

AN EMPIRICAL MEASURE OF INTERNALIZATION  
AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO  
REPORTED CONFORMITY BEHAVIOR

by

DIANE SINCLAIR MACDONALD

B.A., University of Victoria, 1969

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS  
in the Department  
of  
Sociology

*Accepted for the Faculty  
of Graduate Studies,  
[redacted]  
Dean pro tem  
13 May, 1971.*

We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

[redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted]

© DIANE SINCLAIR MACDONALD, 1971  
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA  
April 1971

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA  
LIBRARY  
Victoria, B. C.

Supervisor: Professor Robert Hagedorn

ABSTRACT

Internalization is typically conceptualized as that commitment to a norm or standard of conduct which allows no deviation. Conformity when convenient is not, theoretically, part of an internalizer's behavioral repertoire - his actions are governed by internal standards and are not influenced by external or situational determinants. The process of internalization is a process by which norms become the actor's own and, although he originally learned them from others during the process of socialization, they have now become rules of conduct from which he deviates only at the expense of suffering guilt. This, basically, is the theory of internalization - a theory which is largely unsubstantiated by empirical research.

The present study is an attempt to measure the relationship between internalization and reported conformity. Students enrolled in Introductory Sociology (in three universities in two countries) were given a questionnaire designed to elicit information relevant to cheating behavior in college - a normatively defined area. On the basis of responses to this questionnaire, students were classified as internalizers or as identifiers (those who conform or deviate according to the behavior or expectations of relevant others) and then compared with regard to their reported conformity.

Contrary to prediction, internalization status is not strongly related to conformity. This finding anticipates the conclusion reached - that other variables may be better predictors of conformity than is internalization-identification status.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
Concept of internalization as a conformity-producing mechanism	1
Review of literature	1
Campbell's study	3
Stouffer's study	5
Focus of present study	6
DATA COLLECTION	
Description of sample	6
Measurement instrument	7
CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE ORIENTATION	
Internalization	8
Identification	8
HYPOTHESES, RATIONALES, AND RESULTS	9
CONCLUSION	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	25

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I	Norm Orientation Status And Reported Cheating (All Respondents)	10
II	Norm Orientation Status And Reported Cheating (Canadian Respondents)	11
III	Norm Orientation Status And Approval Of Cheating (All Respondents)	12
IV	Norm Orientation Status And Reactions Toward Jane's Cheating (Canadian Respondents)	14
V	Norm Orientation Status And Attitude Towards Reporting Other Students For Cheating (All Respondents)	16
VI	Norm Orientation Status And Reporting Other Students For Cheating (All Respondents)	17
VII	Number Of Changes In Punitive Action Taken By Internalizers And Identifiers Over Three Situations (All Respondents)	20

The concept of internalization as a conformity-producing mechanism has been the object of abundant theoretical discussion but little empirical research. This paradox has provided the impetus for the present study, in which an attempt is made to substantiate internalization theory with empirical data.

The concept of internalization has frequently been utilized to "explain" conformity to a norm or normative order. Williams (1968:206), for example, states that, if norms have been internalized, "there will be much conformity even if there is no external surveillance of conduct or punishment for deviant behavior". It is assumed that an "internalizer" will commit energy to both the maintenance and defense of some norm, and further, that this expenditure is justifiable on moral or ethical grounds. An internalizer conforms precisely because his behavior is subject to internal controls and not to contingencies arising in everyday life which may or may not make it expedient to conform. Internalized norms become part of the conscience or self-ideal of the individual. Blake and Davis (1964:456), for example, assert that actual behavior may differ from the norm and that it will differ "unless some effort or force is exerted to bring about conformity". However, this force is not necessarily external; it may consist of "inner compulsions" (See also Vander Zanden, 1965:48). An internalizer is presumed to incorporate norms into his personality along with an obligation to act according to these norms or - the theory predicts

- to suffer guilt (See Campbell, 1964:398).

