

# I've Got My Eyes on You: Implicit Socialâ€Pressure Cue

Political Psychology

35, 23-33

DOI: [10.1111/pops.12074](https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12074)

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	The social brain paradigm and social norm puzzles. <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i> , 2014, 26, 384-404.	0.4	3
2	Watchful eyes: implicit observability cues and voting. <i>Evolution and Human Behavior</i> , 2014, 35, 279-284.	2.2	34
3	Losing, but Accepting: Legitimacy, Positivity Theory, and the Symbols of Judicial Authority. <i>Law and Society Review</i> , 2014, 48, 837-866.	1.0	84
4	Social influence processes on adolescents'™ food likes and consumption: the role of parental authoritativeness and individual self-monitoring. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i> , 2016, 46, 114-128.	2.0	10
5	A Closer Look at Eyespot Effects on Voter Turnout: Reply to Matland and Murray. <i>Political Psychology</i> , 2016, 37, 551-557.	3.6	4
6	No evidence that a range of artificial monitoring cues influence online donations to charity in an MTurk sample. <i>Royal Society Open Science</i> , 2016, 3, 150710.	2.4	17
7	Conformity to implicit social pressure: the role of political identity. <i>Social Influence</i> , 2016, 11, 177-184.	1.6	21
8	Change in Institutional Support for the US Supreme Court. <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i> , 2016, 80, 622-641.	1.6	32
9	I Only Have Eyes for You: Does Implicit Social Pressure Increase Voter Turnout?. <i>Political Psychology</i> , 2016, 37, 533-550.	3.6	14
10	Partisan Social Pressure and Voter Mobilization. <i>American Politics Research</i> , 2016, 44, 982-1007.	1.4	6
11	The Social Rewards of Engagement: Appealing to Social Motivations to Stimulate Political Interest at High and Low Levels of External Efficacy. <i>Political Studies</i> , 2017, 65, 24-41.	3.0	33
12	Artificial surveillance cues do not increase generosity: two meta-analyses. <i>Evolution and Human Behavior</i> , 2017, 38, 144-153.	2.2	109
13	Moving the campaign from the front door to the front pocket: field experimental evidence on the effect of phrasing and timing of text messages on voter turnout. <i>Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties</i> , 2017, 27, 291-310.	2.0	16
14	Attentiveness to eyes predicts generosity in a reputation-relevant context. <i>Evolution and Human Behavior</i> , 2017, 38, 729-733.	2.2	13
15	Gender and social conformity: Do men and women respond differently to social pressure to vote?. <i>Social Influence</i> , 2018, 13, 53-64.	1.6	5
16	Social Mobilization. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 2018, 69, 357-381.	17.7	60
17	Evaluation Potential and Task Performance: Evidence From Two Randomized Field Experiments in Election Administration. <i>Political Psychology</i> , 2018, 39, 725-741.	3.6	1
18	Eyes, More Than Other Facial Features, Enhance Real-World Donation Behavior. <i>Human Nature</i> , 2018, 29, 390-401.	1.6	12

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	The future of behavioral insights: on the importance of socially situated nudges. <i>Behavioural Public Policy</i> , 2018, 2, 207-217.	2.4	16
20	A second look at partisanship's effect on receptivity to social pressure to vote. <i>Social Influence</i> , 2019, 14, 1-13.	1.6	2
21	Should I Cast an Ill-Informed Ballot? Examining the Contours of the Normative Obligation to Vote. <i>American Politics Research</i> , 2019, 47, 1081-1099.	1.4	1
22	Political identity moderates the effect of watchful eyes on voter mobilization: A reply to Matland and Murray (2019). <i>Social Influence</i> , 2019, 14, 152-158.	1.6	0
23	Psychological well-being of people living near landfills: preliminary case study in Indonesia. <i>International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare</i> , 2020, 13, 365-379.	0.9	2
24	Are campaign contributions perceived as a civic duty?. <i>Social Science Journal</i> , 0, , 1-10.	1.5	1
25	Can Social Pressure Foster Responsiveness? An Open Records Field Experiment with Mayoral Offices. <i>Journal of Experimental Political Science</i> , 2020, , 1-11.	2.5	1
26	Being watched in an investment game setting: Behavioral changes when making risky decisions. <i>Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics</i> , 2020, 88, 101593.	1.2	1
28	Change in Institutional Support for the U.S. Supreme Court: Is the Court's Legitimacy Imperiled by the Decisions it Makes?. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	4
29	No effect on condemnation of short or long exposure to eye images. <i>Letters on Evolutionary Behavioral Science</i> , 2015, 6, 13-16.	0.3	14
30	Legitimacy, Losing, But Accepting: A Test of Positivity Theory and the Effects of Judicial Symbols. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	3
31	Zivilgesellschaftliches Engagement gegen die AfD: Eine psychologische Analyse von Initiativen und Kampagnen. , 2019, , 203-237.		0
32	Virtue Signaling: Using Risk Preferences to Signal Trustworthiness. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
33	The importance of congruence between stakeholder prosocial motivation and CSR attributions: effects on stakeholders' donations and sense-making of prosocial identities. <i>Journal of Marketing Communications</i> , 2023, 29, 339-357.	4.0	2
34	Getting the Message Out: Why Mail-Delivered GOTV Interventions Succeed or Fail. <i>PS - Political Science and Politics</i> , 0, , 1-8.	0.5	0
35	What hinders residents' prosocial behavior toward tourists? A social cognition perspective. <i>Tourism and Hospitality Research</i> , 2024, 24, 215-228.	3.8	1
36	How do eye cues affect behaviors? Two meta-analyses. <i>Current Psychology</i> , 2024, 43, 1084-1101.	2.8	0
37	Reputation Reminders: When do Eye Cues Promote Prosocial Behavior?. <i>Spanish Journal of Psychology</i> , 2023, 26, .	2.1	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
38	Implicit institutional incentives and individual decisions: Causal inference with deep learning models. Managerial and Decision Economics, 0, , .	2.5	0
39	Education during conflict: The effect of territorial control by insurgents on schooling. SSRN Electronic Journal, 0, , .	0.4	0