

## Identified and Introjected Forms of Political Internalization: Extending Self-Determination Theory

Richard Koestner  
McGill University

Gaëtan F. Losier  
Université de Moncton

Robert J. Vallerand  
Université du Québec à Montréal

Donald Carducci  
McGill University

Canadian voters' reasons for following political events were assessed prior to the 1992 Constitutional Referendum and the 1993 federal election. Results showed that reasons reflecting identification were endorsed more frequently than those reflecting introjection, and distinctive patterns of cognitions, emotions, and actions were associated with the 2 types of internalization. Identification was associated with actively seeking information about political events, possessing a complex set of political attitudes, and being more likely to actually vote. Introjection was associated with relying on the influence of important others, experiencing conflicted emotions about political outcomes, and vulnerability to persuasion. The study also provided evidence that identification and introjection toward politics are distinguishable from intrinsic motivation and amotivation.

Citizens must participate if democratic political structures are to function effectively. Ideally, political participation takes the form of gathering information about political issues, carefully deliberating over this information, working toward an informed decision, and then expressing this decision by voting in elections and referenda. Despite exposure to a clearly articulated ideal for active political participation, North Americans vary widely in the extent to which they participate in political decision making. In the current research, we studied such variability by examining individual differences in the way people have come to value political involvement. In particular, we examined whether identified versus introjected forms of political internalization, operationalized as a distinction between following politics because "it is personally important" versus because "one should do so," would be associated with the manner in

which people reach political decisions, whether they vote in elections, and how they react emotionally to political outcomes. Our research was based on self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1987, 1991; Ryan, 1993, 1995).

Self-determination theory proposes that people are inherently motivated to internalize the regulation of important activities, even those that are initially perceived as uninteresting (Deci, Eghari, Patrick, & Leone, 1994). For example, the theory suggests that even though teenagers are likely to vary in the extent to which they find politics interesting, they all will be motivated to internalize the value placed on political participation by socializing agents such as teachers and parents. Internalization is conceptualized as the process of transforming external regulations into internal regulations. Successful internalization, termed *identification*, involves the integration of formerly external regulations into one's sense of self, typically in the form of important personal values (Ryan, 1995). However, the internalization process often fails to function optimally, resulting in a value or regulatory process being taken in but not accepted as one's own. *Introjection* is the term used to describe such partial internalization of regulations and beliefs. A central difference between the two forms of internalization is that identification is experienced as self-determined because it represents the adoption of beliefs as committed, personal values, whereas introjection is experienced as non-self-determined because it is characterized by approval-based pressures that result in behavioral regulation based on guilt and anxiety avoidance and self-esteem maintenance (Ryan, Rigby, & King, 1993). Introjection also is associated with emotional incongruence and ambivalence because "while it is internal to the person, it remains conflicted

---

Richard Koestner and Donald Carducci, Department of Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; Gaëtan F. Losier, Department of Psychology, Université de Moncton, Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada; Robert J. Vallerand, Research Laboratory on Social Behavior, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

This research was funded by a grant from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC-Canada) and from the Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs et l'Aide à la Recherche. Gaëtan F. Losier was funded by a doctoral fellowship from the SSHRC-Canada. We thank John Lydon for his help in developing the ideas for this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Richard Koestner, Department of Psychology, McGill University, 1205 Dr. Penfield Avenue, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 1B1. Electronic mail may be sent via the Internet to [inkr@musicb.mcgill.ca](mailto:inkr@musicb.mcgill.ca).

and external to the self" (Ryan, 1995, p. 406). The two forms of internalization are expected to be associated with distinctive patterns of thoughts, emotions, and actions.

Self-determination theory assumes that the internalization process can be examined through people's conscious experience of the reasons behind their actions in a particular domain. For example, a recent study measured identified versus introjected forms of self-regulation by inquiring about why people participated in religious activities (Ryan et al., 1993). It was found that Christians vary in their reasons for religious participation, with some adults reporting that "I attend church because by going I learn new things," whereas others said that "I attend church because one is supposed to go." The former reason conveys a sense of personal endorsement indicative of identification, whereas the latter conveys a sense of pressure or demand reflective of introjection. Both types of internalization were found to be higher in a group of teenagers who had volunteered to engage in evangelical work than in a less outwardly involved sample of Christian college students. There also was evidence that both types of internalization promoted church attendance among Christian college students. However, the two forms of internalization were shown to predict differently to adjustment outcomes. Identification was positively associated with psychological adjustment, whereas introjection was negatively related to adjustment. A similar pattern of results was reported by O'Connor and Vallerand (1990).

Identified and introjected forms of internalization also have been examined in the domains of education, leisure, sports, and interpersonal relations (Blais, Sabourin, Boucher, & Vallerand, 1990; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Losier, Bourque, & Vallerand, 1993; Pelletier et al., 1995; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1993). These studies have generally shown that identification is associated with more positive outcomes than introjection, as measured by reports of satisfaction and level of activity. Such results have been explained in terms of the adaptive benefits that accrue from more self-determined forms of behavioral regulation.

Several of the studies that examined identification and introjection also assessed intrinsic motivation and amotivation (cf. Losier et al., 1993; Ryan & Connell, 1989; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992). Individuals are described as intrinsically motivated when they pursue activities spontaneously for the inherent satisfaction experienced in exercising their capacities (Ryan, 1995). If an individual is intrinsically motivated with regard to a particular activity (if he or she naturally finds the activity interesting and enjoyable), it is not necessary to internalize the value placed on the activity by socializing agents. Intrinsic motivation is viewed as the archetype of self-determination, and research has documented its association with successful adaptation (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Koestner & McClelland, 1990). Amotivation represents the absence of motivation and is characterized by nonregulation of one's actions (Deci, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 1991). If an individual is amotivated with regard to a particular activity (if he or she feels disinterested or helpless to perform the activity), it is unlikely that he or she will begin the process of internalizing the value placed on the activity by socializing agents. Amotivation is viewed as reflecting the relative absence of self-determination, and research has docu-

mented its association with passivity, distress, and poor adaptation (Vallerand et al., 1993).<sup>1</sup>

We believe that it is more interesting to explore the distinction between identification and introjection in the political domain than the distinction between intrinsic motivation and amotivation. There seems to be little doubt that people who follow politics because it is inherently interesting and enjoyable will show a more positive form of political participation than those who feel amotivated. Such a difference would simply reflect the fact that intrinsically motivated individuals, because they feel greater interest and competence, are more highly motivated to pursue political activities than those who feel amotivated. Ryan (1995) noted that "contemporary research focuses primarily on the difference between motivation and amotivation—where there are big and obvious main effects of contingency, control and competence variables" (p. 408). He added, however, that important distinctions still need to be made regarding why one acts and that these reflect the relative integration of intentional actions. The distinction between identification and introjection focuses not on the amount of motivation individuals possess toward political activities but on variations in the orientation of motivation. Both identified and introjected individuals are expected to be highly motivated to participate in political activities. After all, research on subtypes of religious and academic internalization has shown that a person who is regulated by an introject can be just as energized and effortful in pursuing activities as someone whose behavior is based on identification. Nonetheless, in both domains, identification and introjection were shown to have distinct experiential and performance consequences (Ryan, 1995).

