# The Psychometric Properties of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS) and the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS) in Hebrew

Rachel Bachner-Melman<sup>1</sup>, Naomi Bacon-Shnoor<sup>2</sup>, Ada H. Zohar<sup>3</sup>, Yoel Elizur<sup>4</sup>, and Richard P. Ebstein<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Psychology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, <sup>2</sup>Educational Psychology Service of the Jerusalem Municipality, Jerusalem, <sup>3</sup>Behavioral Sciences, Ruppin Academic Center, Emek Hefer, <sup>4</sup>School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, <sup>5</sup>Sarah Herzog Memorial Hospital, Jerusalem, all Israel

**Abstract.** We examined the factor structure, reliability, and construct validity of a Hebrew translation of Lennox and Wolfe's Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS) and Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS) in a large Israeli population sample. A total of 1,294 individuals (1,010 females and 284 males), divided into two samples, completed the RSMS, the CAS, the Tridimensional Personality Questionnaire Harm Avoidance Scale, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. With the exception of RSMS Item 12, the total and subscale structure of the English versions of the scales was replicated in both samples. Internal consistencies compared very favorably with those of the original scales. The CAS and the RSMS were moderately correlated yet appeared to be distinct, correlating as expected in opposite directions with harm avoidance and self-esteem. Confirmatory factor analysis justified the use of the RSMS and the CAS as separate scales with two subscales in each. Whereas the fit of our data to the RSMS was very good, the fit to the CAS was far less satisfactory, apparently because items tended to load onto both subscales. The Hebrew translation of the RSMS, and, to a lesser extent, that of the CAS, appear to be psychometrically sound instruments.

Keywords: self-monitoring, concern for appropriateness, self-presentation, factor structure, reliability

# Introduction

Self-presentation can be defined as the behavioral strategies used to adopt desired social images and convey them to other people. This concept was developed and applied in the field of social psychology (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984), and has since generated a large and varied body of research. The finding that self-presentation affects the way people are influenced by social messages and the media has led to a further examination of this construct in marketing and consumer psychology research. Interesting findings with practical implications have resulted, in particular in the realm of advertising (Celuch, Slama, & Schaffenacker, 1997).

Historically, self-presentation emerged from Mark Snyder's "self-monitoring" construct: impression management and responsiveness to changes in the social environment (Snyder, 1974). Snyder saw self-monitoring as a relatively stable personality trait present to varying degrees in different individuals. The self-monitoring scale (SMS) that he

*European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 2009; Vol. 25(1):8–15 DOI 10.1027/1015-5759.25.1.8

devised to measure it was generative yet widely criticized for combining negatively correlated constructs (Lennox, 1988).

Lennox and Wolfe (1984), therefore, divided the SMS into two self-report instruments measuring different aspects of self-presentation: the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS) and the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS). They described two different impression management styles: *acquisitive* self-presentation (RSMS) and *protective* self-presentation (CAS). Whereas both social styles involve a high degree of concern for social cues and approval, protective self-presentation is a passive, fearful approach aimed at gaining acceptance ("getting along"), while acquisitive self-presentation is an active, flexible approach aimed at gaining status ("getting ahead"). The RSMS and the CAS are psychometrically sound (Day, Schleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002) and have generally, but not always, been found to be orthogonal.

Both scales contain a subscale measuring passive sensitivity to the social environment: the sensitivity to the expressive behavior of others (SEBO) subscale for the RSMS and the attention to social comparison information subscale (ATSCI) for the CAS. The other subscale of each scale reflects a more active adaptation to changes in the social environment. For the RSMS this is the Ability to Modify Self-Presentation (AMSP) subscale and for the CAS it is the Cross-Situational Variability (CSV) subscale (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984).

Those scoring high on the CAS have been described as often experiencing negative emotions. The CAS has been found to be negatively associated with self-esteem, extraversion, and emotional stability (Miller, Omens, & Delvadia, 1991), and positively with perfectionism (Miller et al., 1991) and maladaptive social behavior (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). In contrast, the RSMS has been shown to correlate positively with self-confidence (Arkin, 1981), self-esteem, extraversion (Miller et al., 1991), and leadership (Ellis, 1988), and negatively with neuroticism and social anxiety. Self-monitoring, thus, appears to go hand-in-hand with social and psychological health and adaptation.

