Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement

0008-400X/14/$12.00 DOI: 10.1037/a0033107

Appraising the Duality of Self-Monitoring: Psychometric Qualities of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale and the Concern for Appropriateness Scale in French

Nils Myszkowski, Martin Storme, Franck Zenasni, and Todd Lubart
Université Paris Descartes

Revising Snyder's (1974) original Self-Monitoring Scale, Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) double-sided approach distinguishes two aspects of self-monitoring: (a) the active, high self-esteem, and extrovert side, measured by the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS); and (b) the protective, low self-esteem and anxious side, measured by the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS). This study aims at moving forward the assessment of self-monitoring by providing a valid French translation of these two scales. Six hundred and 34 participants were asked to complete the RSMS and the CAS, as well as other measures to assess construct validity. Distribution, scale score reliability, temporal stability, and factor structure were examined. Using a split-sample procedure, construct validity was also investigated, using several criteria (self-esteem, social desirability, extraversion, openness, trait anxiety, self-consciousness, gregariousness, straightforwardness), including new criteria that provide a more accurate definition of the two underlying constructs. The French RSMS and the French CAS replicate the psychometric properties of the other versions (Bachner-Melman, Bacon-Shnoor, Zohar, Elizur, & Ebstein, 2009; O'Cass, 2000) and appear to be psychometrically robust. Strengths, weaknesses, and potential uses of both scales are discussed.

Keywords: self-monitoring, self-presentation, concern for appropriateness, self-regulation, personality

According to Goffman (1959), one's self-presentation has two functions: promoting the management of interpersonal relations and protecting self-esteem. *Self-monitoring* (Snyder, 1974) can be defined as the way one attempts to present oneself in a socially appropriate manner, for impression management purposes. Snyder's theory likens high self-monitors to "social chameleons" and regards them as actors: They are able to regulate their actions and behaviors to fit the social setting, and present the tendency to do so. On the opposite extreme, low self-monitors do not tend to show any concern for what the social situation implies and have the tendency to behave authentically in social interactions. The first scale that measures such individual differences was developed by Snyder (1974). This unidimensional 25-item scale aimed to evaluate the ability and the tendency to adapt one's self-presentation depending on various social setting demands (e.g., "Even if I'm not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time"). Later, Gangestad and Snyder (1985) developed a shortened 18-item version of the questionnaire. However, the construct validity of Snyder's Self-Monitoring Scale is controversial, as empirical studies questioned its unidimensionality (Day, Shleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002; Lennox, 1988; Lennox & Wolfe, 1984).

In view of this arguable unidimensionality, Lennox and Wolfe (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Wolfe, Lennox, & Cutler, 1986) suggested dividing the original Self-Monitoring Scale into two self-report measures to take into account two different kinds of self-presentation. Thus, *self-monitoring* (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Wolfe et al., 1986), as measured by the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS), is defined as the ability to alter one's own behavior depending on what the social setting calls for (e.g., "I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them"), in order to gain social status and power ("getting ahead"). The RSMS is actually quite close to Snyder's original definition of high self-monitors as social chameleons. In contrast, *concern for appropriateness* (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Wolfe et al., 1986), measured by the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS), is defined as the tendency of "getting along" and adjusting one's behavior to acquire social approval and acceptance (e.g., "The slightest look of disapproval in the eyes of a person with whom I am interacting is enough to make me change my approach").

Though originally inspired by exploratory factor analysis of empirical data, the construction of such a dichotomous model can be seen as a data-driven echo of several connected theories, in which the opposition between the RSMS and the CAS can be recognized—the model of positive-reinforcement avoidance motivation (Cunningham, Steinberg, & Grev, 1980); the theory of protective versus acquisitive self-presentation styles (Arkin, 1981); and the model of primary (i.e., acting to influence realities to gain

Nils Myszkowski, Martin Storme, Franck Zenasni, and Todd Lubart, Laboratoire Adaptations Travail Individu, Université Paris Descartes, Boulogne-Billancourt, France.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Nils Myszkowski, Laboratoire Adaptations Travail Individu, EA4469, Université Paris Descartes, 71 Avenue Edouard Vaillant, 92100 Boulogne-Billancourt, France. E-mail: nilsmyszkowski@yahoo.fr

control) versus secondary control (i.e., aligning to realities to control their impact over the self; Weisz, Rothbaum, & Blackburn, 1984). Thus, not only is appraising self-monitoring as a two-sided construct empirically appropriate, it is also theoretically relevant.

