al., 2014; Lockwood, 2012). Unless criteria for evaluating language performance are clearly defined, informal judgments of proficiency may be influenced by interviewers' and decision-makers' experiences and perceptions rather than by applicants' English language proficiency alone. Research on second-language performance assessment also demonstrates that characteristics of raters themselves can influence evaluations of oral language performance (Winke et al., 2013). Perceived linguistic difference is also not equivalent to an inability to communicate effectively (Munro & Derwing, 1995), while accent can influence evaluations of job candidates (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010). As a result, judgments about applicants' English language proficiency based primarily on informal evidence may not accurately reflect the construct being evaluated and may not provide a sufficiently consistent basis for workforce decisions.

The need for more structured and consistent English language proficiency assessment extends beyond hiring. Reliable information about employees' English language proficiency can inform decisions related to training and development, career mobility, and international assignments. Research on multinational organizations demonstrates that language differences can shape employees' participation in organizational communication and knowledge-sharing processes

(Tenzer et al., 2021; Guillouët et al., 2024). Proficiency information can also help organizations identify employees' language-development needs and determine appropriate forms of support (Knoch & Macqueen, 2020). When actual gaps in employees' English language proficiency are not accurately identified, employees may not receive the targeted support needed to achieve expected performance levels.

These challenges are particularly salient in complex, collaborative work environments. Engineering teams may coordinate work across countries and technical disciplines, while project managers may communicate with stakeholders from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Healthcare professionals may interact with multilingual patient populations, where language barriers can affect communication and service outcomes (Al Shamsi et al., 2020). Customer service representatives may similarly engage clients through multiple communication channels in which clarity is important to successful interaction. Across these contexts, sufficient English language proficiency to meet relevant workplace communication demands can represent an operational requirement rather than simply an interpersonal asset.

These measurement challenges may become increasingly consequential as AI changes the communication demands associated with many forms of work. Effective use of generative AI requires employees to formulate appropriate prompts while critically interpreting and evaluating AI-generated outputs. Working with AI in this way may create additional communication and digital literacy demands for employees working in English (Tour & Zadorozhnyy, 2025). Research suggests that generative AI can produce productivity benefits in some workplace contexts (Brynjolfsson et al., 2025). Organizations that lack accurate information about employees' English language proficiency, however, may be less able to identify language-related barriers that affect employees' ability to use these technologies effectively.

Organizations already rely on standardized approaches to evaluate competencies considered important for successful job performance. Technical certifications, professional licensing, and skills assessments provide structured evidence of job-relevant capabilities. English language proficiency assessment can similarly serve as a source of workforce information rather than

solely as a screening mechanism used during recruitment. Addressing the measurement gap therefore requires moving beyond reliance on informal indicators toward systematic assessment capable of producing reliable, valid, and comparable proficiency information (AERA et al., 2014). Instead of relying solely on information derived from informal indicators, consistent application of the criteria underlying standardized assessment can provide organizations with evidence of prospective and existing employees' English language proficiency. Assessment outcomes can then be interpreted in relation to relevant workplace requirements. The section below examines how standardized English language assessment can support workforce decisions across recruitment, workforce development, global talent management, and AI-mediated work.

English Assessment for Workforce Decisions

Once organizations adopt appropriate English language assessments, the resulting proficiency information can support workforce decisions across the employee lifecycle, from recruitment and selection to workforce development, internal mobility, and international assignments. This information can accompany interviews, professional experience, educational qualifications, performance information, and other relevant data, serving as an additional source of evidence.

Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment represents one of the most direct applications of English language proficiency assessment. When English proficiency is relevant to successful job performance, standardized assessment can provide evidence about whether candidates possess the language capabilities needed to meet the communication demands of a position. This information can complement interviews and other selection procedures by providing a more consistent basis for evaluating English language proficiency across candidates.

The value of such information depends on its relationship to actual job requirements. Different positions require substantially different types and levels of English language proficiency. A position involving frequent interaction with international clients, for example, may place substantial demands on speaking and listening, while a technical or analytical position may require greater emphasis on reading complex documentation and producing precise written

communication. Assessment results are therefore most useful when proficiency expectations are established in relation to the communication requirements of the position rather than applied as a uniform standard across substantially different roles.

Workforce Development

English language assessment can also support workforce development by helping organizations identify employees' existing capabilities and areas in which additional language development may be needed. Reliable proficiency information can provide a stronger basis for determining whether employees require language support and which skills should receive particular attention (Knoch & Macqueen, 2020).