In the marketing field, advertisements projecting different images have been found to influence each type of self-presenter differently. Appeals aimed at attaining social advantage have been shown to be more effective with acquisitive self-presenters, whereas appeals showing how to avoid social risk are more effective with protective self-presenters (Celuch & Slama, 1995). The CAS, especially the ATSCI subscale, has been related to an extreme concern for others' reactions, and to sensitivity to social and cultural influences (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Teel, 1992). Other correlates of the CAS are consumer conformity (Bearden & Rose, 1990), susceptibility to peer pressure (Johnson, 1989), and cosmetic use in women (Wolfe et al., 1995).

Based on these findings, we tested the construct validity of the RSMS and CAS by measuring a positive personality trait, self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965), and a negative personality trait, harm avoidance (Cloninger, 1987). We expected to find positive correlations between the RSMS and self-esteem and between the CAS and harm avoidance, and negative correlations between the RSMS and harm avoidance and between the CAS and self-esteem.

A largely Westernized melting pot of variegated European and Oriental cultures, Israeli society is a rich and interesting target for socially orientated research. Whereas a poor translation process may lead to an instrument not equivalent to the original questionnaire, even equivalence between source and target based on content does not ensure the retention of psychometric properties such as validity and reliability that should be examined after translation (Beaton, Bombardier, Guillemin, & Ferraz, 2000). Here we examine the factor structure, reliability, and construct validity of a Hebrew translation of the RSMS and the CAS in an Israeli population sample, in order to evaluate equivalence between the Hebrew version and the original source.

# Method

#### Participants

A total of 1,294 participants (1,010 females, 284 males) filled out questionnaires. Respondents were mainly Israeli college students and their siblings, who completed the CAS and the RSMS as part of a battery of self-report questionnaires administered in a genetic study of personality (Bachner-Melman et al., 2005). The study was originally intended as a study of girls and women, and the relatively late inclusion of males resulted in a gender imbalance in the sample. Respondents and siblings were aged between 13 and 36 ( $M = 21.8 \pm 4.48$ ) and 98% (N = 1,266) defined themselves as Jewish. Of the Jewish participants, 57.6% (n = 745) were Ashkenazic, 21.1% (n = 273) Sephardic, 19.4% of mixed origin, and 1.9% (n = 25) declined to reply; and 16.8% (n = 216) described themselves as religious, 16.7% (n = 216) traditional, 64.1% (n = 829) secular, and 2.5% (*n* = 32) declined to reply.

#### Instruments

- 1. The RSMS has 13 items scored on a six-point Likert scale. The two factors consistently identified using both exploratory and confirmatory factor methods are a sixitem subscale measuring sensitivity to the expressive behavior of others (SEBO) and a seven-item subscale measuring the ability to modify self-presentation (AMSP). Modest positive correlations (0.22-0.34) have been reported between the two subscales. Internal consistency estimates for the whole scale have ranged from 0.75 (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) to 0.87 (O'Cass, 2000), with a recent meta-analysis of 13 studies reporting Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of 0.81 (Day et al., 2002). Alpha coefficients for the subscales were 0.77-0.86 for the AMSP and 0.70-0.85 for the SEBO (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; O'Cass, 2000). Test-retest correlations were found to be 0.6-0.7 for a 3-week period and 0.55, 0.52 and 0.53 for the total scale, SEBO, and AMSP respectively over a 2-year period (Anderson, 1991).
- 2. *The CAS* has 20 items scored on a six-point Likert scale. Its subscales are a seven-item Cross-Situational Variability subscale (CSV) and a 13-item Attention To Social Comparison Information (ATSCI) subscale. The CAS has excellent psychometric properties (Celuch et al., 1997; Cutler & Wolfe, 1985; Johnson, 1984; Miller et al., 1991). Coefficient  $\alpha$  values are consistently above 0.80. The internal reliability of the ATSCI subscale was found to be around 0.80, and that of the CSV subscale around 0.78 (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). The CAS has yielded a test-retest correlation of 0.84 after 3 weeks (Johnson, 1984).
- 3. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES; Rosenberg, 1965) has 10 items scored on a four-point Likert scale. It con-

sists of one factor only. The Hebrew translation has previously been used in research (Shapira et al., 1999). 2-week test-retest was found to be 0.85 (Silbert & Tippett, 1965). The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for this study was 0.90.

