

Social Psychology Theory and Methods

View Online



1.

McGarty, C., Haslam, S.A.: The message of social psychology: perspectives on mind in society. Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge, Mass (1997).

2.

Dunn, D.: Research methods for social psychology. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ (2013).

3.

Breakwell, G.M., Breakwell, G.M.: Doing social psychology research. Blackwell, Malden, Mass (2004).

4.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY THEORY.

5.

Goethals, G.: A Century of Social Psychology: Individuals, Ideas, and Investigations. In: Hogg, M. and Cooper, J.M. (eds.) The SAGE Handbook of Social Psychology: Concise Student Edition. pp. 3–23. SAGE Publications Ltd, London (2007).

6.

D.M., M., E.R., S.: Intergroup Emotions. (2014).

7.

P.G., D.: Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. (1989).

8.

Seger, C.R., Smith, E.R., Mackie, D.M.: Subtle activation of a social categorization triggers group-level emotions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 45, 460–467 (2009).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.12.004>.

9.

Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Küpper, B., Zick, A., Wagner, U.: Secondary Transfer Effects of Intergroup Contact. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 75, 28–51 (2012).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272511430235>.

10.

Turner, R., West, K.: Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. (2010).

11.

Barlow, FKPaolini, SPedersen, AHornsey, MJRadke, HRMHarwood, JRubin, MSibley, CG: The Contact Caveat: Negative Contact Predicts Increased Prejudice More Than Positive Contact Predicts Reduced Prejudice. *PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY BULLETIN*. (2012).

12.

Nelson, T.D.: *Ageism: stereotyping and prejudice against older persons*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass (2002).

13.

Abrams, William Dominic JoshuaSwift, Hannah J.Lamont, Ruth A.Abrams, Dominic: *BMJ OPEN*. (2012).

14.

Swift, Hannah J.. Centre for the Study of Group Processes, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom, H.J.Swift@kent.ac.uk Abrams, Dominic. Centre for the Study of Group Processes, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom Lamont, Ruth A.. Centre for Research in Ageing and Cognitive Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, England Drury, Lisbeth. University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom: Social Issues and Policy Review. 11, 195–231 (2017).

15.

Engel, C.: Dictator games: a meta study. *Experimental Economics*. 14, 583–610 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10683-011-9283-7>.

16.

Yamagishi, T Li, Y Takagishi, H Matsumoto, Y Kiyonari, T: In Search of Homo economicus. *PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE*. (2014).

17.

Fleming, P., Zizzo, D.J.: A simple stress test of experimenter demand effects. *Theory and Decision*. 78, 219–231 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11238-014-9419-2>.

18.

Conner, M., Armitage, C.J.: Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Review and Avenues for Further Research. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 28, 1429–1464 (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01685.x>.

19.

Armitage CJ; Centre for Research in Social Attitudes, Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TP, UK. Conner M: Efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: a meta-analytic review. *The British Journal Of Social Psychology*. 40, (2001).

20.

Martine, Stead Stephen, Tagg Anne Marie, MacKintosh Douglas, Eadie: Development and

evaluation of a mass media Theory of Planned Behaviour intervention to reduce speeding. *Health Education Research*. 20, 36–50 (2005).

21.

Gan, M., Chen, S.: Being Your Actual or Ideal Self? What It Means to Feel Authentic in a Relationship. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 43, 465–478 (2017).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216688211>.

22.

Cacioppo, S., Zhou, H., Monteleone, G., Majka, E.A., Quinn, K.A., Ball, A.B., Norman, G.J., Semin, G.R., Cacioppo, J.T.: You are in sync with me: Neural correlates of interpersonal synchrony with a partner. *Neuroscience*. 277, 842–858 (2014).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.07.051>.

23.

Hofman, W., Finkel, E., Fitzsimons, G.: Close Relationships and Self-Regulation: How Relationship Satisfaction Faci... *JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*. (2015).

24.

Abrahamse, W., Steg, L., Vlek, C., Rothengatter, T.: A review of intervention studies aimed at household energy conservation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 25, 273–291 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.08.002>.

25.

Steg, L., Vlek, C.: Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 29, 309–317 (2009).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2008.10.004>.

26.

Truelove, HBCarrico, ARWeber, EURaimi, KTVandenbergh, MP: Positive and negative spillover of pro-environmental behavior: An integrative review and theoretical framework. *GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE-HUMAN AND POLICY DIMENSIONS*. (2014).

27.

Ederyn, Williams: Experimental comparisons of face-to-face and mediated communication: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 84, 963–976 (1977).

28.

Parks, M.R., Floyd, K.: Making Friends in Cyberspace. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*. 1, (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1996.tb00176.x>.

29.

Costa Pinto, D., Reale, G., Segabinazzi, R., Vargas Rossi, C.A.: Online identity construction: How gamers redefine their identity in experiential communities. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*. 14, 399–409 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1556>.

30.

