

Morally Reframed Arguments Can Affect Support for Po

Social Psychological and Personality Science
9, 917-924

DOI: [10.1177/1948550617729408](https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617729408)

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	The dual nature of partisan prejudice: Morality and identity in a multiparty system. PLoS ONE, 2019, 14, e0219509.	1.1	5
2	Political ideology and health risk perceptions of food. Social Science and Medicine, 2019, 236, 112405.	1.8	10
3	Challenging Moral Attitudes With Moral Messages. Psychological Science, 2019, 30, 1136-1150.	1.8	45
4	Tweeting for peace: Experimental evidence from the 2016 Colombian Plebiscite. Electoral Studies, 2019, 62, 102072.	1.0	10
5	Context and Match Between Context and Framework Components. SpringerBriefs in Complexity, 2019, , 47-55.	0.1	0
6	Moral reframing: A technique for effective and persuasive communication across political divides. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2019, 13, e12501.	2.0	109
7	The Effect of Ideological Identification on the Endorsement of Moral Values Depends on the Target Group. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2019, 45, 851-863.	1.9	31
8	The interplay of modern myths about sexual aggression and moral foundations in the blaming of rape victims. European Journal of Social Psychology, 2020, 50, 111-123.	1.5	23
9	How do we optimize message matching interventions? Identifying matching thresholds, and simultaneously matching to multiple characteristics. European Journal of Social Psychology, 2020, 50, 701-720.	1.5	7
10	Who are the opponents of nudging? Insights from moral foundations theory. Comprehensive Results in Social Psychology, 2021, 5, 64-97.	1.1	3
11	Messaging for environmental action: The role of moral framing and message source. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 2020, 68, 101394.	2.3	41
16	Ideology as Filter: Motivated Information Processing and Decision-Making in the Energy Domain. Sustainability, 2020, 12, 8429.	1.6	8
17	Who's bothered by an unfair world? The emotional response to unfairness scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 2020, 159, 109882.	1.6	2
18	A Review and Conceptual Framework for Understanding Personalized Matching Effects in Persuasion. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 2021, 31, 382-414.	3.2	84
19	Voter Classification Based on Susceptibility to Persuasive Strategies: A Machine Learning Approach. Social Indicators Research, 2021, 155, 355-370.	1.4	0
20	Reducing mask resistance among White evangelical Christians with value-consistent messages. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2021, 118, .	3.3	30
21	Moral concerns are differentially observable in language. Cognition, 2021, 212, 104696.	1.1	17
22	Narrative policy images: Intersecting narrative & attention in presidential stories about the environment. Policy Studies Journal, 2023, 51, 53-77.	3.2	11

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
23	Political message matching and green behaviors: Strengths and boundary conditions for promoting high-impact behavioral change. <i>Journal of Environmental Psychology</i> , 2021, 76, 101643.	2.3	7
24	Measuring moral politics: How strict and nurturant family values explain individual differences in conservatism, liberalism, and the political middle.. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 2020, 118, 777-804.	2.6	10
25	â€Taking Back Controlâ€™, Again: The Effect of Moral Foundation Arguments and Partisan Cues on Attitudes Towards a Peopleâ€™s Vote. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	1
26	Omission and compromise: The sacredness of moral foundations in political groups in Italy. <i>Europe's Journal of Psychology</i> , 2020, 16, 128-147.	0.6	7
27	Psychometrics, Model Generation, and Data. , 2019, , 187-217.		0
28	Framing hate: Moral foundations, party cues, and (in)tolerance of offensive speech. <i>Journal of Social and Political Psychology</i> , 2019, 7, 695-725.	0.6	9
29	Lay Beliefs about Changes in Financial Well-being Predict Political and Policy Message Preferences. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i> , 0, , .	0.4	0
30	Meta-Cognition Predicts Attitude Depolarization and Intentions to Engage With the Opposition Following Pro-Attitudinal Advocacy. <i>Social Psychology</i> , 2020, 51, 408-421.	0.3	1
31	Why moral advocacy leads to polarization and proselytization: The role of self-persuasion. <i>Journal of Social and Political Psychology</i> , 2020, 8, 473-503.	0.6	5
32	Moral Frames Are Persuasive and Moralize Attitudes; Nonmoral Frames Are Persuasive and De-Moralize Attitudes. <i>Psychological Science</i> , 2022, 33, 433-449.	1.8	5
33	Persuading republicans and democrats to comply with mask wearing: An intervention tournament. <i>Journal of Experimental Social Psychology</i> , 2022, 101, 104299.	1.3	28
34	Changing Americansâ€™ Attitudes about Immigration: Using Moral Framing to Bolster Factual Arguments. <i>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</i> , 2022, 700, 73-85.	0.8	3
35	People See Political Opponents as More Stupid Than Evil. <i>Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin</i> , 2023, 49, 1014-1027.	1.9	4
37	Evaluating the relationship between moral values and vaccine hesitancy in Great Britain during the COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i> , 2022, 308, 115218.	1.8	13
38	Advocating for Mask-Wearing Across the Aisle: Applying Moral Reframing in Health Communication. <i>Health Communication</i> , 2024, 39, 270-282.	1.8	2
39	Moral Foundations, Himpathy, and Punishment Following Organizational Sexual Misconduct Allegations. <i>Organization Science</i> , 0, , .	3.0	0
40	Party Foul: The Effectiveness of Political Value Rhetoric is Constrained by Party Ownership. <i>Political Behavior</i> , 0, , .	1.7	1
41	Do environmental messages emphasising binding morals promote conservativesâ€™ pro-environmentalism? A pre-registered replication. <i>Social Psychological Bulletin</i> , 0, 18, .	2.8	2

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
42	The Effect of Moral Foundations on Intergroup Relations: The Salience of Fairness Promotes the Acceptance of Minority Groups. <i>Social Psychological and Personality Science</i> , 2024, 15, 93-105.	2.4	1
43	Political ideology and environmentalism impair logical reasoning. <i>Thinking and Reasoning</i> , 2024, 30, 79-108.	2.1	1