4. The Harm Avoidance Scale of the Tridimensional Personality Questionnaire (TPQ; Cloninger, 1987) consists of 34 items marked "true" or "false." One of the four temperaments measured by Cloninger's TPQ, it represents a preference for safe routine and risk avoidance, and a tendency to be pessimistic, shy, and fatigable (Cloninger, 1987). The TPQ has been translated into Hebrew and tested on a large community sample (Zohar et al., 2001). Test-retest for the TPQ Harm Avoidance Scale has been found to be 0.77 (Kuo, Chien, Soong, Yang, & Chen, 2004) and the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  in this study was 0.86.

## **Translation of CAS and RSMS**

These scales were translated into Hebrew by a psychologist with mother tongue Hebrew and excellent knowledge of English, then professionally edited. Every effort was made to ensure semantic, idiomatic, and conceptual equivalence, and to preserve overall meaning and nuances. An independent psychologist who was also a native speaker of Hebrew, back-translated them. Translators resolved discrepancies and agreed on the final wording.

### Procedure

The study was approved by the Israeli Health Ministry Ethics Committee. Respondents and parents of minors provided written consent. Contact persons and one sibling per family (when available) completed questionnaires.

# Results

We divided our sample into two and included one sibling per family only in each sample so that individuals were independent within each sample. The 741 contact persons (119 males, 622 females) comprised Sample 1 and their 553 participating siblings (165 males, 388 females) comprised Sample 2.

With the exceptions of Item 8 of the RSMS and Item 14 of the CAS, in both samples all items had skewness and kurtosis in the range of (-1, 1), and were, therefore, approximately normally distributed. Most people agreed with Item 8 of the RSMS and Item 14 of the CAS. The mean of the CAS was  $53.45 \pm 13.45$  for Sample 1 and  $52.18 \pm 12.89$  for Sample 2, and the mean of the RSMS (excluding Item 12, see "Factor Structure" below) was  $39.52 \pm 8.25$  for Sample 1 and  $39.09 \pm 8.27$  for Sample

2. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for the CAS was .88 for Sample 1 and .86 for Sample 2, and the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  for the RSMS (excluding Item 12) was .86 for both samples.

## Factor Structure of RSMS and CAS

#### **Primary Analysis**

We ran a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using EQS version 6.1 (Bentler, 1992) to examine the factor structure of the RSMS and the CAS. Since both were derived conceptually from Snyder's self-monitoring concept, we entered all RSMS and CAS items and compared three theoretical models: (1) a one-factor model, as hypothesized by Snyder (Snyder, 1987); (2) a two-factor model, separating RSMS items from CAS items, without stipulating subscales; and (3) a four-factor model, including the four subscales (the SEBO and AMSP of the RSMS, and the ATSCI and CSV of the CAS).

Table 1 presents the item loadings and goodness-of-fit indices for both samples in these three models. Loadings were satisfactory, except for RSMS Item 12. This item was deleted and excluded since it lowered total and subscale reliability considerably. The loading of CAS Item 20 was low but we retained it since it did not significantly affect reliability.

 $\chi^2$  and goodness-of-fit measures for the three models appear in Table 1. Normed fit index, nonnormed fit index (NNFI), and comparative fit index (CFI) are reported as goodness-of-fit measures (Raykov, Tomer, & Nesselroade, 1991). Following Boomsma (2000), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is also reported. NNFI and CFI fit indices close to .95 and RMSEA misfit indices under .06 were adopted as criteria for an acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The four-factor model including the RSMS and CAS subscales was the best fitting model, albeit far from optimal. All differences between the models were statistically significant.

#### **Checking for Group Differences**

In order to examine possible gender differences and age differences in factor structure, we divided both samples by gender and by age and reanalyzed the four-factor model. Concerning age, each sample was divided into two groups, adolescents (ages 13–21) and adults (> age 21) and the same model was run independently for each group. The same procedure was used for gender. The factor structure was found to be similar in all groups and we found no evidence for gender or age differences (data not shown).