The significance attributed to internalization as a mechanism producing conformity is demonstrated by the many suggestions in the literature that one of the paramount tasks of a society is to socialize its members so that they conform because they want to rather than because they are told to (See, for example, Angell, 1958:43-44). The importance attributed to the concept of internalization is, in part, due to the general assumption that norms which have been internalized are more intense (Rommetveit, 1954:56-57), more salient (Kelman, 1961:57-78), more likely to be translated into concrete action regardless of external sanctions (Campbell, 1964:396), more likely to persist (Campbell, 1964:401) and, therefore, to generalize to related issues (See Kelman, 1961: 57-78, and Campbell, 1964:401)<sup>1</sup>, and more likely to demand a high level of commitment (Campbell, 1964) than norms which have not been internalized.

There is a large discrepancy between the importance most sociologists attribute to normative phenomena in general - and internalization in particular - and scientific evidence supporting these assertions. Two exceptions to the "non-

---

1 Implicit in Campbell's discussion regarding attitudes toward alcohol as a social object is the notion of generalization. He states that internalizers are unlikely to develop positive attitudes toward alcohol. Their anti-drinking attitudes generalize to a negative reaction to the taste of alcohol. Therefore, although Campbell does not explicitly state that norms generalize, it is implicit in his third hypothesis (Campbell, 1964:401).

empirical" rule exist: Campbell's study, "The Internalization of Moral Norms" (1964), and Stouffer's study, "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms" (1949). The content of these studies will be detailed below, since partial replication of each will be attempted.

Campbell (1964:396), who discusses three types of reasons for conforming behavior, defines internalization "as commitment to a norm or standard, such that the actor would be expected to commit energy to its defense and maintenance even when external supports or pressures are not available". Identification, on the other hand, occurs when the actor is motivated to imagine the responses of absent others and therefore resist pressure to behave contrary to these remembered agents. The final norm-orientation condition is surveillance, which occurs when "the actor's conformity is a simple minimax function of rewards and costs controlled by the immediate environment" (1964:397).

Campbell utilized a semi-projective story completion technique designed to elicit material relevant to internalization and identification. Basically, a respondent was classified as an "internalizer" if he made any statement to the effect that drinking was wrong as a matter of principle (morally wrong); an "identifier", on the other hand, had to indicate that it was wrong to drink because it was against the wishes of parents or peers. The "source" of the anti-drinking norm was the relevant criterion for classifying respondents - whether that source was internal or external

was the basis of classification.

The substantive focus of Campbell's research was the drinking behavior of respondents, their attitudes toward alcohol as a social object, and the expectations of their peers and parents. Respondents included high school seniors (who, at the time of a subsequent test one year later, were college respondents) and their parents.<sup>1</sup> Responses by the parents to mailed questionnaires demonstrated that "theirs is a culture in which strong adult-based socialization practices encourage abstinence" (Campbell, 1964:399).

Campbell hypothesized that internalizers would be less likely than identifiers to become drinkers during the one-year interval between measures, and that those internalizers who do become drinkers are less likely than non-internalizers (who become drinkers) to develop positive attitudes toward alcohol as a social object. He assumed that college increases a student's exposure to pressures relevant to drinking, and that an actor who has internalized a norm will commit energy to its maintenance even in the face of contrary expectations. He further assumed that when an

---

1 Norms do not necessarily shift between high school and college, although the environment does, as Campbell points out. At college "the opportunity-structure for drinking increases" (1964:401). One of the assumptions often made about internalized norms is that they will persist over time. (This provides social scientists with the rationale for believing that behavior can indeed be predicted from norms.) The point is that someone who has previously internalized a norm should resist contrary pressures and this should show in his reported behavior as later measured.

actor who has internalized a norm succumbs to contrary pressures, "a residue is left in the form of ambivalent attitudes toward the social object in question" (1964:402). Thus, internalizers who had become drinkers were shown to be less likely to like the taste of alcohol. Campbell found some support for his hypothesis that the internalization of an abstinence norm at Time A could predict continued abstinence at Time B.

The focus of Stouffer's study (1949) does not concern internalization per se, but rather simultaneous role obligations which conflict. Stouffer suggests that most people "are subject to strains to conformity to norms incompatible from one group to another" (1949:708). He postulated a "range of permissible behavior" as perceived by an individual, and suggests that this range is important for the analysis of what constitutes a social norm in any group.