Employees with different proficiency profiles may require substantially different forms of support. Some may need development in particular language skills, such as speaking or writing, while others may require support with the more complex communication demands associated with new professional responsibilities. Assessment can also provide a basis for evaluating development over time, allowing organizations to examine changes in proficiency and determine whether additional support may be needed. In this way, assessment can support development opportunities that are more closely aligned with employees' demonstrated needs and workplace requirements.

Global Talent Management

Consistent English language measurement can support talent-management decisions across employees from diverse linguistic, educational, and geographic backgrounds by providing a common reference point across offices and regions. Shared proficiency standards can support greater comparability in decisions involving international recruitment, internal mobility, and international assignments when assessment criteria and score interpretations are applied consistently.

Employees participating in multinational projects, virtual teams, or globally coordinated roles may encounter communication demands that differ from those of their current positions. Reliable proficiency information can provide evidence relevant to employees' readiness for

these responsibilities while helping organizations identify individuals who may benefit from additional language development before assuming new roles. Language capabilities are particularly relevant in multinational environments because language barriers can affect communication, participation, and knowledge transfer across organizational units and teams (Peltokorpi & Vaara, 2014; Tenzer et al., 2021).

At the same time, proficiency information should remain one component of broader talent-management decisions rather than serving as a stand-alone indicator of employee readiness or potential. International assignments and cross-border responsibilities require professional expertise, intercultural competence, organizational knowledge, and other capabilities in addition to language proficiency. Standardized English assessment can contribute useful evidence about one dimension of readiness while complementing these other sources of information.

Organizational Workforce Insights

At an aggregate level, assessment data can help organizations identify patterns in English language proficiency across departments, business units, or geographic regions. When interpreted appropriately, such information can contribute to decisions about recruitment priorities, language-development investments, succession planning, and international talent deployment. These patterns can also help organizations identify areas in which communication requirements and existing workforce capabilities are not well aligned. However, group-level proficiency results should not be treated as comprehensive measures of workforce capability, nor should differences among groups automatically be attributed to deficiencies in employees. Rather, assessment data can provide one source of information for identifying patterns that warrant further analysis and for supporting organizational decisions about workforce development and deployment.

English Proficiency in AI-Mediated Work

The growing use of generative AI may increase the importance of English language proficiency information for understanding workforce capabilities and development needs. Employees increasingly interact with AI systems through language: they formulate instructions, refine

prompts, interpret generated responses, evaluate information, and incorporate AI-generated content into communication and decision-making. These activities may create additional language demands for employees who perform AI-mediated work in English (Tour & Zadorozhnyy, 2025). At the same time, generative AI can help users produce and refine language, making it more difficult to determine whether AI-assisted communication reflects an individual's independent language proficiency. This distinction is important when interpreting and assessing language performance in AI-mediated environments (Chuang & Yan, 2025).

English language proficiency should not be treated as a proxy for digital or AI literacy. Effective AI use requires broader capabilities related to understanding and applying AI, critically evaluating its outputs, and recognizing the ethical considerations associated with its use (Ng et al., 2021). English language proficiency can nevertheless represent one component of readiness for employees whose interaction with AI systems occurs primarily in English. Reliable proficiency information can therefore provide evidence that helps organizations distinguish language-related barriers from other factors affecting employees' use of AI. An employee who has difficulty formulating precise prompts, interpreting nuanced responses, or evaluating complex AI-generated text may require language development, AI-literacy development, domain-specific support, or some combination of these. Understanding employees' English proficiency provides one source of evidence that can help organizations make this distinction and target development more appropriately.

As organizations continue to integrate AI into workplace processes, the communication demands associated with particular jobs may also change. Analyses of workplace communication requirements should account not only for communication among employees, customers, and international partners but also for the language-intensive activities employees perform through AI-enabled systems (Chee et al., 2024). Proficiency expectations and assessment strategies may therefore need to evolve alongside changes in how work is performed.

Building an Effective English Language Assessment Strategy

Meaningful and reliable information about employees' English language proficiency requires appropriate, high-quality instruments capable of generating that information. However, not every English language assessment is suitable for every workforce purpose, and standardized administration alone does not ensure that assessment results are appropriate for hiring, development, mobility, or other organizational decisions. Organizations should therefore consider the reliability of assessment results and the validity of their intended interpretations and uses, the extent to which scores can be interpreted in relation to relevant workplace communication demands, and the consistency and fairness of assessment implementation within the organizational context (AERA et al., 2014). Ultimately, the focus of English language proficiency evaluation should extend beyond obtaining a score to the quality of the evidence supporting the interpretations and decisions made on the basis of that score.