Table 1. RSMS and CAS item loading	s and goodness of fit	indices for one-factor,	two-factor, and	four-factor models for
Sample 1 (S1; $N = 741$ , 119 n	nales, 622 females) a	and Sample 2 (S2; $N = 1$	553, 165 males,	388 females)

		Item loadings		
Item number (subscale)	Item paraphrased	1 factor	2 factors	4 factors
			S1 (S2)	
CAS 1 (CSV)	I show different sides to different people.	.68 (.57)	.62 (.52)	.71 (.61)
CAS 2 (ATSCI)	What others are doing must be the right thing.	.38 (.29)	.42 (.33)	.41 (.37)
CAS 3 (ATSCI)	I avoid wearing clothes not in style.	.27 (.16)	.30 (.19)	.37 (.30)
CAS 4 (CSV)	In different situations I act like different persons.	.76 (.70)	.71 (.68)	.76 (.69)
CAS 5 (ATSCI)	At parties I usually try to fit in.	.43 (.49)	.43 (.48)	.45 (.51)
CAS 6 (ATSCI)	If uncertain how to act I watch others for cues.	.50 (.52)	.61 (.60)	.69 (.67)
CAS 7 (CSV)	Others do not know me.	.40 (.40)	.45 (.44)	.56 (.56)
CAS 8 (ATSCI)	I notice reactions to avoid being out of place.	.61 (.54)	.70 (.64)	.77 (.74)
CAS 9 (ATSCI)	I pick up slang expressions easily.	.45 (.42)	.46 (.43)	.45 (.41)
CAS 10 (CSV)	Different contexts make me behave differently.	.72 (.69)	.71 (.69)	.73 (.72)
CAS 11 (ATSCI)	I pay attention to what others are wearing.	.28 (.28)	.30 (.30)	.32 (.37)
CAS 12 (ATSCI)	Disapproval makes me change my approach.	.52 (.49)	.56 (.54)	.56 (.55)
CAS 13 (CSV)	Different people see me differently.	.55 (.57)	.57 (.59)	.70 (.72)
CAS 14 (ATSCI)	It's important to me to fit in to a group.	.33 (.31)	.36 (.33)	.46 (.42)
CAS 15 (ATSCI)	I often do what I think others want me to.	.69 (.64)	.77 (.69)	.78 (.69)
CAS 16 (CSV)	I am not always the person I appear to be.	.48 (.48)	.50 (.53)	.66 (.69)
CAS 17 (ATSCI)	If uncertain how to act I take cues from others	.57 (.57)	.68 (.65)	.77 (.72)
CAS 18 (ATSCI)	I keep up with the fashion by observing others	.39 (.42)	.44 (.45)	.52 (.59)
CAS 19 (CSV)	People don't know who I really am.	.43 (.43)	.49 (.49)	.63 (.63)
CAS 20 <sup>a</sup> (ATSCI)	I do what I like and do not follow the crowd.	.05 (.02)	.12 (.05)	.22 (.17)
RSMS 1 (AMSP)	I can alter my behavior when appropriate.	.58 (.59)	.60 (.58)	.69 (.65)
RSMS 2 (SEBO)	I can read others' emotions through their eyes.	.32 (.28)	.56 (.63)	.73 (.76)
RSMS 3 (AMSP)	3 (AMSP) I can control the way I come across to people.		.73 (.71)	.72 (.73)
RSMS 4 (SEBO) I am sensitive to slight changes in expression.		.33 (.25)	.50 (.49)	.68 (.63)
RSMS 5 (SEBO)	MS 5 (SEBO) I understand others intuitively.		.55 (.57)	.80 (.77)
RSMS 6 (SEBO)	I can tell if others find a joke is in bad taste.	.32 (.25)	.53 (.48)	.66 (.56)
RSMS 7 (AMSP)	I can readily change my image.	.61 (.54)	.73 (.71)	.79 (.77)
RSMS 8 (SEBO)	I feel when I've said something inappropriate.	.34 (.27)	.55 (.55)	.70 (.67)
RSMS 9 (AMSP)	I can't adapt my behavior to different people.	.41 (.32)	.56 (.53)	.65 (.61)
RSMS 10 (AMSP)	I can adjust my behavior to any situation.	.52 (.53)	.68 (.70)	.75 (.75)
RSMS 11 (SEBO)	I can tell when someone is lying to me.	.23 (.22)	.43 (.50)	.54 (.59)
RSMS 12 <sup>a</sup> (AMSP)	I have difficulty putting up a good front.	.12 (.04)	.19 (.15)	.28 (.22)
RSMS 13 (AMSP)	I can regulate my actions appropriately.	.39 (.35)	.55 (.52)	.58 (.54)
	df	495	494	489
	$\chi^2$	6003.4 (4259.1)	4509.3 (2978.3)	2744.7 (1920.8)
	NFI	.44 (.40)	.58 (.58)	.74 (.73)
	NNFI	.42 (.39)	.58 (.60)	.76 (.77)
	CFI	.46 (.43)	.61 (.62)	.78 (.78)
	RMSEA	.12 (.12)	.11 (.10)	.08 (.07)