Stouffer studied conflicting role expectations in a sample of Harvard and Radcliffe students. Each respondent was confronted with questions which were designed to pose a dilemma to him. He was asked first to imagine he was proctoring an examination in which he saw a student cheating. He was then asked to check (from a list) which punitive action he would take under the following conditions: (a) He did not know the student and neither authorities nor student friends would hear about his part in the incident; (b) only authorities would know about his part; and (c) only student friends would know about his part. Each respondent was then

confronted with the same check list, only this time the student seen cheating is his room-mate and close friend. Each respondent was also questioned about what he perceived to be authorities' and students' expectations regarding his behavior as a proctor.

Although he reached no substantive conclusions, Stouffer found the range of role expectations to be important in any attempt to define a social norm, and he suggests that a fruitful subsequent step would consist of differentiating individuals into types according to how they perceive conflicting role (normative) expectations and then to ask how these types vary with respect to some pertinent social and psychological characteristics. In the research undertaken here, individuals will be classified into types on the basis of their orientation to norms.

The focus of the present study is, broadly speaking, internalization theory. Specifically, this research is designed to test some of the ideas presented by both Campbell and Stouffer. Conceptual and operational definitions of each of the norm orientation conditions will be given, followed by several hypotheses and the data relevant to each of them.

#### DATA COLLECTION

Collection of data from two hundred and ninety-six American college students took place between 1968-1970. One hundred and thirteen Canadian students received the questionnaire during the summer and Fall of 1970. Neither

sample was random. The American data was collected from students at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles and California State College at Fullerton. Of these respondents 22.6%, 12.8%, 29.4% and 32.8% were in first, second, third and fourth year respectively, and 2% were graduate students. Canadian respondents included summer school students, as well as some full-time (winter) students enrolled in Introductory Sociology at the University of Victoria.<sup>1</sup> Of these students 78.95% were in first year university, 9.77% were in second year and the other 12% were spread about equally over third, fourth, and graduate years. Of all the respondents 93% were Caucasian and about 55% were Protestant, 47% were social science majors, 54% were female and 51% were between 18 and 20 years of age.

The questionnaire was originally designed to get as much data as possible relevant to the norms concerning college cheating. The present study utilizes some of the responses to that questionnaire. For the Canadian respondents some further questions were designed (following Campbell, 1964) with this specific research in mind. The measures, based on these questions, are described below.

---

1 Dr. Robert Hagedorn and Dr. Sanford Labovitz were co-directors of the American research. I am indebted to them for the use of the data collected. Dr. Hagedorn further allowed me to make use of the same questionnaire with Canadian students drawn from his sociology classes. Without these generous contributions this study could not have been done.

CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE ORIENTATION

Internalization is "commitment to a norm or standard, such that the actor would be expected to commit energy to its defense and maintenance even when external supports or pressures are not available" (Campbell, 1964:396). The actor commits this energy because he wishes to live up to his self-image and to maintain his own moral standards. Behavior which does not conform to his self-imposed standards makes him uncomfortable or guilty. This conceptualization of internalization leads to an operational classification such that a respondent is an internalizer if he responds that cheating is never, under any circumstances, justified. For a portion of the respondents (the Canadian respondents, for whom some further data was available) one further criterion was added: An "internalizer" also had to report that it would bother him most that he knew he had cheated rather than that others knew, in the hypothetical situation where he was asked to imagine he had, indeed, cheated. Thus, the results will be reported for all the respondents using only the first criterion, as well as for the Canadian respondents utilizing both criteria.<sup>1</sup>

Identification is more difficult to define conceptually, since several related usages of the term appear. For present purposes, however, it is sufficient to state that the central

---

1 Each time that Canadian respondents are mentioned, this criterion has been added.

concern of an identifier is with others - his conformity is motivated by either their expectations for his behavior or by their behavior itself. He conforms, in a sense, simply to please others. While the internalizer is conforming to an internalized norm, the identifier is conforming to external agents (others). Therefore, a respondent will be operationally classified as an identifier if he reports that cheating is justified in order to help a close friend.

Note that the operational definitions utilized here are different than those used by Campbell (1964). As mentioned previously (Page 3), Campbell used a semi-projective story completion technique. In this study, respondents are classified on the basis of their answers to direct questions.

#### HYPOTHESES, RATIONALES, AND RESULTS

Hypothesis 1. - Internalizers (of a non-cheating norm) are less likely than identifiers to report having cheated.