The RSMS is a 13-item scale, comprising two subscales that measure two aspects of active self-presentation modification ability: Sensitivity to Expressive Behaviours of Others (SEBO; six items) and Ability to Modify Self-Presentation (AMSP; seven items). The CAS is a 20-item scale, also divided into two subscales, which measure two traits of protective disapproval-avoidant self-presentation inclination: Attention to Social Comparison Information (ATSCI; 13 items) and Cross-Situational Variability (CSV; 7 items) (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Both the RSMS and the CAS have theoretical bidimensional structures, with two correlated factors. Confirming Lennox and Wolfe's approach of self-presentation, Day et al.'s meta-analysis (2002) showed that the RSMS and CAS were frequently found to be orthogonal and had better reliability than both the original 25-item Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) and the short 18-item version (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985). The RSMS has been translated in Japanese (Ishihara & Mizuno, 1992), Greek (Malikiosi-Loizos & Anderson, 1992), and Hebrew (Bachner-Melman, Bacon-Shnoor, Zohar, Elizur, & Ebstein, 2009). The translations of the RSMS and the CAS have shown satisfactory psychometric properties, providing useful tools for researchers in various countries.

Cronbach's alphas for the original RSMS ranged from .75 (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) to .87 (O'Cass, 2000), and an average alpha of .81 was recently estimated in Day et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis. Concerning the two subscales, the scale score reliability of the original AMSP is around .77 and the original SEBO is around .70 (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; O'Cass, 2000). The original RSMS has shown good construct validity (Day et al., 2002) and test–retest reliability (Anderson, 1991). Cronbach's alpha for the original CAS is approximately .80 (Bachner-Melman et al., 2009). For the two subscales, the scale score reliability of the original ATSCI and CSV were .80 and .78, respectively (Bachner-Melman et al., 2009). The CAS has shown good construct validity (Cutler & Wolfe, 1985) and test–retest reliability (Johnson, 1984).

Although Gangestad and Snyder's version of the Self-Monitoring Scale (Gangestad & Snyder, 1985) has a psychometrically robust French translation (Gana & Brechenmacher, 2001), it appeared that the bidimensionality of the construct of self-monitoring, as argued by Lennox and Wolfe (1984), might be relevant and complementary to the translation of the original SMS. As the RSMS and the CAS have been useful in various fields of research, including leadership (Day et al., 2002; Ellis, 1988), consumer behaviors (Bearden & Rose, 1990), risk behaviors (Bearden, Rose, & Teel, 1994), social influence (Johnson, 1989), and job performance (Day et al., 2002), this study aimed to provide a French translation of these two scales. Of particular interest was the distribution of scores, temporal stability, scale score reliability, factor structure, and construct validity of these instruments. Using several personality measures, this study also aimed to locate the constructs measured by the RSMS and the CAS among other conative and affective constructs.

Previous research (e.g., Bachner-Melman et al., 2009; Miller, Omens, & Delvadia, 1991) suggests that self-esteem is positively correlated with self-monitoring and negatively correlated with concern for appropriateness; thus, similar results were expected in this study. Moreover, Miller et al. (1991) have found that self-monitoring was positively correlated with private self-consciousness, whereas concern for appropriateness was positively correlated with public self-consciousness. Therefore, comparable results were anticipated in the present study. As the self-consciousness facet of neuroticism was found to be positively correlated with concern for own adequacy (Costa & McCrae, 1995), it was hypothesized to be positively correlated with concern for appropriateness. In addition, as social anxiety was proposed to be related to defensive self-presentation strategies (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Schlenker & Leary, 1982; Trower & Gilbert, 1989; Walters & Hope, 1998), concern for appropriateness was hypothesized to be positively correlated with social anxiety. An earlier framework (Tournois, Mesnil, & Kop, 2000) has shown that there is a moderate positive correlation between the tendency to present oneself in a socially desirable manner and self-monitoring, suggesting that—although linked—social desirability and self-monitoring are different constructs. Thus, self-monitoring was hypothesized to be positively correlated with social desirability. Furthermore, as the RSMS has been found to be positively correlated with extraversion (Miller et al., 1991), its French translation was hypothesized to be positively correlated with gregariousness and extraversion. Moreover, Costa, McCrae, and Dye (1991) proposed that straightforwardness is a feature of low self-monitors; thus, it was hypothesized that self-monitoring correlates negatively with straightforwardness. Finally, as concern for appropriateness was found to be positively correlated with fear of negative evaluation (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984), concern for appropriateness was hypothesized to be positively correlated with trait anxiety.