CAS – Concern for Appropriate Scale; RSMS – Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; CSV – Cross-Situational Variability; ATSCI – Attention to Social Comparison Information; AMSP – Ability to Modify Self-Presentation; SEBO – Sensitivity to the Expressive Behavior of Others; NFI – normed fit index; NNFI – nonnormed fit index; CFI – comparative fit index; RMSEA – root mean square error of approximation. <sup>a</sup>reversed item.

Table 2. Goodness of fit indices for the RSMS and for the<br/>CAS in Sample 1 (S1; N = 741, 119 males, 622<br/>females) and Sample 2 (S2; N = 553, 165 males,<br/>388 females)

	CAS	PSMS
	CAS	KSWIS
	S1 (S2)	S1 (S2)
df	169	53
$\chi^2$	1755.5 (1163.4)	225.0 (138.9)
NFI	.72 (.71)	.94 (.94)
NNFI	.70 (.71)	.94 (.95)
CFI	.74 (.74)	.95 (.96)
RMSEA	.11 (.10)	.07 (.05)
NIET 1.0	1 NINITY	

NFI – normed fit index; NNFI – nonnormed fit index; CFI – comparative fit index; RMSEA – root mean square error of approximation.

*Table 3.* Two-factor solution from principal component factor analysis entering all RSMS items (except item 12) for sample 1 (S1; N = 741, 119 males, 622 females) and sample 2 (S2; N = 553, 165 males, 388 females)

RSMS Item	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> ) S1; S2	α if deleted* S1 (S2)	SEBO S1 (S2)	AMSP S1 (S2)
2	3.5 (1.1); 3.4 (1.1)	.81 (.78)	.75 (.74)	
4	3.6 (1.1); 3.5 (1.2)	.82 (.80)	.73 (.71)	
5	3.7 (1.0); 3.7 (1.0)	.79 (.78)	.84 (.79)	
6	3.6 (1.1); 3.6 (1.1)	.82 (.81)	.70 (.64)	
8	3.8 (0.9); 3.8 (0.9)	.81 (.79)	.74 (.72)	
11	3.1 (1.0); 3.1 (1.1)	.84 (.80)	.64 (.67)	
1	3.2 (1.2); 3.2 (1.1)	.83 (.81)		.77 (.72).
3	3.2 (1.1); 3.1 (1.1)	.83 (.80)	[.34 (.31)]	.70 (.72)
7	2.8 (1.2); 2.8 (1.2)	.82 (.79)		.78 (.77)
9ª	2.8 (1.2); 2.2 (1.2)	.83 (.82)		.76 (.74)
10	2.8 (1.1); 2.7 (1.2)	.81 (.79)		.78 (.76)
13	3.3 (1.0); 3.4 (1.0)	.84 (.83)		.57 (.63)
% Varia	nce accounted for		40.28 (39.83)	16.98 (14.76)
Eigenva	lue		4.86 (4.8)	2.17 (1.92)
Mean			21.39 (21.06)	18.13 (18.03)
Standard	d deviation		4.65 (4.65)	5.16 (5.03)
Coeffici	ent α		.84 (.85)	.82 (.83)

Factor structure matrix coefficients less than 0.30 omitted; \*of subscale; <sup>a</sup>Item reversed. RSMS – Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; SEBO – Sensitivity to the Expressive Behavior of Others; AMSP – Ability to Modify Self-Presentation.