The internalizer hurts only himself by his deviant behavior - his behavior is controlled internally and he responds to his self-opinion. The identifier, on the other hand, responds to external controls. He is primarily concerned with what others think of him and will, therefore, vary his behavior in accordance with those he identifies with. However, according to Campbell, even if he identifies with others who believe that cheating is wrong, there is at least the chance that these others will not find out about his cheating behavior and he may decide that this risk is worth taking (See Campbell, 1964:398).

Results: Table I demonstrates that internalizers are indeed less likely to report having cheated on college exams than are identifiers. Of the internalizers 68.4% report that they have never cheated, while only 41.5% of the identifiers claim never to have cheated. However, one internalizer claims that he has cheated on college exams

TABLE I - Norm Orientation Status And Reported Cheating (All Respondents)

How often have you cheated on exams in college?

	Very Frequently	Frequently	Seldom	Never
Identifiers	0	3	21	17
Internalizers	1	5	78	182

$$\begin{aligned}
 N &= 307 \\
 \chi^2 &= 13.4483^1 \\
 V &= .2093
 \end{aligned}$$

very frequently, while none of the identifiers admit cheating very frequently. On the whole, the findings do support the hypothesis, but the strength of the relationship

---

1 Use of chi square is not normally justified with a non-random sample. It is used here as some indication that the observed distribution differs from that expected by chance. Note that the use of V (a measure of the strength of relationship between the variables; see Blalock, 1960:230) is justified; its validity does not rest on assumptions about the random choice of respondents.

is not very great. For these data Cramer's V is .2093.<sup>1</sup> Similar results are obtained when high school cheating is reported (12% of identifiers and 37% of internalizers report never having cheated in high school), but again the relationship is not very strong (V = .2446).

Canadian students report never having cheated in college more often than do all subjects, with 97% of the internalizers and 75% of the identifiers claiming never to have cheated on college examinations. The relationship between internalization-identification status and reported cheating behavior is slightly stronger with these respondents (See Table II). The results are similar (in direction) for

TABLE II<sup>2</sup> - Norm Orientation Status And Reported Cheating (Canadian Respondents)

How often have you cheated on exams in college?

	Seldom	Never
Identifiers	3	9
Internalizers	1	32

N = 45  
x<sup>2</sup> = 5.2446  
V = .3413

- 1 When a V is computed from Campbell's data, the relationship between drinking or abstaining and internalization-identification status is .1181. (The V was computed from the data in Table III, Campbell, 1964:405).
- 2 None of the Canadian respondents reported "very frequent" or "frequent" cheating.

reported high school cheating with 23% of the identifiers and 32% of the internalizers claiming never to have cheated.

Hypothesis 2. - Those internalizers who do report having cheated are more likely to report guilt feelings about their act than are those identifiers who report having cheated.

According to Campbell, since deviance affects the internalizer's self-image, he is likely to feel that he has let himself down and to feel guilty for not conforming to something he believes as a matter of principle (cheating is

TABLE III - Norm Orientation Status And Approval Of Cheating (All Respondents)

If you have cheated on exams, how did you feel about it?

	Strongly Approve	Approve	Indif-ferent	Dis-Approve	Strongly Disapprove
Identifiers	1	1	25	10	1
Internalizers	3	4	38	95	68

N = 246  
 $\chi^2 = 41.8615$   
V = .4125

wrong). The identifier does not believe that cheating is wrong as a matter of principle; if he believes it is wrong, it is only because he hurts relevant others by cheating.

Results: Table III demonstrates that internalizers are more likely than identifiers to disapprove of their cheating. Of the identifiers 2.6% strongly disapprove of their own

cheating, while 32.6% of the internalizers strongly disapprove. The relationship is slightly stronger between norm-orientation status and approval-disapproval than it was between status and reported cheating behavior, the V being .4125. The results are similar for Canadian respondents, with none of the identifiers reporting that they strongly disapproved of their own cheating, while 42.3% of the internalizers report that they strongly disapprove of their act.