Kenneth J., Gergen: Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 26, 309–320 (1973).

31.

Parker, Ian. Division of Psychology and Social Change, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom, i.a.parker@mmu.ac.uk: Critical psychology: What it is and what it is not. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*. 1, 1–15 (2007).

32.

Clarke, V.: Men Not Included? *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*. 3, 309–349 (2007). https://doi.org/10.1300/J461v03n04_01.

33.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY METHODS.

34.

Simmons, J.P., Nelson, L.D., Simonsohn, U.: False-Positive Psychology. *Psychological Science*. 22, 1359–1366 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>.

35.

Yong, E.: Replication studies: Bad copy. *Nature*. 485, 298–300 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1038/485298a>.

36.

S.T., F.: Mob Rule or Wisdom of Crowds?, http://datacolada.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Fiske-presidential-guest-column_APS-Observer_copy-edited.pdf.

37.

King, M., Gordon, B.: Social Desirability Bias: A Neglected Aspect of Validity Testing. *Psychology & Marketing*. (2000).

38.

Norman, G.: Likert scales, levels of measurement and the 'laws' of statistics. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*. (2010).

39.

Allen, E., Seaman, C.: Statistics Roundtable: Likert Scales and Data Analyses, <http://asq.org/quality-progress/2007/07/statistics/likert-scales-and-data-analyses.html>.

40.

Janice, RattrayMartyn C, Jones: Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*. 16, 234–243 (2007).

41.

Greenwald, A.G., Poehlman, T.A., Uhlmann, E.L., Banaji, M.R.: Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 97, 17–41 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015575>.

42.

Kevin A, FentonAnne M, JohnsonSally, McManusBob, Erens: Measuring sexual behaviour: methodological challenges in survey research. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*. 77, 01–92 (2001).

43.

Bryman, A.: *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2016).

44.

Brinkmann, S., Kvale, S.: *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. SAGE, Los Angeles (2015).

45.

Richards, L., Morse, J.M.: *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Sage, Los Angeles (2013).

46.

Mason, J.: *Qualitative researching*. SAGE, London (2002).

47.

King, N., Horrocks, C., Brooks, J.M.: *Interviews in qualitative research*. SAGE, Los Angeles (2019).

48.

Eaton, S.: *Research Assistant Training Manual: Focus Groups*, <https://drsaraheaton.files.wordpress.com/2017/02/ra-training-manual-focus-groups-2017-0>

2-10.pdf.

49.

Nicholas, A., Maner, J.: The Good-Subject Effect: Investigating Participant Demand Characteristics. *Journal of General Psychology*. (2008).

50.

Millsap, R.E., Maydeu-Olivares, A.: *The SAGE handbook of quantitative methods in psychology*. SAGE, Los Angeles, [Calif.] (2009).

51.

Durgin, F.H., Baird, J.A., Greenburg, M., Russell, R., Shaughnessy, K., Waymouth, S.: Who is being deceived? The experimental demands of wearing a backpack. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. 16, 964–969 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.3758/PBR.16.5.964>.

52.

Coe, R.: What effect size is and why it is important?, <http://www.cem.org/attachments/ebe/ESguide.pdf>.

53.

Ryan, R.S., Wilde, M., Crist, S.: Compared to a small, supervised lab experiment, a large, unsupervised web-based experiment on a previously unknown effect has benefits that outweigh its potential costs. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 29, 1295–1301 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.01.024>.

54.

Gary L. Brase: How different types of participant payments alter task performance. *Judgment and Decision Making*,. 419–428 (2009).

55.

Anderson, C., Lindsay, J., Bushman, B.: *Research in the Psychological Laboratory: Truth or*

Triviality? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. (1999).

56.

Mitchell, G.: Revisiting Truth or Triviality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 7, 109–117 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691611432343>.

57.

Schmuckler, M.: What Is Ecological Validity? A Dimensional Analysis. *Infancy*. (2001).

58.

Green, D.P., McGrath, M.C., Aronow, P.M.: Field Experiments and the Study of Voter Turnout. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*. 23, 27–48 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457289.2012.728223>.

59.

Desposato, S.: Ethical Challenges and Some Solutions for Field Experiments, <http://www.desposato.org/ethicsfieldexperiments.pdf>.

60.

Salovey, Peter.: Field Experiments in Social Psychology: Message Framing and the Promotion of Health Protective Behaviors. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 47, 488–505 (2004).

61.

Tsatsou, P.: Digital technologies in the research process: Lessons from the digital research community in the UK. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 61, 597–608 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.053>.

62.

Dhiraj Murthy: Digital Ethnography: An Examination of the Use of New Technologies for Social Research. *Digital Ethnography: An Examination of the Use of New Technologies for*

Social Research. 42, 837–855.

63.

Ryan, T., Walker, R.: Life story work: why, what, how and when. CoramBAAF, Adoption & Fostering Academy, London (2016).

64.

Podwalking: A framework for assimilating mobile methods into action research.