To investigate the construct validity of the French RSMS and CAS, we used the French Revised Self-Consciousness Scale (Pelletier & Vallerand, 1990; Scheier & Carver, 1985), French Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; Vallières & Vallerand, 1990), the Social Desirability scale (DS-36; Tournois et al., 2000), the French State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Gauthier & Bouchard, 1993; Spielberger, 1983) in its trait form, the French Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999; Plaisant, Srivastava, Mendelsohn, Debray, & John, 2005), and some specific facets from the French NEO-Personality Inventory—Revised (NEO-PI–R scale (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Rolland, 1993).

Method

Participants

The translated RSMS and CAS questionnaires were completed by 634 participants (478 females, 156 males). The age of the respondents ranged between 17 and 52 ($M = 20.3$; $SD = 2.80$). All participants were French first-year university students from Paris, who responded to the RSMS and the CAS, along with various convergent validity questionnaires. The administration was supervised by research psychologists, with guaranteed confidentiality.

Materials

The French RSMS and the CAS. We translated the two American-English scales into French using a back-translation methodology. First, the questionnaire was translated from English into French and this version was translated from French into

English. Then, this version was compared to the original RSMS and CAS. To maintain the semantic and conceptual correspondence of the two versions, the RSMS and the CAS were translated from English to French by a psychologist with both English and French mother tongues. The items were then back-translated by another bilingual psychologist. Afterward, both resolved the dissimilarities that had appeared and settled on the final translation. The French translations of the RSMS and the CAS are reported in the Appendix.

The French version of the RSMS is a 13-item self-report questionnaire, divided into two subscales: The 6-item Sensitivity to Expressive Behaviours of Others subscale (Items 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11), and the 7-item Ability to Modify Self-Presentation subscale (Items 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13; Items 9 and 12 are reversed). The French version of the CAS is a 20-item self-report questionnaire, divided into two subscales: the 13-item ATSCI subscale (Items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20; Item 20 is reversed) and the 7-item CSV subscale (Items 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19). The participants respond the two questionnaires using a 6-point Likert scale from 0 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*). The scores of the RSMS and the CAS theoretically range from 0 to 65 and from 0 to 100, respectively.

The Revised Self-Consciousness Scale (Pelletier & Vallerand, 1990; Scheier & Carver, 1985). This 22-item scale measures private and public aspects of self-consciousness. It is divided into two subscales: (a) private self-consciousness (i.e., the tendency to pay attention to personal and intimate aspects of one's self such as beliefs, desires, and emotions); and (b) public self-consciousness (i.e., the tendency to pay attention to self-aspects that are more likely to be noticed by other people such as physical appearance and social behaviour). The French translation of the RSCS has shown good psychometric properties. The participants respond using a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*not like me at all*) to 4 (*a lot like me*). The scores of private self-consciousness, public self-consciousness and social anxiety theoretically range from 9 to 36, from 7 to 28, and from 6 to 24, respectively.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; Vallières & Vallerand, 1990). This 10-item unidimensional scale measures the value one attributes to oneself. The French translation has shown satisfactory psychometric properties. The participants respond using a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 4 (*totally agree*). The scores theoretically range from 10 to 40.

The DS-36 (Tournois et al., 2000). This 36-item scale is designed to measure *social desirability*, which is defined as the tendency to present oneself in a socially desirable way. It is divided into two 18-item subscales (a self-deception subscale and an other-deception subscale) and has shown good psychometric properties. The participants respond using a 7-point Likert scale where only the first and the last response options are labelled *totally false* and *totally true*, respectively. The scores of each subscale theoretically range from 18 to 126.

The State–Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-Y; Gauthier & Bouchard, 1993; Spielberger, 1983). This 20-item scale is the most widely used questionnaire for measuring anxiety. The French-Canadian translation of the STAI-Y, which has shown good psychometric properties, was used in this study in its trait form. The participants respond using a 4-point Likert scale (1: *almost never*; 2: *sometimes*; 3: *often*; 4: *almost always*). The scores theoretically range from 20 to 80.

The Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999; Plaisant, Courtois, Réveillère, Mendelsohn, & John, 2010; Plaisant et al., 2005). The French translation of this scale is a 45-item measure of the Big Five factors (extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience). It has proven to be a good compromise between brevity and psychometric robustness. The participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale (1: *disagree strongly*; 2: *disagree a little*; 3: *neither agree nor disagree*; 4: *agree a little*; 5: *agree strongly*). The scores of extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness theoretically range from 8 to 40, from 10 to 50, from 9 to 45, from 8 to 40 and from 10 to 50, respectively.

The NEO-PI–R (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Rolland, 1993). This inventory, which has shown satisfactory psychometric qualities, is a well-researched self-report questionnaire designed to measure the Big Five dimensions and their facets. In this study, the NEO-PI–R was not used to measure the Big Five dimensions, but to explore specific facets. Three out of its thirty 8-item subscales were extracted and used in this study: Gregariousness (E2), Straightforwardness (A2) and Self-Consciousness (N4). The participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale (1: *disagree strongly*; 2: *disagree*; 3: *neither agree nor disagree*; 4: *agree*; 5: *agree strongly*). The scores of each subscale theoretically range from 8 to 40.

Procedure

All the participants were recruited at the university and rewarded with credit course points. As we used many different validity criteria that had different Likert scales, it was decided to shorten the duration of administration for participants, so that they would remain fully concentrated, motivated and alert. To do so, participants were randomly divided into four groups. The RSMS and the CAS were administrated to each group, but the groups had to complete different validity criteria. Each group completed approximately the same total number of items. In the first group (n = 157), participants were asked to answer the Revised Self-Consciousness Scale and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. In the second group (n = 131), participants were asked to complete the DS-36. In the third group (n = 133), participants were asked to respond to the Big Five Inventory. In the fourth group (n = 129), respondents were requested to complete the STAI-Y in its trait form and three NEO-PI–R subscales: Straightforwardness (A2), Gregariousness (E2), and Self-Consciousness (N4). Finally, 84 participants had complete RSMS and CAS data but incomplete validation data. Consequently, they were excluded from construct validity analyses. The order in which the different questionnaires were completed was randomized.

Temporal stability was also studied among a random subsample (n = 117), with a second session 1 week after the first questionnaires were completed.

Data Analysis

Item and score distributions, scale score reliability, temporal stability, and correlations between the instruments were analyzed. Confirmatory factor analyses using Amos 18 were conducted to study the factor structure of the RSMS and the CAS. The model

that was tested for the RSMS was a model with two correlated factors (SEBO and AMSP), and the model that was tested for the CAS was a model with two correlated factors (ATSCI and CSV). Concerning both the RSMS and the CAS, the fit of the theoretical model was also compared with the fit of a unidimensional model and with the fit of a model with two independent factors. Concerning the CAS, as some items had similar wordings (see the Appendix), the tested models allowed for correlations within four specific pairs of item errors: Items 3 and 18 both focus on fashion-following tendencies in dressing habits; Items 5 and 14 both focus on integrating oneself in a group; Items 6 and 17 both focus on the extent to which one tends to look for cues when not certain how to act in a social environment; finally, Items 7 and 19 both focus on the feeling of not being known by others. Modification indices were examined for both the RSMS and the CAS. As they did not suggest changes that would critically increase the fit, the models were not further modified.

Various fit indices are reported for each confirmatory factor analyses. The cut-off values for acceptable model fit used in this study were above .90 for the goodness-of-fit index (Byrne, 1994), above .93 for the comparative fit index (Byrne, 1994), under .08 for the standardized root mean square residual (Hu & Bentler, 1999), under .07 for the root mean square error of approximation (Steiger, 2007) and under 5 for the χ^2/df ratio (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010). Finally, the comparison between the theoretical models and the alternate models was based on the minimum Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) procedure (Akaike, 1978), as recommended by Burnham and Anderson (2004). According to this procedure, the preferred model should have the lowest AIC.