When assessment results are used to inform high-stakes workforce decisions, the assessments organizations select should demonstrate appropriate measurement characteristics for their intended uses. Assessment scores should support the interpretations and decisions for which they are intended (Chapelle & Voss, 2021). An assessment appropriate for general proficiency classification, for example, does not necessarily provide all of the evidence needed to support specific employment decisions. At the same time, general proficiency assessments may provide sufficient and appropriate evidence for many organizational purposes. Organizations should therefore consider the relationship among the construct being measured, the evidence produced by the assessment, the communication requirements of relevant roles, and the decisions the resulting scores are expected to support.

Equally important are fairness, reliability, and measurement precision. Construct-irrelevant factors associated with assessment procedures should be closely monitored and addressed so that they do not systematically disadvantage particular groups of employees or candidates. Fair assessment requires consideration of accessibility, cultural and linguistic appropriateness, administration conditions, and scoring practices (AERA et al., 2014). Assessment results should also be sufficiently consistent and precise for their intended uses, with differences in scores

reflecting meaningful differences in English language proficiency rather than unnecessary variation arising from administration conditions or other sources of measurement error (AERA et al., 2014).

Operational characteristics such as scalability, security, accessibility, administrative efficiency, and technological integration should also be considered. Organizations should determine whether an assessment is accessible to relevant employee and candidate populations and whether its delivery requirements, technological infrastructure, administration options, and reporting systems are compatible with organizational needs and resources. Assessments should be administered consistently, with appropriate safeguards to protect score integrity and candidate privacy (AERA et al., 2014). Score comparability should also be considered across relevant populations, administrations, and geographic settings. Common proficiency frameworks or reporting scales can facilitate interpretation and comparison; however, comparability should be supported by appropriate evidence rather than assumed from the use of a common framework or score scale alone (Chapelle & Voss, 2021).

An effective assessment strategy should begin with a solid understanding of workplace requirements. Analyzing the nature and complexity of the language demands placed on employees, together with the organizational context in which communication occurs, can provide organizations with the information needed to identify assessments that are most appropriate for their workforce needs (Knoch & Macqueen, 2020). This analysis should consider employees' professional responsibilities, communication partners, communication modalities, and other relevant characteristics of the organizational context (Al Hilali & McKinley, 2021). As AI becomes integrated into workplace processes, this analysis should also account for language-intensive activities employees perform through AI-enabled systems. For example, employees in technical positions may work across teams, interpret domain-specific digital documentation, and communicate highly specialized content with a high degree of precision. Customer-facing roles may involve less technical but more interactional communication, such as responding to queries, interpreting client needs, and resolving misunderstandings. Employees in coordinating roles may be required to communicate extensively across languages and cultures, while those

in management positions may need to negotiate, provide feedback, and clearly communicate decisions.

The widely varying demands of these roles suggest that English language proficiency should not be treated as a single universal threshold that employees must meet. Organizations could instead focus on identifying job-specific language and communication requirements and determining the levels and dimensions of English language proficiency necessary to meet those requirements (Knoch & Macqueen, 2020). Assessment results can then be interpreted against those expectations. Requiring substantially more English language proficiency than a role demands may introduce unnecessary barriers, while setting requirements below actual workplace demands may result in employees lacking the English language proficiency needed for successful communication. Establishing evidence-based proficiency expectations therefore creates the link between assessment scores and the workforce decisions those scores are intended to support.

Conclusion

The discussion above highlights several considerations for organizations seeking to use English language assessment effectively in workforce decision-making. When developing or reviewing an English language assessment strategy, organizations should consider the following:

1. Identify workplace communication requirements by determining the English language demands associated with relevant workplace roles, including emerging demands associated with AI-mediated work.
2. Establish appropriate proficiency expectations by defining the English language capabilities needed to meet those requirements.
3. Select testing instruments that provide appropriate evidence by considering validity, reliability, fairness, measurement precision, and the relationship between assessment results and their intended uses.

4. Evaluate accessibility, scalability, security, administration conditions, technological integration, and score comparability across relevant populations and settings.
5. Use English proficiency results as one source of evidence alongside professional experience, performance information, job-specific expertise, and other relevant indicators when making workforce decisions.

The strategic value of English language assessment lies not in testing more employees or generating more proficiency scores, but in providing organizations with reliable information that can support better workforce decisions. When assessment is aligned with actual communication requirements and integrated appropriately with other sources of workforce information, it can help organizations identify existing capabilities, target development needs, support employee mobility, and prepare employees for changing forms of work. In an increasingly global and AI-mediated workplace, English language assessment can therefore provide organizations with reliable evidence about a capability that continues to support communication across complex human, organizational, and technology-mediated environments.