### The Present Investigation

The purpose of our research was to extend past research on self-determination theory by assessing identified versus introjected forms of internalization in the domain of politics. Two studies were conducted in which Canadian students' reasons for following politics were assessed. The first study was begun in the week prior to the 1992 constitutional referendum and focused on examining the relation of identification and introjection to decision-making processes, emotional involvement in the referendum outcome, and voting behavior. The second study was completed in the week prior to the 1993 federal election and focused on examining further the cognitive processes associated with identified and introjected forms of political internalization by assessing differentiation among political attitudes and vulnerability to persuasion.

<sup>1</sup> Deci and Ryan (1985) originally used the term *amotivation* to describe actions that are unintentional. More recently, Deci and Ryan (1991) suggested that amotivation can occur both at the external boundary (i.e., between the person and the social world) and the internal boundary (i.e., between the self and nonintegrated internal forces). According to this view, external amotivation results from the perception of incompetence in a given domain or because of some contextual barrier and is similar to Seligman's (1975) notion of helplessness. By contrast, internal amotivation occurs because one feels ineffective in dealing with nonintegrated forces within oneself. We measured amotivation more generally, without specific reference to forces that are either within oneself or in the environment.

The guiding hypothesis for both studies was that identification and introjection would be associated with distinctly different forms of political participation. Identification was expected to be associated with active information seeking, differentiation of political attitudes, the experience of generally positive emotions, and a high rate of voting behavior. Introjection was expected to be associated with relying on important others in making political decisions, vulnerability to the influence of politician's arguments, and experiencing conflicted emotions. In both studies, intrinsic motivation and amotivation toward politics also were assessed. We planned to examine the extent to which introjection was distinct from amotivation and identification was distinct from intrinsic motivation.

### Study 1

The 1992 Canadian referendum on the Charlottetown Accord provided a unique opportunity to examine the role of political motivation on decision-making strategies and emotional processes in the context of an important political event. The Charlottetown Accord was a historic constitutional agreement that was reached by Canada's prime minister and its 10 provincial premiers in August 1992. The constitutional reforms proposed in the accord would have provided distinct status to the predominantly French-speaking province of Quebec, guaranteed self-government for native peoples, and created a senate with far broader powers. Canadians voted in a nationwide referendum that was held on October 26th, 1992, to determine whether the changes proposed in the accord would become part of a new Canadian Constitution.

We planned to examine whether voters' reasons for following politics would influence the way they participated in the referendum process. First, we examined the manner in which individuals gathered information to make their referendum decision. We hypothesized that individuals with identified reasons for following the referendum would actively seek out information concerning the referendum and would make their own decisions, whereas individuals with introjected reasons for following the referendum would behave more passively and vote according to how individuals close to them planned to vote. Second, we examined voters' anticipated emotions and actual emotional reactions to the referendum outcome. We hypothesized that individuals with more identified reasons for following the referendum would experience more pleasant emotions related to the referendum outcome, whereas individuals with introjected reasons would display a conflicted emotional response to the outcome. Finally, we examined whether the reasons individuals had for following the referendum predicted whether they would actually vote. We hypothesized that individuals with more identified reasons for following the referendum would be more likely to vote.

### Method

#### Participants

This study was a joint venture involving the departments of psychology at McGill University and the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM). Questionnaires were first developed in English and then translated to French by us. Questionnaires were distributed in 9 differ-

ent classes at McGill and 7 different classes at UQAM 1 week prior to the referendum. All participants were assured that their responses would be anonymous and confidential. As an incentive for individuals to participate in the study, we offered all participants an opportunity to win a cash prize of \$300. The prize was to be given to the one student at each university who best estimated the actual popular vote in favor of the referendum for each of the 10 Canadian provinces. Questionnaires were collected from 288 respondents.

Sixty-eight percent of the participants were female and 82% resided in Quebec. Forty-nine percent of the participants were English-speaking, 46% were French-speaking, and 5% were native speakers of some other language. Seven participants who resided outside of Canada were excluded from the study because they were not eligible to vote in the referendum.

One week following the referendum, we returned to 12 of the original classes to assess whether the participants had voted and their emotional reaction to the outcome of the referendum. Four classes could not be followed-up because of scheduling difficulties. Nonetheless, we were able to follow-up 54% of the original sample. Results of *t* tests indicated that there were no differences between the follow-up and original sample on demographic characteristics or on the scales measuring political motivation ( $ps > .20$ ). Results of *t* tests also indicated that the follow-up sample did not differ from the original in terms of political information seeking, reliance on important others in making political decisions, or anticipated emotions regarding a favorable referendum outcome ( $ps > .20$ ). Thus, the follow-up sample appeared to be representative of the original.

We were able to match participants' follow-up and initial questionnaires because we had instructed them to list their parents' birthdates on both questionnaires. Parents' birthdates were chosen because this is information that nearly all participants can easily recall but is not available to others, thus ensuring anonymity. The two winners of the \$300 prize were announced during the follow-up sessions by providing the parental birthdates. Both winners collected their money.

### Measures

*Political motivation.* The scales used to measure identification and introjection toward politics were adapted from scales developed by Vallerand and O'Connor (1989; O'Connor & Vallerand, 1990, 1994) to measure motivational styles across six separate domains, including religion, recreation, interpersonal relations, and current events. This methodology offered four advantages: (a) It included a Current Events subscale that could readily be adapted to consider reasons for following political events; (b) the scales were developed and validated in both English and French; (c) the scales were shown to display good reliability and validity; and (d) the scales included an assessment of intrinsic motivation and amotivation, allowing us to distinguish these constructs from identification and introjection.

The scales developed by Vallerand and O'Connor (1989) were modeled after the Attributional Style Questionnaire (Seligman, Abramson, Semmel, & von Bayer, 1979). Three questions are presented for each of the six domains (e.g., "Why do you follow current events?"), and respondents are required to indicate their level of agreement with each of four responses. The responses are fixed and were selected to reflect amotivation ("I don't know, I don't see what it does for me"), introjection ("Because I am supposed to do it"), identification ("I choose to do it for my own good"), and intrinsic motivation ("For the pleasure of doing it").

In our study, respondents were asked four questions regarding their reasons for following the referendum: (a) Why is it important that you get information concerning the present constitutional accord? (b) Why is it important that you voice your concerns in relation to the present constitutional debate? (c) Why is it important that you carefully weigh

all the complex issues of the accord before deciding your vote? (d) Why is it important that you vote in the upcoming referendum? For each question, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale (1 = *do not agree at all*, 7 = *totally agree*), with the four statements developed by Vallerand and O'Connor used to assess amotivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation.

Summary scores for amotivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation were created by calculating the mean of the four responses. The four-item scales were shown to be highly reliable ( $\alpha > .80$ ).

**Decision-making strategy.** One way to make a political decision is to rely on others and vote as they do. This option was assessed by asking respondents to rate on a 7-point scale the extent to which they agreed with the following statements: (a) "In general, I want to do what most people who are important to me think I should do concerning voting on the referendum," (b) "I find that I can think better about political issues when I have the advice of others," and (c) "I would feel lost roaming around without political guidance." These three items were combined to form a summary measure labeled *Passive Reliance on Others* ( $\alpha = .78$ ).