Results

Distribution Analyses

Distribution analyses showed that the scores of all the items for both the RSMS and the CAS were approximately normally distributed. The skewness of all items ranged between −0.53 and 0.11 for the RSMS and between −0.69 and 0.25 for the CAS. The kurtosis of the items ranged between −0.60 and 0.49 for the RSMS and between −0.75 and 0.57 for the CAS. Concerning the RSMS and CAS scores, distribution analyses showed approximately normal distributions, with standard deviation values of respectively 8.0 and 11.5, skewness values of respectively −0.09 and −0.21, and kurtosis values of respectively 0.36 and 0.27. Means, standard deviations, medians, minimums, and maximums for all scales are reported in Table 1.

Age was not found to be significantly correlated with either the RSMS ($r = .03$; $p = .42$) or the CAS ($r = .01$; $p = .80$) scores. No statistically significant gender differences were observed: RSMS, $t(632) = -.32$, $p = .74$; CAS, $t(632) = -1.42$, $p = .15$.

Scale Score Reliability

Both scales showed good scale score reliability, as the Cronbach's alpha for the RSMS was .82 (95% CI [.80, .84]) and the Cronbach's alpha for the CAS was .81 (95% CI [.79, .83]). Concerning the subscales of the RSMS and the CAS, Cronbach's alpha were .77 (95% CI [.74, .80]) for the AMSP, .82 for the SEBO (95% CI [.80, .84]), .79 for the ATSCI (95% CI [.77, .81]) and .80 for the CSV (95% CI [.78, .82]).

As Bachner-Melman et al. (2009) and O'Cass (2000) noted, Item 12 of the RSMS was questionable, as it lowered the Cronbach's alphas of both the AMSP (.77 with vs. .80 without) and the RSMS (.82 with vs. .83 without). Even though the presence of this item remains debatable, it was kept because (a) the AMSP was composed of only seven items; (b) the item's impact on the psychometric qualities of the RSMS was not critical in our translation; and (c) keeping Item 12 allowed future comparisons between French scores and other international scores (which are calculated including Item 12).

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Scale/subscale	*M*	*SD*	Median	Minimum	Maximum
RSMS/Revised Self-Monitoring Scale	38.7	8.0	38	12	61
AMSP/Ability to Modify Self-Presentation	19.6	5.2	19	4	35
SEBO/Sensitivity to Expressive Behavior of Others	19.2	4.6	19	2	30
CAS/Concern for Appropriateness Scale	49.6	11.5	51	13	82
CSV/Cross-Situational Variability	18.2	6.0	18	0	35
ATSCI/Attention to Social Comparison Information	31.4	8.3	32	5	55
Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	29.2	5.3	29	17	40
Revised Self Consciousness Scale/Private	26.8	4.4	27	15	35
Revised Self Consciousness Scale/Public	20.2	4.2	21	7	28
Self-Consciousness Scale/Social Anxiety	16.2	4.1	16	6	24
Big Five Index/Extraversion	25.3	6.3	25	11	39
Big Five Index/Agreeableness	37.6	5.3	38	23	50
Big Five Index/Conscientiousness	28.5	5.5	28	14	44
Big Five Index/Neuroticism	25.3	6.1	26	10	40
Big Five Index/Openness to experience	36.5	5.3	37	21	49
DS36/Self-Deception	67.6	15.2	66	31	103
DS36/Other-Deception	72.7	14.5	72	33	108
NEOPI-R/N4 Self-Consciousness	22.2	4.2	23	11	31
NEOPI-R/E2 Gregariousness	30.4	4.1	30	21	40
NEOPI-R/A2 Straightforwardness	27.3	5.4	27	14	38
STAI/Trait Anxiety	47.4	8.8	47	30	70

Test–Retest Reliability

Test–retest correlation coefficients and average measure Intraclass Correlation Coefficients (ICC [2,k]) were computed for each scale and subscale. The RSMS ($r = .85$; ICC = .53), the CAS ($r = .82$; ICC = .49), AMSP ($r = .86$; ICC = .61), SEBO ($r = .80$; ICC = .59), ATSCI ($r = .84$; ICC = .53), and CSV ($r = .81$; ICC = .66) showed acceptable temporal stability (Landis & Koch, 1977).

Factor Structure

The fit indices of all the models that were tested are reported in Table 2. The observed fit indices suggest that the theoretical model of the RSMS has an acceptable fit. However, the fit of the theoretical model of the CAS was borderline acceptable.