Canadian respondents were given one further question relevant to guilt feelings. A semi-projective question<sup>1</sup> (in which the respondent was told to imagine that Jane, a good student, cheated) was administered. The respondents were asked to state how they thought Jane would have felt about her act when she reconsidered the incident. The responses, which lend support to the hypothesis, are given in Table IV (See Page 14). Note that none of the internalizers thought Jane would feel guilty because others might find out. An "internalization response" - precisely, that Jane would feel guilty because she violated her own standards - was given by 37.5% of the identifiers and 48% of the internalizers. The percentage for internalizers is surprisingly low, given that in-

---

1 This semi-projective question was adapted from Campbell (1964), who used a similar question as his measure of internalization-identification status. This hypothesis, then, can be considered to be a test of the relationship between the semi-projective measure of internalization, adapted from Campbell, and the measure utilized for Canadian respondents (described on Page 8).

ternalization is defined as a conformity response to internal controls. The frequency of "guilty for 'rational' reasons" given by internalizers is also surprising, especially when

TABLE IV - Norm Orientation Status And Reactions Toward Jane's Cheating (Canadian Respondents)

Jane would have felt...

	Not Guilty:		Guilty because of:	
	Blameless, Justified, Indifferent	Violation of Own Standards	Chance of Discovery	"Rational" <sup>1</sup> Reasons
Identifiers	1	3	3	1
Internalizers	1	12	0	12

N = 33  
 $\chi^2 = 12.1841$   
V = .6076

compared with Campbell's (1964) results. Campbell finds that: "Non-internalizers are more likely to rate both identification and rational reasons high, whereas internali-

<sup>1</sup> A respondent was scored as having given a "guilty because of rational reasons" response if he made any statement to the effect that cheating was pointless. For example, one respondent stated that Jane would have "felt badly because she knew her work well, and didn't have to cheat".

zers more often give internalization reasons." (1964:404)<sup>1</sup>

Hypothesis 3. - Internalizers (of a non-cheating norm) should respond positively to the question: "Should you report a college student who is cheating on an exam?" more often than identifiers.

Traditionally, two approaches regarding the generality of norms have been prevalent. One approach maintains that internalized norms generalize to related issues (Campbell, 1964:401). If this approach is correct, then presumably a respondent who believes that cheating is wrong as a matter of principle (internalizer) also believes that one should report cheaters. This is what the above hypothesis, based on the assumption that generalization occurs, predicts.

On the other hand, if the hypothesis is not supported by the data, this would lend support to the other traditional approach - compartmentalization. This approach maintains that the individual has the capacity to compartmentalize, enabling him to experience no conflict, while believing both that cheating is wrong and that one should not report cheaters.

Results: Table V (See Page 16) demonstrates that internalization-identification status makes very little difference with regard to this hypothesis, although the find-

---

1 I am grateful to Dr. Alex Bavelas who, during the conceptualization of the research, suggested that, since an internalizer expends more energy to defend and maintain his commitment to a norm (see Campbell, 1964:396), this result is not unexpected. An internalizer will attempt to rationalize his act precisely because it was wrong - this is part of maintaining his commitment. These results seem to support this suggestion.

ings are in the direction predicted. Ninety-seven point six per cent of the identifiers and 82% of the internalizers believe that one should not report a college student who is cheating on an exam. Again, the strength of the relationship is low ( $V = .1463$ ). These findings lend some limited support to the contention that internalized norms generalize to related issues; however, the data are obviously not conclusive.

TABLE V - Norm Orientation Status And Attitude Towards Reporting Other Students For Cheating (All Respondents)

Should you report a college student who is cheating on an exam?

	Yes	No
Identifiers	1	41
Internalizers	48	219

$N = 309$   
 $\chi^2 = 6.6162$   
 $V = .1463$

Canadian respondents felt similarly, with 100% of the identifiers and 84.8% of the internalizers replying negatively to the question: "Should you report a college student who is cheating on an exam?"

Hypothesis 4. - Internalizers (of a non-cheating norm) are more likely than identifiers to have reported fellow students for cheating.

Results: The data presented in Table VI support this hypothesis to a very limited extent. None of the identifiers have ever reported a college student for cheating, whereas

TABLE VI - Norm Orientation Status And Reporting Other Students For Cheating (All Respondents)

Have you ever reported a college student who cheated on an exam?