Another way to make the decision is to actively seek out information concerning the referendum and to try to make up one's own mind. This option was assessed with five items. Respondents rated on a 7-point scale the extent to which they agreed with the following statements: (a) "I have tried to think things over carefully and reflect on all aspects of the accord," (b) "I read the newspapers and watch the news carefully so that I can understand the details of the agreement," (c) "I have spoken to a lot of people about the constitutional agreement and what it means," (d) "Figuring out how I would vote has been a slow process that has taken a long time," (e) "I have had to reconsider my position several times in the past month as new information came out about the accord and its potential consequences." Items were combined to form a summary measure labeled *Active Information Seeking* ( $\alpha = .86$ ).

**Emotions.** Participants were asked to indicate on a list of 15 emotions (6 pleasant and 9 unpleasant) how they would feel if the referendum were to go in the direction they preferred. For each emotion, a 7-point scale was provided with *feel no emotion* and *feel the emotion strongly* as the respective poles. The list of emotions was taken from Diener's (1991) Daily Affect Survey. The six pleasant emotions were contentment, love, friendliness, affection, happiness, and relief ( $\alpha = .86$ ); the 9 unpleasant emotions were fear, anger, disgust, regret, sadness, worry, irritation, depression, and anxiety ( $\alpha = .86$ ). The means of pleasant and unpleasant emotions were calculated separately. A follow-up questionnaire was later administered to assess participants' actual emotional reactions to the outcome of the vote.

**Voting behavior.** In the follow-up questionnaire administered 1 week after the referendum, participants were asked whether they actually voted in the referendum. They also were asked whether they had voted yes or no to the accord.

## Results and Discussion

### Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 shows the means and intercorrelations for the four political motivation scales. It can be seen that identified rea-

sons for following the referendum were endorsed most highly ( $M = 4.88$ ), followed by introjected ( $M = 3.15$ ) and intrinsic reasons ( $M = 2.71$ ). Participants reported a low level of amotivation ( $M = 1.61$ ).<sup>2</sup> The table also shows that introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation were significantly positively correlated with one another ( $r_s = .20-.39$ ). It also can be seen that amotivation was unrelated to introjection and significantly negatively related to both identification and intrinsic motivation. Note that even the significant intercorrelations are relatively modest, suggesting that it is useful to distinguish identification and introjection from intrinsic motivation and amotivation.

Means were calculated for all of the outcome variables. Participants were more likely to report that they had actively sought information related to the accord ( $M = 4.39$ ) than that they had relied on the influence of important others ( $M = 2.01$ ). They also were more likely to report that they anticipated experiencing pleasant rather than unpleasant emotions if the referendum outcome was in the direction they favored ( $M_s = 3.41$  and  $1.61$ , respectively). Eight-five percent of the participants who were followed-up reported that they voted in the referendum, with 53% stating that they voted yes.

Results of *t* tests indicated that the sex of the participants was unrelated to any of the motivation scales or outcome variables; however, language was significantly related to the way people voted and to the decision-making measures. Seventy-nine percent of the English-speaking respondents reported voting yes in the referendum compared with only 19% of the French-speaking respondents. English-speaking respondents also were significantly more likely than French-speaking respondents to report that they relied on the influence of others,  $t(279) = 5.99$ ,  $p < .01$ , and that they had actively sought information about the accord,  $t(279) = 4.07$ ,  $p < .01$ . For these analyses, participants who reported neither English or French as their native language were grouped with the English speakers.<sup>3</sup>

Correlations among the dependent variables revealed that there was no relation between active information seeking and

<sup>2</sup> As with other instruments based on self-determination theory, the motivation scale used here is intended to assess different types of reasons for doing an activity such as following politics rather than for not doing a particular activity. Thus, the questions are worded so as to pull for an expression of political interest rather than disinterest. This wording likely contributed to the low scores obtained on the Amotivation subscale.

<sup>3</sup> Because preliminary analyses revealed few interaction effects, sex and language were not included in the central analyses that follow. Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to examine possible sex and language differences in the relation of the two forms of internalization to outcomes. Specifically, each of the outcomes was regressed on sex, language, identification, and introjection, entered together as a first set, the Sex  $\times$  Identification and Sex  $\times$  Introjection interaction terms, entered as a second set, and the Language  $\times$  Identification and Language  $\times$  Introjection interaction terms, entered as a third set. None of the interactions with sex approached significance ( $p_s > .10$ ). Only one significant interaction emerged for language. A Language  $\times$  Introjection interaction obtained for passive reliance on others indicated a strong positive relation between introjection and passive reliance on others for English-speaking respondents, but only a weak positive relation for French-speaking respondents.

Table 1  
Means and Intercorrelations of Motivation Subscales in Study 1

Subscale	1	2	3	4	<i>M</i>
1. Amotivation	—				1.61
2. Introjection	.04	—			3.15
3. Identification	-.34*	.20*	—		4.88
4. Intrinsic Motivation	-.17*	.31*	.39*	—	2.71

\*  $p < .01$ .

relying on others,  $r(279) = -.05$ , or between anticipation of pleasant and unpleasant emotions,  $r(279) = -.06$ . There was, however, a significant positive relation between actively seeking information and anticipating unpleasant emotions,  $r(279) = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ . No other relations among the dependent variables approached significance ( $ps > .10$ ).

### Central Analyses

In this research we followed recent studies by Ryan et al. (1993) and Deci et al. (1994) in trying to distinguish between identification and introjection. We therefore begin by presenting the results related to the two types of internalization. The results related to intrinsic motivation and amotivation are provided later.

Table 2 provides the partial correlations of the two types of internalization with the dependent variables assessing decision-making strategies, anticipated emotions, and voting behavior. Partial correlations were used because of the significant positive correlation obtained between identification and introjection. The partial correlations for identification controlled for introjection, whereas those for introjection controlled for identification. It can be seen that the decision-making predictions were confirmed: Identification was significantly positively associated with active information seeking, whereas introjection was significantly positively related to passive reliance on important others. Identification also was significantly negatively related to passive reliance on others. Thus, identification appears to result in more active, self-initiating forms of political decision making than introjection.

Table 2 also shows that the predictions regarding emotional processes were confirmed. Identified reasons were significantly positively related to expecting pleasant emotions if the referendum went in one's favor but were unrelated to unpleasant emotions, suggesting emotional congruence with one's political stand. Introjected reasons were significantly positively associated with anticipating both pleasant and unpleasant emotions

if the referendum results were as one preferred, reflecting a conflicted pattern of emotions.

Table 2 also shows that the prediction for voting behavior was confirmed. As hypothesized, identified self-regulation was significantly positively related to actual voting behavior. That is, follow-up questionnaires indicated that respondents who had endorsed identified reasons for following the referendum were more likely to actually cast their ballot on election day. Note that the high percentage of respondents who actually voted in our sample (85%) might have limited the size of the correlation that was obtained between identification and voting behavior.