European Journal of Psychological Assessment 2009; Vol. 25(1):8-15

*Table 4.* Two-factor solution from principal component factor analysis entering all CAS items for Sample 1 (S1; N = 741, 119 males, 622 females) and Sample 2 (S2; N = 553, 165 males, 388 females)

CAS Item	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> ) S1; S2	α if deleted* S1 (S2)	CSV S1 (S2)	ATSCI S1 (S2)
1	3.0 (1.3); 2.9 (1.3)	.85 (.83)	.65 (.61)	
4	2.5 (1.3); 2.4 (1.3)	.84 (82)	.65 (.62)	[.37 (.34)]
7	2.8 (1.2); 2.9 (1.3)	.85 (83)	.73 (.67)	
10	2.2 (1.4); 2.2 (1.3)	.84 (.82)	.64 (.66)	[.37 (.31)]
13	2.7 (1.3); 2.8 (1.3)	.84 (.81)	.76 (.76)	
16	2.5 (1.2); 3.0 (1.3)	.84 (.81)	.79 (.79)	
19	2.9 (1.2); 2.9 (1.3)	.84 (.82)	.79 (.75)	
2	1.9 (1.2); 1.9 (1.2)	.83 (.81)		.36 (.42)
3	2.4 (1.4); 2.3 (1.5)	.83 (.82)		.60 (.56)
5	3.1 (1.1); 3.1 (1.2)	.83 (.81)		.54 (.56)
6	2.7 (1.2); 2.7 (1.2)	.82 (.80)	(.34)]]	.61 (.57)
8	2.6 (1.2); 2.5 (1.3)	.81 (.79)	[.35 (.32)]	.69 (.67)
9	2.7 (1.3); 2.8 (1.2)	.83 (.81)	(.31) ]]	.44 (.38)
11	3.6 (1.2); 3.3 (1.2)	.83 (.81)		.43 (.51)
12	2.3 (1.3); 2.2 (1.2)	.82 (.81)	[.34 (.36)]	.39 (.48)
14	3.8 (1.0); 3.8 (1.0)	.82 (.81)		.63 (.55)
15	2.4 (1.2); 2.3 (1.1)	.81 (.80)	[.49 (.47)]	.61 (.55)
17	2.5 (1.2); 2.3 (1.2)	.81 (.80)	[.34 (.37)]	.66 (.59)
18.	2.3 (1.3); 2.1 (1.3)	.82 (.79)		.70 (.75)
20ª	1.9 (1.1); 1.9 (1.1)	.84 (.83)		.38 (.40)
% Varia	nce accounted for		31.84 (29.42)	12.69 (12.97)
Eigenva	lue		6.37 (5.88)	2.54 (2.59)
Mean			19.19 (18.92)	34.26 (33.27)
SD			6.53 (6.43)	9.11 (8.83)
Coeffici	ent α		.86 (.84)	.84 (.82)

Factor structure matrix coefficients less than 0.30 omitted; \*of subscale; aItem reversed. CAS – Concern for Appropriateness Scale CSV – Cross-Situational Variability; ATSCI – Attention to Social Comparison Information.

#### Follow-up Analyses

To examine why the fit was inadequate, two CFAs were conducted, one for the CAS and the other for the RSMS, comparing the goodness-of-fit of the scales. Table 2 shows that the fit of our data to the RSMS, but not to the CAS, was good.

	AMSP S1(S2)	SEBO S1(S2)	CAS S1(S2)	CSV S1(S2)	ATSCI S1(S2)	HA	SES
RSMS	.86 (.87)	.82 (.84)	.37 (.28)	.38 (.27)	.28 (.21)	13 (24)	.11 (.11)
AMSP		.41 (.46)	.41 (.35)	.39 (.35)	.32 (.25)	16 (27)	.18 (.12)
SEBO			.21 (.12)	.23 (.10*)	.15 (.11)	41 (13)	ns (ns)
CAS				.80 (.78)	.90 (.89)	.34 (.21)	28 (19)
CSV					.47 (.41)	.27 (.16)	32 (25)
ATSCI						.31 (.19)	19 (10*)
HA							60 (47)

*Table 5.* Intercorrelations of the RSMS and CAS total and subscales for sample 1 (S1; N = 741, 119 males, 622 females) and sample 2 (S2; N = 553, 165 males, 388 females)