	Yes	No
Identifiers	0	42
Internalizers	5	262

N = 309  
 $\chi^2 = .7994$   
V = .0509

1.8% of the internalizers have done so. (Of all respondents 71.36% report that they have, on at least one occasion, seen another student cheating). The Canadian data is even more striking - none of the Canadian respondents claim to have reported a cheater. Not only is there no strong relationship between norm orientation and reporting cheating, the Canadian data do not even support the direction of the hypothesis. These data lend some support to the compartmentalization thesis.

Hypothesis 5. - An internalizer of a non-cheating norm should report that, in the situation where he is asked to imagine he is proctoring an examination and catches a student cheating, he would take the same action regardless of whether or not authorities or student friends know about his part in the incident. Identifiers, however, will vary their action in a non-random manner, depending upon the situation.

The internalizer's behavior is governed by internal "agents"; he responds only to his self-opinion or image. External agents are unimportant to him. The identifier, on the other hand, is primarily oriented towards what others think of him and will, therefore, vary his behavior in accordance with those that he identifies with. Stouffer (1949:707-717), in his analysis of conflicting social norms, sets up the following situation - a student is asked to imagine he is supervising an examination and catches another student cheating. The student is then asked to name the punitive action he would take under these conditions:

(a) When neither authorities nor students will find out about his part in the incident; (b) when authorities will find out; and (c) when students will find out.

Stouffer found the range of expectations to be important in defining social norms. He states: "It is common and convenient to think of a social norm as a point" and finds that "this is probably quite unrealistic as to most of our social behavior...it may be precisely the ranges of permissible behavior which most need examination" (Stouffer, 1949: 717). Stouffer did not separate respondents into

internalizers and identifiers although, implicitly, he considered all his respondents identifiers, since he assumed that they would alter their behavior according to whether the student caught cheating is unknown or is a close friend, and according to the three conditions outlined above. The hypothesis suggests that a range may be important for identifiers, but that to an internalizer a norm is a point which allows for no variation in his behavior.

Results: To test this hypothesis, the number of changed responses that each person made was calculated. In other words, each respondent was asked to name the punitive action he would take in each of the three different situations suggested by Stouffer. An internalizer should not, the hypothesis predicts, vary his response - he should report that he would take the same punitive action regardless of who will subsequently find out about that action.<sup>1</sup> Of the internalizers 68.75% did not alter their action over the three situations, compared with 50% of the identifiers. On the other hand, 28.67% of the internalizers did vary

---

1 Punitive actions included the following:

- (a) Take away his notes and exam book, dismiss him and report him for cheating.
- (b) Take away his notes, let him finish the exam, but report him for cheating.
- (c) If he can be led to withdraw from the exam on some excuse, do not report him for cheating; otherwise report him.
- (d) Take away his notes, but let him finish the exam, and not report him for cheating.
- (e) Act as if nothing had happened and not report him for cheating.

their action in one of the situations, compared with 45% of the identifiers. Of the internalizers 2.57% gave a different response in each of the three situations. The comparative percentage for identifiers is 5%. Table VII summarizes this data.

TABLE VII - Number of Changes In Punitive Action Taken By Internalizers And Identifiers Over Three Situations (All Respondents)

	No Change	One Change	Two Changes
Identifiers	50.00% (N = 20)	45.00% (N = 18)	5.00% (N = 2)
Internalizers	68.75% (N = 187)	28.67% (N = 78)	2.57% (N = 7)

The data are contrary to internalization theory which is based on the assumption that an internalizer will not vary his behavior according to external situational variables; in other words, that an internalized norm is a point rather than a range. Of the internalizers 31.25% did vary their response at least once, depending upon the situation. This is significantly different from the zero predicted. Internalization-identification status did, however, make some difference, since more identifiers (50%) than internalizers (31.25%) altered their action according to the situation—these data support Stouffer's premise that a norm is a range rather than a point.

## CONCLUSION

All of the hypotheses were supported to some extent by the data. To quote Campbell: "The data are encouraging if one heeds the consistency of the results, but less encouraging if he notes the often meager magnitude of the category differences." (Campbell, 1964: 411) Campbell's optimism is not shared, although the results of this study are certainly similar to his findings.<sup>1</sup> In most cases, however, the internalization-identification dimension made so little difference that the utility of these concepts can be seriously questioned.