Both identification and introjection were unrelated to whether respondents voted yes or no to the accord. We had no reason to expect that either form of internalization would influence the content of their beliefs about this particular political issue.

Table 3 shows the partial correlations of identification and introjection with pleasant and unpleasant emotions reported 1 week after the referendum. The results are given separately for those who voted no and those who voted yes. (The "no" side was victorious in the referendum, winning 54% of the national vote and a popular majority in 6 of 10 provinces, including the province of Quebec, where most respondents resided.) One would therefore expect relations with pleasant emotions only for those who had voted no. It can be seen that introjected individuals who voted no continued to display a conflicted pattern of emotions, reporting significantly greater pleasant emotions and significantly greater unpleasant emotions. Identified individuals who voted no reported only significantly more pleasant emotions.

An interesting pattern emerged among yes voters in which introjection was no longer associated with a conflicted pattern of emotions. Instead, it was strongly positively associated with unpleasant emotions and unrelated to pleasant emotions. It would seem that introjected individuals are better able to avoid conflicted emotions when things are the opposite of their desires. Identification was unrelated to pleasant and unpleasant emotions among yes voters.

Table 2  
Partial Correlations of Identification and Introjection With Study 1 Outcomes

Variable	Identification	Introjection
Decision-making strategies		
Passive reliance on others in making decision	-.17*	.26**
Actively seeking information	.32**	.08
Anticipated emotions		
Expected pleasant emotions if outcome is in one's favor	.25**	.22**
Expected unpleasant emotions if outcome is in one's favor	-.03	.20*
Voting behavior		
Actually voted, (1 = did not/2 = did)	.15*	.00
Way voted, (1 = yes/2 = no)	.03	-.06

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

### Distinguishing the Two Forms of Internalization From Intrinsic Motivation and Amotivation

We included an assessment of intrinsic motivation and amotivation to distinguish the two forms of internalization from more commonly studied motivational phenomena. Although the intercorrelations reported in Table 1 point to the distinctiveness of identification and introjection from intrinsic motivation and amotivation, it also is important to consider whether such distinctiveness is evident in the pattern of correlations with various outcomes. In particular, we wanted to show that introjection represents more than just not caring about politics, thus showing a distinct pattern of correlates from amotivation, and that identification represents more than just being keenly interested in politics, thus showing a distinct pattern of correlates from intrinsic motivation. To consider these issues, correlations were calculated between intrinsic motivation and amotivation and the various outcomes.

The correlations for amotivation revealed both overlap with and distinctiveness from the results obtained for introjection.

Table 3  
*Partial Correlations of Identification and Introjection With Emotions After Referendum*

Variable	Identification	Introjection
Among voters on winning "no" side		
Pleasant emotions	.31**	.35**
Unpleasant emotions	.00	.24*
Among voters on losing "yes" side		
Pleasant emotions	-.01	.07
Unpleasant emotions	.12	.41**

Note. Only "no" voters received their preferred outcome as the referendum was defeated in 6 of 10 provinces and by 54% of voters across the country.

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Amotivation paralleled introjection in that it was significantly positively related to relying on important others in making decisions ( $r = .28, p < .01$ ) and unrelated to voting behavior ( $r = -.05$ ). However, unlike introjection for which no relation emerged, amotivation was significantly negatively related to actively seeking information ( $r = -.39, p < .01$ ). Also, whereas introjection was significantly positively associated with the anticipation of both pleasant and unpleasant emotions about the referendum, amotivation was unrelated to anticipated emotions ( $r_s = .02$  and  $.10$  for pleasant emotions and unpleasant emotions, respectively).

The correlations for intrinsic motivation revealed both overlap with and distinctiveness from the results obtained for identification. Intrinsic motivation paralleled identification in that it was significantly positively related to both active information seeking ( $r = .21, p < .01$ ) and anticipating pleasant emotions ( $r = .27, p < .01$ ) and unrelated to anticipating unpleasant emotions ( $r = .09$ ). However, in contrast to the significant positive relation that was found for identification, intrinsic motivation was unrelated to actually voting ( $r = .00$ ). Also, it was unrelated to relying on important others in making the referendum decision ( $r = -.09$ ), whereas identification was found to be significantly negatively related to such behavior.<sup>4</sup>

### Summary

The results support the predicted relations between the two types of internalization and decision-making strategies, anticipated emotions, and voting behavior. Identification was associated with actively seeking information about the referendum rather than relying on the advice of important others, anticipating only pleasant emotions when the outcome was as desired, being more likely to actually vote, and experiencing only pleasant emotions when the actual outcome matched one's vote. Introjection was associated with passive reliance on others in decision making about the referendum, anticipating conflicted emotions about a positive resolution, and actually experiencing conflicted emotions after the referendum resulted in a favorable outcome.

The supplemental analyses pointed toward continuity between the two forms of internalization and intrinsic motivation and amotivation, as well as a reasonable degree of distinctiveness.

The key findings with regard to distinctiveness were that amotivation did not relate to conflicted emotions, which is a hallmark of introjection (Ryan, 1995), and that intrinsic motivation did not mimic identification in being associated with actual voting behavior.

### Study 2

Study 1 represented a first attempt to extend self-determination theory to the realm of political participation. We found that identified and introjected reasons for following politics could be reliably assessed and that these measures displayed some degree of predictive validity with regard to decision-making styles, emotional responses, and voting behavior. We also found that the two forms of internalization could be discriminated from measures of intrinsic motivation and amotivation.

Study 2 was designed to further examine the decision-making processes associated with identification and introjection in the context of the 1993 Canadian federal election. This election was unique in that it involved five different political parties, each of which stood a chance to win 20% of the national vote. The election was especially challenging and complex for voters because the five parties varied greatly in the positions they took on the various issues raised in the campaign (e.g., immigration, national unity, language laws). We viewed this complexity as an opportunity to examine whether identified and introjected forms of internalization would predict the extent to which eligible voters (a) actively pursued information regarding the various parties' positions; (b) showed differentiation in their attitudes toward the various parties; (c) were accurate in their understanding of the positions taken by the various parties; and (d) could be influenced by exposure to the arguments of the leaders of the political parties.

Study 1 showed that identification was associated with more vigorous pursuit of political information. In Study 2 we improved our assessment of information seeking by requiring respondents to indicate the frequency with which they engaged in 12 different information-seeking activities, such as reading a magazine story about the election or sending away for campaign literature. Study 1 included only five items, all of which were phrased in a more global fashion that might promote inaccurate reporting.