For both the RSMS and the CAS, according to the minimal AIC procedure (Akaike, 1978; Burnham & Anderson, 2004), the theoretical two correlated factors models had a better fit than the alternate models. This result supports the theoretical models and the use of both total scale scores and subscale scores. The factor loadings of the items for the SEBO and the AMSP ranged from .57 to .75 and from .27 to .72, respectively. The factor loadings of the items for the ATSCI and the CSV ranged from .33 to .65 and from .36 to .69, respectively.

Construct Validity

Several criteria were used to examine the construct validity of the RSMS and the CAS (see Table 3). First, as expected, the RSMS and the CAS were weakly correlated ($r = .18$; $p < .01$), which argues for Lennox and Wolfe's double-sided approach of self-monitoring. Moreover, the RSMS was found to be positively and moderately correlated with extraversion, public self consciousness, self-deception, openness, and gregariousness, while being negatively and moderately correlated with straightforwardness and neuroticism. These results confirm our hypotheses and suggest that the RSMS measures an active, high self-esteem and extrovert side of self-monitoring, which is consistent with Lennox and Wolfe's (1984) definition of self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974; Wolfe et al., 1986).

In addition, the CAS was found to be positively and moderately correlated with trait anxiety, social anxiety, and the self-consciousness facet of neuroticism. Moreover, the CAS was negatively and moderately correlated with self-esteem, other-deception, and self-deception. These results confirm our hypotheses and suggest that the CAS measures a more defensive, uncomfortable and anxious side of self-monitoring, which is consistent with the definition of concern for appropriateness (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Wolfe et al., 1986).

Discussion

The psychometric properties of RSMS and CAS (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984) were replicated with this French translation. It has been shown that both the RSMS and the CAS have good temporal stability, scale score reliability, and construct validity. Moreover, Lennox and Wolfe's addition to Snyder's (1974) concept of self-monitoring is reinforced, as the distinction between active and protective self-monitoring is observed in the correlations between the RSMS, the CAS, and other scales.

Structural validity appeared satisfactory, even though, similar to previous results (Bachner-Melman et al., 2009), support for the dimensionality of the CAS was weaker. Earlier framework (Bachner-Melman et al., 2009) suggested that this poorer fit could indicate a blurred distinctness of the subscales of the CAS, as noted before, which can be enlightened by the fact that the subscales of the CAS (ATSCI and CSV) measure personality traits and behavioral tendencies that are closely related, whereas the subscales of the RSMS measure social abilities (Ability to Modify Self-Presentation and Sensitivity to Expressive Behaviours of Others), which are easier to distinguish for participants and, thus, easier to operationalize in a questionnaire. Such an explanation was not supported in this study, as the correlations found between the ATSCI and CSV and between the AMSP and SEBO were similar. More generally, the fit indices that were observed for the theoretical models in this study are comparable with other translations (notably Bachner-Melman et al., 2009). However, as in other languages, more research has to be done to improve the structural validity of the CAS.

This research has limitations. First, the representativeness of the sample is questionable, as it is mostly composed of young adult female participants. Second, the 1-week interval used to assess test–retest reliability can be considered too short to assess stability over time. Third, as all instruments were self-report, correlations may have been overestimated because of shared method variance. Fourth, the correlation between each construct used as a convergent validity criterion was measured using one questionnaire. Thus, the results of the construct validity analysis may have been prone to mono-method bias. Fifth, the correlation between self-monitoring and the self-consciousness facet of neuroticism is inconsistent with the correlation between self-monitoring and the Revised Self-Consciousness Scale.

Table 2
Fit Indices of the RSMS and The CAS

Scale (model)	χ^2	*df*	χ^2/df	GFI	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA	AIC
RSMS (2 correlated factors theoretical model)	200.7	64	3.135	.953	.942	.055	.058	254.7
RSMS (2 independant factors model)	294.9	65	4.536	.936	.902	.131	.075	346.9
RSMS (1 factor model)	824.8	65	12.690	.751	.678	.111	.136	876.8
CAS (2 correlated factors theoretical model)	586.1	165	3.552	.914	.871	.063	.063	679.2
CAS (2 independant factors model)	659.0	166	3.970	.906	.849	.094	.068	747.0
CAS (1 factor model)	1106.8	166	6.668	.801	.711	.100	.095	1194.8

Note. GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; AIC = Akaike Information Criterion; RSMS = Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; CAS = Concern for Appropriateness Scale.