References

- Ahamed, K. (2026). English language proficiency and employability in the global workforce: Challenges and opportunities for non-native English speakers. *Language Teaching*, 4(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.30560/lt.v4n1p1>
- Al Hilali, T. S., & McKinley, J. (2021). Exploring the socio-contextual nature of workplace writing: Towards preparing learners for the complexities of English L2 writing in the workplace. *English for Specific Purposes*, 63, 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.03.003>
- Al Shamsi, H., Almutairi, A. G., Al Mashrafi, S., & Al Kalbani, T. (2020). Implications of language barriers for healthcare: A systematic review. *Oman Medical Journal*, 35(2), e122. <https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2020.40>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association.
- Bankins, S., Hu, X., & Yuan, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence, workers, and future of work skills. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 58, 101828. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101828>
- Barry, P., & Kane, B. (2023). Global virtual team working during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Interacting with Computers*, 35(5), 681–690. <https://doi.org/10.1093/iwc/iwad029>
- Bhuiyan, M. H. M., Bala Kumar, M. K., & Staicu, C.-A. (2026). “Write in English, nobody understands your language here”: A study of non-English trends in open-source repositories. In *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE '26)*. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Botto Tobar, M. A., Serebrenik, A., & van den Brand, M. G. J. (2025). AI coding tools in bilingual software development: A survey of Spanish-speaking developers. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on the Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE Companion '25)* (pp. 1522–1530). Association for Computing Machinery.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2025). Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 140(2), 889–942. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044>

- Chapelle, C. A., & Voss, E. (Eds.). (2021). *Validity argument in language testing: Case studies of validation research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chee, H., Ahn, S., & Lee, J. (2024). A competency framework for AI literacy: Variations by different learner groups and an implied learning pathway. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(2), 617–638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13556>
- Chuang, P.-L., & Yan, X. (2025). Language assessment in the era of generative artificial intelligence: Opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *System*, 134, Article 103846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103846>
- Deprez-Sims, A.-S., & Morris, S. B. (2010). Accents in the workplace: Their effects during a job interview. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45(6), 417–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2010.499950>
- Guillouët, L., Khandelwal, A. K., Macchiavello, R., Malhotra, M., & Teachout, M. (2024). Language barriers in multinationals and knowledge transfers. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01487
- Kankaanranta, A., Karhunen, P., & Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2018). “English as corporate language” in the multilingual reality of multinational companies. *Multilingua*, 37(4), 331–351. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2017-0077>
- Knoch, U., & Macqueen, S. (2020). *Assessing English for professional purposes*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429340383>
- Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(1), 241–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052>
- Lockwood, J. (2012). Are we getting the right people for the job? A study of English language recruitment assessment practices in the business processing outsourcing sector. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(2), 107–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943612436975>
- Maurer, M., Bach, N., & Oertel, S. (2022). Forced to go virtual: Working-from-home arrangements and their effect on team communication during COVID-19 lockdown.

- German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 36(3), 238–269.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221083698>
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 73–97.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x>
- Neeley, T. (2012). Global business speaks English. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(5), 116–124.
- Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100041.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *The impact of AI on the workplace: Main findings from the OECD AI surveys of employers and workers*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/ea0a0fe1-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). *Generative AI and the SME workforce: New survey evidence*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2d08b99d-en>
- Peltokorpi, V., & Vaara, E. (2014). Knowledge transfer in multinational corporations: Productive and counterproductive effects of language-sensitive recruitment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(5), 600–622. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.1>
- Piekkari, R., Welch, D. E., & Welch, L. S. (2014). *Language in international business: The multilingual reality of global business expansion*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. (2021). The impact of language barriers on knowledge processing in multinational teams. *Journal of World Business*, 56(2), 101184.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2020.101184>
- Ting, A. (2026). Incorporating AI literacy into a university professional communication English class. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 82, 101711.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2026.101711>
- Tour, E., & Zadorozhnyy, A. (2025). Conceptualizing and operationalizing prompt literacy for English language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 69(3), e70020.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.70020>

Winke, P., Gass, S., & Myford, C. (2013). Raters' L2 background as a potential source of bias in rating oral performance. *Language Testing*, 30(2), 231–252.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532212456968>

Zirar, A., Ali, S. I., & Islam, N. (2023). Worker and workplace artificial intelligence (AI) coexistence: Emerging themes and research agenda. *Technovation*, 124, 102747.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2023.102747>