The second issue we examined considered the extent to which

<sup>4</sup> Hierarchical multiple regressions also were conducted for each of the dependent variables in Table 2. In these analyses, sex and language were entered in a first step, followed by amotivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation entered together in a second step. The results paralleled those reported in the text based on the correlations. Relying on others was significantly related to introjection ( $\beta = .26, p < .01$ ) and amotivation ( $\beta = .29, p < .01$ ). Active information seeking was significantly related to amotivation ( $\beta = -.28, p < .01$ ), identification ( $\beta = .19, p < .01$ ), and intrinsic motivation ( $\beta = .11, p < .05$ ). Anticipated pleasant emotions were significantly related to identification ( $\beta = .20, p < .01$ ), introjection ( $\beta = .17, p < .01$ ), and intrinsic motivation ( $\beta = .15, p < .01$ ). Anticipated unpleasant emotions were significantly related only to introjection ( $\beta = .15, p < .01$ ). Actually voting in the referendum was significantly related only to identification ( $\beta = .20, p < .01$ ). None of the motivation measures were related to the direction of the respondents' vote.

forms of internalization might influence the manner in which individuals organize their attitudes and opinions about politicians. Self-determination theory suggests that identification not only represents a more integrated form of self-regulation than introjection but that it also is more likely to be associated with greater differentiation in cognitive processes (Deci & Ryan, 1991). We examined this issue by asking respondents to indicate their approval of the five political leaders' position on three different issues. The most undifferentiated set of attitudes would be reflected by giving identical ratings to all of the leaders and across all of the issues. A differentiated picture would be reflected by varying one's ratings of the different leaders on the same issue as well as varying one's rating of the same leader across different issues. As an index of attitude differentiation, we used the standard deviation of respondents' ratings across the various leaders and issues. We hypothesized that identified reasons would be positively associated with greater variability in ratings, reflecting a more differentiated pattern of political opinions.

Active information seeking and differentiation of political attitudes should lead to more accurate knowledge of various political parties' positions on key campaign issues. Accumulating such knowledge was no easy task in the 1993 election because of the wealth of parties and issues. However, Grolnick and Ryan (1987) found that schoolchildren with identified reasons for pursuing their academic activities displayed greater conceptual understanding of complex material presented to them in class. This suggests that in the context of an election, voters with identified reasons might display a more sophisticated understanding of the issues central to the campaign. We assessed campaign knowledge by constructing an objective test that required respondents to indicate which party or parties supported each of 10 positions (e.g., which parties propose creating jobs by investing in public works projects?).

The final issue involved examining the extent to which respondents' attitudes could be swayed by exposure to the arguments of politicians. Given that introjection represents only a partial internalization of political beliefs, we considered it likely that voters with more introjected reasons for following the elections might be especially vulnerable to the persuasive messages of politicians. To test this hypothesis, respondents were required to observe two 10-min segments from a TV debate among the five political leaders. They reported their opinions of the leaders on three issues prior to and following the observation. Persuasibility was measured by subtracting respondents' predebate approval ratings of the candidates' positions from their postdebate ratings. Only two of the three issues were actually the subject of the debate segments; the third undiscussed issue was intended to serve as a control. We expected that all respondents would be somewhat swayed by the arguments of the politicians and thus would report greater approval after watching the issues debated than before. However, we also expected that it would be those respondents who possessed introjected reasons for following politics who would be most influenced by viewing the candidates' debate.

In summary, in Study 2 we examined the relation of identification and introjection with active information seeking, differentiation of political opinions, accuracy of knowledge

about campaign issues, and vulnerability to persuasion by politicians. The first three outcomes were expected to be positively associated with identification, whereas the fourth was expected to be positively associated with introjection. We again included an assessment of intrinsic motivation and amotivation to determine whether introjection could be distinguished from amotivation and identification from intrinsic motivation.

### Method

Participants were 56 female and 18 male McGill University students who were recruited through advertisements that invited volunteers for a study of political attitudes. Participants were majors in a wide range of disciplines, including psychology, art, music, engineering, and occupational therapy. Seventy-two percent were English-speaking, 23% French-speaking, and 5% were other. The experiment was conducted during the week prior to the 1993 federal election. Respondents received \$10 for participating in the hour-long experiment.

### Procedure

Participants attended sessions in groups of 3–5. Respondents completed a package of questionnaires for 20 min, watched a 20-min videotape, and then completed a follow-up questionnaire that required approximately 5 min to complete. To ensure anonymity, they were instructed not to place any form of identification on the questionnaires. Respondents completed scales in the following order: Political Motivation Questionnaire, information-seeking behaviors, approval ratings of five leaders on three campaign issues, and a campaign knowledge quiz.

After completing the questionnaires, respondents were shown two 10-min segments of the candidates debate in which the party leaders discussed two of the three issues presented on the approval rating questionnaire (job creation and the constitution). After viewing both segments, respondents completed a second questionnaire concerning their approval of the five candidates' positions on the three issues previously mentioned. They were then thanked for their participation and debriefed about the purpose of the study.

### Measures

*Political motivation.* Respondents were asked four questions regarding their reasons for following the election: (a) "Why is it important that you get information concerning the candidates in the upcoming election?" (b) "Why is it important that you voice your concerns in relation to the upcoming election?" (c) "Why is it important to weigh all of the issues in the upcoming election?" (d) "Why is it important to vote in the upcoming election?" Amotivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation were assessed with the same responses as in Study 1. All four scales were again shown to be highly reliable ( $\alpha > .80$ ).

*Active information seeking.* Twelve questions assessed the extent to which respondents actively followed the federal election campaign during the previous month by gathering information about the parties and their candidates. For example, respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they had read a newspaper story about the election or watched a TV news segment about the election in the previous month. A 6-point scale ranged from *not at all* to *once a week to every day*. The 12 items yielded a highly reliable index of active information seeking ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Differentiation of political attitudes.* Participants were asked to rate their approval of each of the five candidates' positions on three separate campaign issues: national unity, immigration policy, and job creation plans. Respondents used a 7-point scale to make these ratings. Differentiation of opinions was assessed by calculating the standard deviation of respondents' approval ratings across the five candidates and the three

issues. Greater variability across the 15 ratings was interpreted as a reflection of greater differentiation.

**Accuracy of campaign knowledge.** Respondents' knowledge of campaign issues was measured by a 10-item political issues quiz. Each question required respondents to indicate the party or parties that espoused a particular campaign position. For questions with multiple answers, respondents received points for each correct one. For example, they were asked which party or parties supported the existing policy of official bilingualism. Three points were given if respondents answered Liberal, New Democrat, and Conservative. Scores could range from 0 to 16.

**Vulnerability to persuasion by candidates.** All respondents observed two 10-min segments of a campaign debate involving the five candidates. The segments were shown on a large-screen TV projection system. Each segment included a 1-min speech by the candidates on the given issue followed by 5 min of exchange among the candidates. Segments were chosen so that they involved approximately equal participation by all of the leaders. The segments concerned two of the three issues on which participants had earlier been asked to evaluate the candidates: national unity and job creation. After viewing the videotaped segments, respondents were again asked to indicate their level of approval with the candidates' positions on national unity and job creation. They also were asked to indicate their approval of the candidates' position on immigration policy, even though this was not discussed on the videotaped segments. This issue was intended to serve as a control. Thus, respondents twice rated the five leaders on three specific issues, with two of the issues having been discussed during the debate that was observed in between the two sets of ratings.

Because all the candidates involved in the debate were expected to be trying to influence viewers to approve of their positions, we measured persuasion in terms of the mean change in approval ratings across the five candidates. This mean change was calculated separately for each of the three issues. However, we combined the scores for the two issues that respondents were exposed to on the video segments.