\* Correlation significant at p < .05 (all other correlations significant at p < .01). ns – nonsignificant. RSMS – Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; AMSP – Ability to Modify Self-Presentation; SEBO – Sensitivity to the Expressive Behavior of Others; CAS – Concern for Appropriateness Scale CSV – Cross-nSituational Variability; ATSCI – Attention to Social Comparison Information; HA – TPQ Harm Avoidance; SES – Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

To test our hypothesis that loadings of certain items onto both the CSV and the ATSCI explained the inferior fit of the CAS, we ran exploratory factor analyses (Kaiser's normalized varimax rotation) for the CAS and the RSMS separately. In these analyses, a two-factor solution appeared appropriate both for the RSMS and for the CAS, based on the relative slopes of the scree plots and the interpretability of the resultant factor solutions. Results are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Varimax solutions are shown, although promax solutions produced the identical factor structure in all analyses. The two derived subscales are identical to those consistently identified in published research on the original English scales. As hypothesized, only Item 3 of the RSMS but eight items of the CAS (4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 18) loaded above 0.30 onto both subscales, providing a probable explanation for the inferior fit of our data to the CAS and the relatively low fit of the four-factor model. Subscale means were consistent with those in previous research (Wolfe et al., 1995). Internal consistencies were adequate and similar to those reported for the English versions, with Cronbach's as for the CAS toward the top of this range.

## Intercorrelations Between Scale Totals and Subscales, Harm Avoidance and Self-Esteem

Intercorrelations between the RSMS and CAS totals and subscales, TPQ Harm Avoidance and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale are shown in Table 5. As predicted, the CAS correlated positively with harm avoidance and negatively with self-esteem, and the RSMS in the opposite direction. The CAS and RSMS correlated positively and significantly (.37 in Sample 1, .28 in Sample 2, p < .01). The correlations of the CAS and RSMS subscales with their respective total scales were (evidently) highest, followed by the (negative) correlation between harm avoidance and self-esteem (-.60 for Sample 1, -.47 for Sample 2, p < .01). The moderate correlation between the SEBO and the ATSCI was unexpected (.32 for Sample 1, .25 for Sample 2, p < .01).

## Discussion

Our analyses of the Hebrew translation of Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) RSMS and CAS replicated most of the psychometric features established for the original questionnaires in English. Based on CFAs, we found support for the conceptual division of Snyder's original SMS (Snyder, 1974) into two scales assessing self-monitoring and concern for appropriateness. We also found support for the factor structures of these scales, with two subscales measuring passive and active social adaptation comprising each scale. In two samples, each with over 500 individuals, our data showed a good fit to the factor structure of the RSMS, but not of the CAS. The reason for this appears to be that although each CAS item loaded first and foremost onto the subscale to which it was found to belong in the English version of the questionnaire, eight items also loaded above 0.30 onto the other subscale, blurring the distinctness of the subscales.

RSMS Item 12 lowered the reliability of the RSMS and the AMSP. O'Cass (2000) also dropped this item from the RSMS because of poor reliability, so our finding does not appear to be sample or culture specific. Future research should help to decide the fate of this item. We found low loadings for CAS Item 20, as did Cutler and Wolfe (1985). Other loadings were acceptable and internal consistencies compared extremely favorably with those of the original scales.

We found the RSMS and the CAS to be correlated (0.37 in Sample 1, 0.28 in Sample 2). This supports Slama and Celuch (1995), who found a correlation of 0.28 (p < .01), and casts further doubt on the orthogonality of the scales. They do, however, appear to be distinct and to assess different sources of social competence, as concluded by Miller et al. (1991). A single-factor model proved extremely inadequate. We found the scales to correlate oppositely with harm avoidance and self-esteem, confirming a link between self-monitoring and psychological health and between concern for appropriateness and negative personality characteristics. Two limitations of our study were the low

number of male versus female participants and the lack of randomization of the order of questionnaires.

The current study provides evidence that the Hebrew translation of the RSMS has good psychometric properties and is fit to be used in research. The Hebrew version of the CAS is also acceptable, although many of its items tend to load onto both subscales. Perhaps this is an indication that in Israeli culture the distinction between the active and passive components within the protective selfpresentation style is less clear than in more Western cultures. It is our hope that these questionnaires, available on request from the corresponding author, will be applied in Israel, helping to replicate and extend the rich findings they have so far yielded internationally in social psychology, marketing, employment, business, and personality research.

#### Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities (RPE). We thank Professor Ray Wolfe for permission to translate the CAS and RSMS into Hebrew.

## References

- Anderson, L. (1991). Test-retest reliability of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale over a 2-year period. *Psychological Reports*, 68, 1057–1058.
- Arkin, R.M. (1981). Self-presentation styles. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bachner-Melman, R., Zohar, A.H., Bacon-Shnoor, N., Elizur, Y., Nemanov, L., Gritsenko, I. et al. (2005). Link between vasopressin receptor AVPR1A promoter region microsatellites and measures of social behavior in humans. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 26, 2–10.
- Bearden, W., & Rose, R. (1990). Attention to social comparison information: An individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 473–481.
- Beaton, D.E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M.B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25, 3186–3191.
- Bentler, P.M. (1992). *EQS structural equations program manual*. Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.
- Boomsma, A. (2000). Reporting analysis of covariance structures. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 7, 461–482.
- Celuch, K., & Slama, M. (1995). "Getting along" and "getting ahead" as motives for self-presentation: Their impact on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 1700–1713.
- Celuch, K., Slama, M., & Schaffenacker, S. (1997). Concern for appropriateness and ad context effects. *Psychology and Marketing*, 14(1), 19–28.
- Cloninger, C.R. (1987). A systematic method for clinical descrip-

European Journal of Psychological Assessment 2009; Vol. 25(1):8-15

tion and classification of personality variants. Archives of General Psychiatry, 44, 573–588.

- Cutler, B.L., & Wolfe, R.N. (1985). Construct validity of the Concern for Appropriateness Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 318–323.
- Day, D.V., Schleicher, D.J., Unckless, A.L., & Hiller, N.J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 87, 390–401.
- Ellis, R. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14*, 681–693.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1–55.
- Johnson, M.A. (1984). Self-monitoring: Reliability of the Concern for Appropriateness Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Saint Joseph, MO.
- Johnson, M.A. (1989). Concern for appropriateness scale and behavioral conformity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53, 567–574.
- Kuo, P.-H., Chien, Y.-C., Soong, W.-T., Yang, H.-J., & Chen, W.J. (2004). Assessing personality features and their relations with behavioral problems in adolescents: Tridimensional Personality Questionnaire and Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 45(1), 20–28.
- Lennox, R.D. (1988). The problem with self-monitoring: A twosided scale and a one-sided theory. *Journal of Personality As*sessment, 52, 58–73.
- Lennox, R.D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1349–1364.
- Miller, M.L., Omens, R.S., & Delvadia, R. (1991). Dimensions of social competence: Personality and coping style correlates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 955–964.
- Netemeyer, R., Bearden, W., & Teel, J. (1992). Consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and attributional sensitivity. *Psychology and Marketing*, 9, 379–394.
- O'Cass, A. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of a revised version of the Lennox and Wolfe revised self-monitoring scale. *Psychology and Marketing*, *17*, 379–419.
- Raykov, T., Tomer, A., & Nesselroade, J.R. (1991). Reporting structural equation modeling results in psychology and aging: Some proposed guidelines. *Psychology and Aging*, 6, 499–503.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shapira, B., Zislin, J., Gelfin, Y., Osher, Y., Gorfine, M., Souery, D. et al. (1999). Social adjustment and self-esteem in remitted patients with unipolar and bipolar affective disorder: A case-control study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 40(1), 24–30.
- Silbert, E., & Tippett, J. (1965). Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. *Psychological Reports*, 16, 1017–1071.
- Slama, M., & Celuch, K. (1995). Self-presentation and consumer interaction styles. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 10(1), 19–30.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526–537.

- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: Freeman.
- Wolfe, R., Wesley, J., Macelova, L., Hudiburg, R., Ahrens, P., Bates, L. et al. (1995). Women's use of cosmetics: A motivational analysis. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Geneseo.
- Zohar, A.H., Lev-Ari, L., Benjamin, J., Ebstein, R., Lichtenberg, P., & Osher, Y. (2001). The psychometric properties of the Hebrew version of Cloninger's TPQ. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 118–128.

Rachel Bachner-Melman

Psychology Hebrew University of Jerusalem Mount Scopus Jerusalem 91905 Israel Tel. +972 2 5636828 E-mail msrbach@mscc.huji.ac.il