Table 3
Correlation Coefficients Between The RSMS, The CAS, The Subscales and The Criteria

	n	RSMS	AMSP	SEBO	CAS	CSV	ATSCI
RSMS/Revised Self-Monitoring Scale	634	/	/	/	/	/	/
AMSP/Ability to Modify Self-Presentation	634	.84**	/	/	/	/	/
SEBO/Sensitivity to Expressive Behavior of Others	634	.79**	.34**	/	/	/	/
CAS/Concern for Appropriateness Scale	634	.18**	.19**	.10*	/	/	/
CSV/Cross-Situational Variability	634	.21**	.20**	.14**	.72**	/	/
ATSCI/Attention to Social Comparison Information	634	.10*	.12**	.04	.86**	.26**	/
Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale	157	.08	.15	−.02	−.24**	−.35**	−.06
Revised Self Consciousness Scale/Private	157	.29**	.18*	.29**	.24**	.24**	.14
Revised Self Consciousness Scale/Public	157	.39**	.25**	.39**	.42**	.07	.52**
Self-Consciousness Scale/Social Anxiety	157	−.09	−.19*	.05	.21**	.21**	.12
Big Five Index/Extraversion	133	.40**	.45**	.20*	−.07	−.04	−.08
Big Five Index/Agreeableness	133	.00	−.05	.07	−.13	−.25**	−.01
Big Five Index/Conscientiousness	133	.09	.06	.08	−.14	−.09	−.13
Big Five Index/Neuroticism	133	−.26**	−.28**	−.13	.03	.17*	−.08
Big Five Index/Openness to experience	133	.21*	.10	.27**	−.13	.00	−.18*
DS36/Self-Deception	131	.22*	.27**	.06	−.19*	−.19*	−.11
DS36/Other-Deception	131	.15	.08	.16	−.21*	−.19*	−.14
NEOPI-R/N4 Self-Consciousness	129	−.23**	−.30**	−.07	.46**	.17	.48**
NEOPI-R/E2 Gregariousness	129	.20*	.24**	.08	.02	−.29**	.22*
NEOPI-R/A2 Straightforwardness	129	−.34**	−.39**	−.17	−.09	−.28**	.07
STAI/Trait Anxiety	129	−.16	−.23**	−.03	.42**	.28**	.35**

Note. RSMS = Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; AMSP = Ability to Modify Self-Presentation; SEBO = Sensitivity to Expressive Behavior of Others; CAS = Concern for Appropriateness Scale; CSV = Cross-Situational Variability; ATSCI = Attention to Social Comparison Information.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The complex relationships between self-monitoring and self-consciousness should be investigated in further studies. Finally, the results of this study do not provide clear recommendations about whether to keep or discard Item 12.

As a weak correlation was observed between the RSMS and the CAS, it appears that Lennox and Wolfe's two-sided approach to self-monitoring (Lennox, 1988; Lennox & Wolfe, 1984; Wolfe et al., 1986) is relevant to fully appraise the nature of this construct. The dimension of self-monitoring that is measured by the RSMS truly corresponds to Snyder's (1974) view of this construct. It refers to the positive, active, extrovert, open, gregarious, and easy side of self-monitoring. Oppositely, the dimension of self-monitoring, which is measured by the CAS, is the negative, reactive, protective, anxious, low self-esteem, and apprehensive side of self-monitoring.

In line with our expectations and the "social chameleon" definition of self-monitoring (Snyder, 1974), self-monitoring was positively correlated with extraversion and gregariousness. In addition, as hypothesized, concern for appropriateness was negatively correlated with self-esteem, whereas the expected correlation between self-esteem and self-monitoring failed to be significant, suggesting that the RSMS measures a self-reported ability that may not essentially be a trait of high self-esteem individuals. As predicted, private self-consciousness was positively correlated with self-monitoring, whereas public self-consciousness and the self-consciousness facet of neuroticism were correlated with concern for appropriateness, suggesting that this facet of neuroticism is characterized by one's concern for fitting the social environment. Moreover, as hypothesized, social desirability, especially self-deception, was positively correlated with self-monitoring, whereas social desirability was unexpectedly negatively correlated with concern for appropriateness. This result suggests that self-deception, other-deception, and self-monitoring are active self-presentation strategies, whereas concern for appropriateness results from protecting oneself from the environment.