## Results and Discussion

### Preliminary Analyses

Table 4 shows the means and intercorrelations for the four political motivation scales. It can be seen that identified reasons for following the referendum were endorsed most highly ( $M = 5.11$ ), followed by intrinsic ( $M = 3.25$ ) and introjected ( $M = 2.89$ ) reasons. Participants reported a low level of amotivation ( $M = 1.71$ ). The table also shows that amotivation was significantly positively correlated with introjection and negatively with identification. Intrinsic motivation was significantly positively related to identification. Identification and introjection were unrelated. These results suggest a stronger association between amotivation and introjection and between identification and intrinsic motivation than those obtained in Study 1.

Respondents reported a low level of information seeking ( $M$

$= 3.10$  on 1–7 scale, indicating "once a week") and displayed moderate levels of campaign knowledge, as reflected in a mean score of 52% on the campaign issues quiz. Participants' sex and language were unrelated to the other variables assessed.<sup>5</sup>

Paired  $t$  tests revealed that respondents reported significantly more favorable opinions of politicians' stand on national unity,  $t(72) = -6.37, p < .001$ , and job creation,  $t(72) = -4.99, p < .001$ , after watching the debate segments. However, respondents' opinions on the issue of immigration policy, to which they were not exposed, showed no change over the course of the experiment,  $t(72) = 0.89, ns$ . These results suggest that the debate segments were effective in enhancing respondents' approval of the various politicians. For national unity, the average approval rating of the five leaders rose from 4.28 to 4.98. For job creation, the average approval rating rose from 4.84 to 5.40.

Table 5 shows the correlations among the four dependent variables. It can be seen that both information seeking and differentiation of attitudes were significantly positively related to accuracy on the campaign knowledge quiz. Respondents who reported actively seeking information were somewhat less likely to change their opinions as a result of viewing the debate segments ( $p = .10$ ).

### Central Analyses

Table 6 shows the partial correlations of the two types of internalization with the dependent variables assessing active information seeking, attitude differentiation, accuracy of campaign knowledge, and degree of persuasibility on the issues respondents were exposed to in the debate segments. The correlations reported for identification controlled for introjection and those for introjection controlled for identification. It can be seen that identification was again significantly positively associated with active information seeking. Introjection was slightly negatively related to active information seeking. As in Study 1, these results suggest that identification results in more active, initiating forms of decision making than does introjection.

Table 6 also shows that the prediction regarding differentiation of opinions was confirmed. Identified reasons were significantly positively related to displaying greater differentiation in approval ratings of the various leaders' positions on various issues. That is, respondents with identified reasons for following politics were more likely to report varying approval ratings of different politicians on different issues. We suggest that after actively seeking information about the candidates, voters with identified reasons are in a good position to develop complex attitudes that take into account differences among politicians and issues. Introjected reasons were unrelated to the display of differentiated opinions.

<sup>5</sup> Because preliminary analyses revealed no interaction effects, sex and language were not included in the central analyses that follow. Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to examine possible sex and language differences in the relation of the two forms of internalization to outcomes. Specifically, each of the outcomes was regressed on sex, language, identification, and introjection, entered together as a first set, the Sex  $\times$  Identification and Sex  $\times$  Introjection interaction terms, entered as a second set, and the Language  $\times$  Identification and Language  $\times$  Introjection interaction terms, entered as a third set. None of the interactions with sex or language approached significance ( $ps > .10$ ).

Table 4  
Means and Intercorrelations of Motivation Subscales in Study 2

Subscale	1	2	3	4	$M$
1. Amotivation	—				1.71
2. Introjection	.25*	—			2.89
3. Identification	-.30**	-.02	—		5.11
4. Intrinsic Motivation	-.18	-.24	.48**	—	3.25

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 6 also shows that the prediction regarding accuracy of campaign knowledge was not supported. The slight positive relation of identification to greater accuracy on the campaign quiz did not approach significance. Thus, despite the fact that identified reasons were associated with active information seeking and greater differentiation of political attitudes, there was no reported evidence from identified voters that they were significantly more accurate in their political knowledge.

Table 6 also shows the partial correlations of identification and introjection with change in approval ratings for the issues participants viewed from the debate. Neither identification nor introjection were related to change in approval ratings for the candidates' positions on immigration, which was the issue that was not covered by the debate ( $ps > .10$ ). However, introjection was significantly positively related to changing one's opinion in a positive direction for the two issues that were observed in the debate segments, as predicted. Identification was unrelated to change in approval ratings on these issues. Because all of the candidates were trying to enlist viewers' support for their own positions, we interpreted this result as an indication that introjection makes individuals vulnerable to persuasion by politicians' arguments.

Note that the way in which we operationalized persuasibility is questionable because it measures attitude change only in a favorable direction. It could be argued that in a debating context (in which candidates are trying to differentiate themselves from others), persuasion could be reflected in attitudes that become more favorable to some candidates and less favorable to others. To consider whether identification and introjection would be similarly related to a nondirectional measure of attitude change, we computed an index of absolute change in approval that consisted of the mean of the absolute values of respondents' change in approval ratings across the five candidates on each issue. The partial correlational analyses for identification and introjection were then repeated with this index of change. The results, although weaker, mirrored those obtained with the first measure of persuasibility. Introjection was significantly positively related to persuasibility ( $pr = .19, p = .05$ ), whereas identification was unrelated ( $pr = .00$ ).

The content of the debate segments also needs to be considered when interpreting the persuasibility results. For example, it is possible that the large number of candidates and the fast-paced nature of the debate may have limited respondents' ability to process information in a rational, thoughtful manner. Cacioppo, Petty, Kao, and Rodriguez (1986) used the term *cen-*

Table 6  
*Partial Correlations of Identification and Introjection With Study 2 Outcomes*

Outcome	Identification	Introjection
Actively seeking information	.40**	-.17
Differentiation among politicians' stand on various issues	.30*	-.06
Accuracy of knowledge about parties' position on campaign issues	.14	-.04
Persuasion in politicians' direction after viewing debate segments	-.15	.32*

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

*tral processing* to refer to a process in which an individual thinks about, analyzes, and assesses the quality and logic of a persuasive message. Cacioppo et al. contrasted this rational process with what they termed *peripheral processing*, in which an individual attends to factors irrelevant to the content or logical merit of the persuasive argument (e.g., a candidate's attractiveness or sense of humor). We suggest that the candidates in the debate appealed primarily to the peripheral rather than central processing route. It is possible that identified individuals would show greater evidence of persuasibility if the arguments had appealed to central processing.<sup>6</sup>

#### *Distinguishing Identification and Introjection From Intrinsic Motivation and Amotivation*

We included an assessment of intrinsic motivation and amotivation to distinguish the two forms of internalization from these more commonly studied motivational phenomena. We again wanted to show that introjection represents more than just not caring about politics, thus showing a distinct pattern of correlates from amotivation, and that identification represents more than just being keenly interested in politics, thus showing a distinct pattern of correlates from intrinsic motivation. To consider these issues, we calculated correlations between intrinsic motivation and amotivation and the various outcomes.