Perhaps the norm orientation types do exist and their operational measure is to blame for the lack of conclusive support for the predictions. At least one factor, however,

---

1 Prior to analysis of the data, Dr. Donald W. Ball suggested that internalizers might report their cheating behavior more often than identifiers - in other words, tell the truth more often - simply because they are internalizers. An identifier, on the other hand, may not report cheating behavior, because the opinions of others count so much. If the consistency of the results is viewed as encouraging, this suggestion is particularly valid, since another method of data collection might result in higher correlations. (There is no way to test whether or not identifiers are lying by the questionnaire method - perhaps a lie detector or some other "indirect" device would be more appropriate.) However, if the strength of the relationship is regarded as the crucial test of internalization theory, this suggestion has less impact, since 31.25% of the internalizers, who, even according to this hypothesis, are telling the truth, still report having cheated - a marked deviation from the theory which predicts that none of them will cheat. In summary, if consistency is viewed as the critical test, other measures are worthwhile; however, the position taken here is that the data suggest that further testing of internalization, as it is presently conceptualized, is unwarranted.

detracts from this explanation. Campbell (1964) measured internalization and identification in a slightly different manner and still failed to find strong evidence for his hypotheses. Three different measures<sup>1</sup>, then, have been utilized and none of them proved particularly effective.<sup>2</sup>

Assuming that the data from both Campbell's (1964) and the present study are correct, consideration of some alternative proposals is warranted. For example, examination of situational variables may be essential to the understanding of cheating behavior. The data reported here, for example, suggest that Canadian college students are more "moral" than their American counterparts. This is not due to the different measures of internalization utilized since, when internalization-identification status is ignored, 49.3% of all the American respondents compared with 88.7% of all the Canadian respondents report never having cheated in college. When reported cheating in high school is considered, however, the direction is reversed. American students seem to be more

- 
- 1 The three measures include: 1. The semi-projective technique utilized by Campbell (1964); 2. the direct question measure from the original questionnaire ("Do you feel student cheating on college exams is ever justified?") and 3. the additional measure for Canadian respondents (who, to be classified as internalizers, also had to indicate that it would bother them the most that they themselves knew they had cheated).
  - 2 When the relationship between internalization and reported conformity was tested, Campbell's (1964) semi-projective technique produced a  $V = .1181$ , the direct question measure produced a  $V = .2093$ , and the additional criteria for Canadian respondents produced a  $V = .3413$ .

"ethical" in this case, although the difference is not as great. Thirty-one per cent of American respondents and 28% of Canadian respondents report that they have never cheated in high school. Perhaps a situational variable, or combination of variables, would explain both why Canadian college respondents seem to be more "moral" as well as why the direction was reversed for high school cheating. Differences between American and Canadian educational systems might explain these findings. This speculation is tentative; however, the data do suggest that situational variables are operative, since even internalizers vary their behavior according to the situation (see the results for hypothesis 5).

Another proposal<sup>1</sup> put forward was that an alternative conceptualization of internalization be considered. An internalizer may believe very strongly that cheating is wrong, and yet have cheated so often that the goal is unattainable. He continues to cheat and lower his opinion of himself, and yet, the more he cheats, the more he believes it is wrong to cheat. This suggestion has interesting implications for guilt theory; perhaps guilt is directly, rather than inversely, related to deviance. This conceptualization of internalization differs from the one presented, in that this hypothesis suggests that internalization of a norm may, at least for some people, be inversely related to conformity. Thus the respondent who reported having cheated frequently

---

1 Suggested by Dr. Alex Bavelas.

(and who was classified by independent measures as an internalizer) may indeed exhibit as many internalization characteristics as those respondents (also classified as internalizers) who report never having cheated - even though their behavior is at polar ends of a conformity continuum. This means that, while internalization may actually exist, its relationship to conformity is not predictable.