The correlations for amotivation revealed both overlap with and distinctiveness from the results obtained for introjection. Amotivation paralleled introjection in that it was unrelated to differentiation among candidates' stand on various issues ( $r = -.07$ ) and to accuracy of campaign knowledge ( $r = .00$ ). Amotivation also

Table 5  
*Correlations Among Dependent Measures in Study 2*

Dependent measure	1	2	3	4
1. Information seeking	—			
2. Differentiation of attitudes	.17	—		
3. Accuracy of campaign knowledge	.42**	.33*	—	
4. Change in approval after viewing debate	-.22	.04	-.06	—

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

<sup>6</sup> Another issue to consider regarding persuasibility is the extent to which the communications appealed to emotion. The possibility that introjected individuals are more vulnerable to persuasion on affect-driven issues could be explored by observing their attitude change separately for the issues of job creation and national unity. Although job creation is of personal relevance to many college students, the national unity issue would seem to be far more likely to elicit an emotional reaction. The fact that nearly identical results were obtained for introjection across the two issues ( $prs = .32$  and  $.23$  for job creation and national unity, respectively) argues against the notion that introjected individuals are especially vulnerable to persuasion on emotionally charged issues. (A transcript of the debate segments is available from Richard Koestner.)

was significantly negatively related to actively seeking information ( $r = -.29, p < .05$ ), whereas introjection was negatively related, but not significantly so. However, whereas introjection was significantly positively associated with persuasibility, amotivation was unrelated to this outcome measure ( $r = .01$ ).

The correlations for intrinsic motivation revealed both overlap with and distinctiveness from the results obtained for identification. Intrinsic motivation paralleled identification in that it was significantly positively related to active information seeking ( $r = .49, p < .01$ ) and unrelated to persuasibility ( $r = -.07$ ). However, in contrast to the significant positive relation that was found for identification, intrinsic motivation was unrelated to the differentiation of political attitudes ( $r = .18$ ). Also, intrinsic motivation was significantly positively related to the accuracy of campaign knowledge ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ), but identification was unrelated to this outcome.<sup>7</sup>

### Summary

The results of Study 2 show that identification was associated with active information seeking and differentiation of political opinions; however, the expected positive association with accuracy of knowledge about campaign issues failed to emerge. Introjection was significantly related to vulnerability to persuasion by politicians. Supplemental analyses revealed that amotivation could be distinguished from introjection and identification from intrinsic motivation. Thus, amotivation did not relate to vulnerability to persuasion, as introjection did, and intrinsic motivation did not relate to differentiation of political attitudes, whereas identification did.<sup>8</sup>

### General Discussion

In this research we attempted to extend self-determination theory to the political domain. This theory posits that individuals are inherently motivated to internalize the regulation of important, culturally prescribed activities (Deci & Ryan, 1991). The internalization process, which involves transforming external regulations into internal regulations, is influenced by social factors such as the extent to which the interpersonal environment provides structure, includes involved others, and supports autonomy (Ryan, 1995). Because social factors are not always conducive to successful internalization, two fundamental subtypes of internalization can be distinguished (Deci et al., 1994). The term *identification* refers to successful internalization in which formerly external regulations are integrated into one's sense of self, typically in the form of important personal values. The term *introjection* refers to partial internalization in which a value or regulatory process is taken in but not accepted as one's own. Previous research in the domains of religion and education indicated that the two forms of internalization are associated with distinctly different emotional, cognitive, and behavioral patterns (Ryan & Connell 1989; Grolnick & Ryan, 1987; Ryan et al., 1993; Vallerand & Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1993).

The internalization process also is influenced by developmental considerations; different developmental stages call for a focus on internalizing certain types of regulations and values. For example, late childhood primarily requires the internalization of relatively concrete regulations regarding conscientious and

agreeable behavior, whereas late adolescence and early adulthood call for internalization of more abstract concerns such as the development of a coherent and personally meaningful set of religious and political beliefs (Marcia, 1980). In this research we focused on what should be a developmentally appropriate issue for college students: Why do they consider it important to follow political events? Is it "something you are choosing to do for your own good?" Or is it "something you feel you are supposed to do?" The first response was intended to reflect identification and the second introjection. Our guiding hypothesis was that the two forms of internalization would be associated with distinct forms of political participation. Specifically, identification was expected to be associated with active information seeking, differentiation of attitudes regarding politicians and issues, the experience of generally pleasant emotions, and a high rate of voting behavior. Introjection was expected to be associated with relying on important others in making political decisions, vulnerability to the influence of politician's arguments, and experiencing conflicted emotions.

The results support these predictions. Identification was associated with actively seeking information about political events in Studies 1 and 2. That is, individuals with identified reasons for following politics reported that they more frequently read newspaper stories and watched TV news segments about the referendum and the election. Perhaps because of their initiative in gathering political information, identified individuals also displayed a complex and differentiated view of the politicians' standing on various issues. Thus, their approval ratings for the 1993 federal elections showed careful discrimination among the various candidates for issues central to the campaign. Individuals with identified reasons also appeared to possess clearly differentiated emotions about political events. Thus, in Study 1, identified individuals reported that they expected to experience predominantly pleasant emotions when the results favored their position. The postreferendum follow-up con-

<sup>7</sup> A reviewer suggested that individual differences in campaign knowledge might be influencing the observed relations of political identification and introjection to the other dependent variables. To examine this possibility, we repeated all of the partial correlational analyses while controlling for performance on the campaign knowledge quiz. Nearly identical results emerged. Identification was still significantly related to active information seeking ( $pr = .33, p < .01$ ) and differentiation of attitudes ( $pr = .22, p < .05$ ). Introjection was still significantly related to greater persuasibility on the two debated issues ( $pr = .32, p < .05$ ) and unrelated to persuasibility on the undebated issue ( $pr = .02$ ). Controlling for campaign knowledge also did not alter the results obtained for intrinsic motivation and amotivation.

<sup>8</sup> Hierarchical multiple regressions also were conducted for each of the dependent variables in Table 6. In these analyses, sex was entered in a first step, followed by amotivation, introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation entered together in a second step. The results paralleled those reported in the text based on the correlations. Active information seeking was significantly related to intrinsic motivation ( $\beta = .38, p < .01$ ). The standardized regression coefficients for identification and amotivation were .16 and  $-.22$ , respectively. Differentiation in political attitudes was significantly related only to identification ( $\beta = .25, p < .05$ ). Accuracy of campaign knowledge was significantly related only to intrinsic motivation ( $\beta = .30, p < .01$ ). Vulnerability to persuasion was significantly related only to introjection ( $\beta = .40, p < .01$ ).

firmed these expectations; identified respondents who voted for the winning "no" side of the referendum reported pleasant emotions a week later. This postreferendum follow-up also revealed that identified voters had been significantly more likely to actually vote in the referendum. Taken together, these results suggest that identified reasons for following political events promote active involvement that can be observed with regard to individuals' emotions, cognitions, and behaviors. The consistency of this involvement across various levels of analysis points to the personality integration and coherence that is thought to be the hallmark of self-determination (Deci, 1995; Koestner, Bernieri, & Zuckerman, 1992; Koestner & Zuckerman, 1994).

A different picture emerged for individuals who reported introjected reasons for following political events. In Study 1, such individuals reported that they relied heavily on the advice and influence of other people in deciding how to vote in the referendum. They showed no tendency to actively seek information on their own in either Study 1 or Study 2. Perhaps because of their passivity, introjected individuals also were shown to be vulnerable to persuasion by politicians. Thus, they reported markedly more favorable opinions of politicians' stand on issues such as job creation after they had watched the politicians present their ideas in the context of a debate. The vulnerability to persuasion of individuals with introjected beliefs may be because they have conflicted emotions about their political positions. Thus, in Study 1 we found that respondents who espoused strongly introjected reasons for following the referendum reported that they expected to experience both pleasant and unpleasant emotions when the outcome was in their favor. The postreferendum follow-up confirmed this anticipation; introjected "no" voters reported significantly higher pleasant and unpleasant emotions after the "no" side was victorious. Behavioral passivity and emotional ambivalence have been previously postulated as hallmarks of introjection (Ryan, 1995). Taken together, these results suggest that political participation is fraught with difficulties for those young adults who come to value such participation primarily because it is something they "are supposed to do."

Our research was designed primarily to distinguish the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral correlates of identified and introjected forms of political internalization. However, we also assessed the extent to which individuals were amotivated and intrinsically motivated to follow political events because we thought it important to demonstrate that the distinction between introjection and identification did not merely capture a difference between apathy and enthusiasm toward politics. The term *amotivation* refers to the absence of motivation. The term *intrinsic motivation* refers to the spontaneous, self-initiated pursuit of activities for the inherent satisfaction experienced in exercising one's capacities (Ryan, 1995). Amotivation was expected to be somewhat associated with introjection because they each reflect relatively low levels of self-determination. Intrinsic motivation was expected to be somewhat associated with identification because they represent more self-determined forms of regulation. Intercorrelations among the four motivation subscales confirmed that introjection tends to cluster with amotivation and that identification coheres with intrinsic motivation. However, there also was clear evidence that introjection showed some unique correlates apart from those evidenced for

amotivation and that identification and intrinsic motivation similarly diverged with regard to the outcomes with which they were associated.

Amotivation paralleled introjection in that it was unrelated to differentiation of political attitudes, accuracy of campaign knowledge, and voting behavior. There also was a parallel in that amotivation and introjection were both positively related to relying on others in making political decisions. However, whereas introjection was significantly positively associated with the anticipation of both pleasant and unpleasant emotions about the referendum, amotivation was unrelated to anticipated emotions. Also, whereas introjection was significantly positively associated with persuasion by candidates, amotivation was unrelated to this outcome measure. Thus, conflicted emotions and vulnerability to persuasion appear to be uniquely associated with introjection.

The results obtained for intrinsic motivation paralleled those for identification in that respondents who followed politics "for the pleasure of it" reported actively seeking information and experiencing predominantly pleasant emotions, just like those with identified reasons for following politics. However, there were two ways in which intrinsic motivation and identification were different. First, whereas identification was unrelated to accuracy of knowledge of campaign issues, intrinsic motivation was significantly associated with superior performance on the objective test designed to assess such accuracy. Second, unlike identification, there was no evidence that intrinsic motivation was related to actually voting in the referendum. It is puzzling that people who naturally enjoy following politics would spontaneously gather information and become emotionally involved in political issues, but not follow through to cast their ballot in a referendum. We speculate that people who are intrinsically motivated to follow politics resemble sports fans who are eager to find out information about their team and what its chances of winning are and who get emotionally involved in rooting for their team, but who do not believe that their own behavior is important to the outcome in any way. This line of speculation suggests that in terms of the democratic ideal of fostering an electorate made up of involved participants who voice their opinions in elections, it may be important to promote identified reasons for following politics, even if a young person has a strong natural interest in the process. That is, it is important for citizens to see not only that politics can be interesting but also that what happens is personally important to them.

Our research represents only a first attempt to examine self-determination theory in the realm of politics. Our assessment of political motivation was less complex than used in previous studies of religion and education, and our subject sample was narrowly drawn to include only college students. Nonetheless, our results are consistent with previous research and theorizing regarding identification and introjection. Importantly, this research goes beyond previous work on self-determination theory by identifying certain cognitive-affective processes that are uniquely associated with identification (e.g., possessing differentiated attitudes) and introjection (e.g., conflicted emotions). We encourage other researchers to further distinguish identification and introjection not only from each other but also from their more frequently studied motivational brethren: intrinsic motivation and amotivation.

## References

- Blais, M. R., Sabourin, S., Boucher, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Toward a motivational model of couple happiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 1021-1031.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Kao, C. F., & Rodriguez, R. (1986). Central and peripheral routes to persuasion: An individual difference perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1032-1042.
- Deci, E. L. (1995). *Why we do what we do*. New York: Grosset-Putnam.
- Deci, E. L., Eghari, H., Patrick, P. C., & Leone, D. R. (1994). Facilitating internalization: The self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality*, *62*, 119-142.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Support of autonomy and the control of behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 1024-1037.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Diener, E. (1991, October). *Measuring subjective well-being*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Denver, CO.
- Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 890-898.
- Koestner, R., Bernieri, F., & Zuckerman, M. (1992). Self-determination and consistency between attitudes, traits and behaviors. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 52-59.
- Koestner, R., & McClelland, D. C. (1990). Perspectives on competence motivation. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 527-548). New York: Guilford Press.
- Koestner, R., & Zuckerman, M. (1994). Causality orientations, failure and achievement. *Journal of Personality*, *62*, 321-346.
- Losier, G. F., Bourque, P. E., & Vallerand, R. J. (1993). A motivational model of leisure participation in the elderly. *Journal of Psychology*, *127*, 153-170.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Abelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.
- O'Connor, B. P., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Religious motivation in the elderly: A French-Canadian replication and extension. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *130*, 53-59.
- O'Connor, B. P., & Vallerand, R. J. (1994). Motivation, self-determination, and person-environment fit as predictors of psychological adjustment among nursing home residents. *Psychology and Aging*, *9*, 189-194.
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., Brière, N. M., & Blais, M. R. (1995). Toward a new measure of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation in sports: The Sport Motivation Scale (SMS). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *17*, 35-53.
- Ryan, R. M. (1993). Agency and organization: Intrinsic motivation, autonomy and the self in psychological development. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *The Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 40, pp. 1-56). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). The integration of behavioral regulation within life domains. *Journal of Personality*, *63*, 397-429.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 749-761.
- Ryan, R. M., Rigby, S., & King, K. (1993). Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientations and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 586-596.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Seligman, M. E. P., Abramson, L. Y., Semmel, A., & von Bayer, C. (1979). Depressive attributional style. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *88*, 242-247.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivational styles as predictors of behavior: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality*, *60*, 599-620.
- Vallerand, R. J., & O'Connor, B. P. (1989). Motivation in the elderly: A theoretical framework and some promising findings. *Canadian Psychology*, *30*, 538-550.
- Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senécal, C., & Vallières, E. F. (1993). On the assessment of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation in education: Evidence on the concurrent and construct validity of the Academic Motivation Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *53*, 159-172.

Received April 24, 1995

Revision received July 27, 1995

Accepted July 29, 1995 ■