If the process of internalization is essential to conformity, other techniques of measuring the concept are necessary. If, however, the findings presented are valid, then the explanation of conformity depends upon either re-conceptualizing internalization or investigating alternative variables.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamson, Mark  
1969 Sociology - An Introduction to Concepts, Methods, and Data. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 6-7.
- Allen, Vernon L.  
1965 Situational Factors in Conformity. In Leonard Berkowitz (ed.). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 133-175.
- Angell, Robert C.  
1958 Free Society and Moral Crisis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 43-44.
- Aronfreed, Justin  
1968 Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control Over Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1-42.
- Aubert, Vilhelm  
1967 Elements of Sociology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 18-39.
- Becker, Howard  
1960 Normative Reactions to Normlessness. American Sociological Review, 25, 803-810.
- Blake, Judith and Davis, Kingsley  
1964 Norms, Values, and Sanctions. In R.E.L. Faris (ed.) Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 456-484.
- Blalock, Hubert M.  
1960 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Broom, Leonard and Selznick, Philip  
1955 Sociology. New York: Harper and Row, 68-76.
- Campbell, Ernest Q.  
1964 The Internalization of Moral Norms. Sociometry, 27, 391-412.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle  
1970 The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency. Crime and Delinquency, 16.

- Cloward, Richard and Ohlin, Lloyd E.  
1960 Delinquency and Opportunity - A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: The Free Press.
- Davis, Kingsley  
1949 Human Society. New York: Macmillan, chapter 3.
- Foa, Uriel G.  
1958 Behavior, Norms, and Social Rewards in a Dyad. Behavioral Science, 3, 323-334.
- Gibbs, Jack P.  
1965 Norms: The Problem of Definition and Classification. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 586-594.  
  
1966 The Sociology of Law and Normative Phenomena. American Sociological Review, 31, 315-325.  
  
1968 The Study of Norms. The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.
- Goode, William J.  
1960 Norm Commitment and Conformity to Role-Status Obligations. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 246-258.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.  
1960 The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161-178.
- Homans, George C.  
1950 The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 121-127.
- Jackson, Jay  
1965 Structural Characteristics of Norms. In Steiner, I. D. and Fishbein M. (eds.) Current Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 301-309.
- Johnson, Harry M.  
1960 Sociology: A Systematic Introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.
- Kelley, Harold H. and Shapiro, Martin M.  
1954 An Experiment on Conformity to Group Norms Where Conformity is Detrimental to Group Achievement. American Sociological Review, 19, 667-677.

- Kelman, Herbert C.  
1961 Processes of Opinion Change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, 57-78.
- Lowry, Ritchie P. and Rankin, Robert P.  
1969 Sociology - The Science of Society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 120-132.
- Mizruchi, Ephraim and Perrucci, Robert  
1962 Norm Qualities and Differential Effects of Deviant Behavior: An Exploratory Analysis. American Sociological Review, 27, 391-399.
- Morris, Richard T.  
1956 A Typology of Norms. American Sociological Review, 21, 610-613.
- McKee, James B.  
1969 Introduction to Sociology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 85-86.
- Parsons, Talcott  
1951 The Social System. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1-41.
- Rommetveit, Ragnar  
1954 Social Norms and Roles: Explorations in the Psychology of Enduring Social Pressures. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stouffer, Samuel A.  
1949 An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms. American Sociological Review, 14 (Dec.), 707-717.
- Schwartz, Shalom H.  
1968 Awareness of Consequences and the Influence of Moral Norms on Interpersonal Behavior. Sociometry, 31, 355-369.
- Vander Zanden, James W.  
1965 Sociology - A Systematic Approach. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 38-62.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr.  
1960 American Society, A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred Knopf.  
1968 The Concept of Norms. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.

Surname: MACDONALD Given Names: DIANE SINCLAIR

Place of Birth: TORONTO, ONT. Date of Birth: APRIL 29, 1947

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA 1965 to 1971  
\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A. 1969 University of Victoria  
\_\_\_\_\_

Honors and Awards:

University of Victoria Scholarship, 1970/71  
\_\_\_\_\_

Publications:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA LIBRARY

MANUSCRIPT THESIS

AUTHORITY TO DISTRIBUTE

AUTHOR: This thesis may be lent or microfilm  
copies made available:

(a) Without restriction

(b) With the restriction that,  
for a period of five years

(until \_\_\_\_\_) the  
written approval of the  
following is required:

(1) The Chairman, School  
of Graduate Studies

(2) The Author

(3) both the Chairman,  
School of Graduate  
Studies, and the Author

BORROWERS: The borrower undertakes, by signing below, to  
give proper credit for any use made of the  
thesis, and to obtain the consent of the author  
if it is proposed to make extensive quotations,  
or to reproduce the thesis in whole or in part.

Signature of Borrower

Address

Date