In line with the expectations of Costa et al. (1991), straightforwardness was negatively correlated with self-monitoring, whereas it was not correlated with concern for appropriateness. As straightforwardness is characterized by calculative and non-guileful behaviors (Costa et al., 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1995), the results suggests that high self-monitors are characterized by deceitful and manipulative behavior. Finally, the results suggest that social anxiety and concern for appropriateness are not two overlapping constructs, as their measures were only weakly correlated. However, further research involving other social anxiety measures (e.g., Heeren et al., 2012; Yao et al., 1999) is needed to better investigate the relationship between the two constructs.

This study moves forward the assessment of self-monitoring by providing measuring tools, which did not previously exist in French, to operationalize the two sides of self-monitoring. Like the original versions of the RSMS and the CAS (Bearden et al., 1994; Bearden & Rose, 1990; Day et al., 2002; Ellis, 1988; Johnson, 1989; Netemeyer, Bearden, & Teel, 1992), the French translation of these scales could be valuable in the numerous fields of research that focus on conformist behaviors, including social psychology, consumer psychology, and creativity, and in every field of research where "getting along" and "getting ahead" should be considered as two different psychological ways of self-monitoring.

Résumé

Dans le cadre d'un examen de la Self-Monitoring Scale de Snyder (1974), l'approche bidimensionnelle de Lennox et Wolfe (1984) a permis d'établir deux aspects du monitorage de soi : a) le monitorage de type actif, extraverti, avec une estime de soi élevée, mesuré par la Revised Self-Monitory Scale (Échelle révisée de monitorage de soi; RSMS); b) le monitorage de type protecteur,

reflétant une tendance à l'anxiété sociale et à la timidité, mesuré par la Concern for Appropriateness Scale (Échelle d'inquiétude pour les convenances; CAS). La présente étude vise à faire avancer l'évaluation du monitorage de soi en proposant une traduction en français de ces deux échelles. Six cent trente-quatre participants ont rempli la RSMS et la CAS ainsi que d'autres outils en vue d'évaluer la validité conceptuelle. La distribution, la fiabilité des résultats, la stabilité temporelle et la structure factorielle ont été examinées. Au moyen d'un échantillon fractionné, la validité conceptuelle a été évaluée selon plusieurs critères (estime de soi, désirabilité sociale, extraversion, ouverture, anxiété réactionnelle, convivialité, franchise), dont certains nouveaux qui fournissent une définition plus précise des deux concepts sous-jacents. Les versions françaises de la RSMS et de la CAS possèdent les mêmes propriétés psychométriques des autres versions (Bachner-Melman, Bacon-Shnoor, Zohar, Elizur & Ebstein, 2009; O'Cass, 2000), et elles semblent solides d'un point de vue psychométrique. Les auteurs présentent les forces, les faiblesses et les usages possibles des deux échelles.

Mots-clés : monitorage de soi, présentation de soi, souci des convenances, autorégulation, personnalité.

References

Akaike, H. (1978). A Bayesian analysis of the minimum AIC procedure. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, 30*(1), 9–14. doi:10.1007/BF02480194

Anderson, L. R. (1991). Test-retest reliability of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale over a two-year period. *Psychological Reports, 68,* 1057–1058. doi:10.2466/pr0.1991.68.3.1057

Bachner-Melman, R., Bacon-Shnoor, N., Zohar, A. H., Elizur, Y., & Ebstein, R. P. (2009). The psychometric properties of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (RSMS) and the Concern for Appropriateness Scale (CAS) in Hebrew. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 25,* 8–15. doi:10.1027/1015-5759.25.1.8

Bearden, W. O., & Rose, R. L. (1990). Attention to social comparison information: An individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16,* 461–471. doi:10.1086/209231

Bearden, W. O., Rose, R. L., & Teel, J. E. (1994). Correlates of conformity in the consumption of illicit drugs and alcohol. *Journal of Business Research, 30,* 25–31. doi:10.1016/0148-2963(94)90065-5

Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. (2004). Multimodel inference understanding AIC and BIC in model selection. *Sociological Methods & Research, 33,* 261–304. doi:10.1177/0049124104268644

Byrne, B. M. (1994). *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/WINDOWS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 64,* 21–50. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6401_2

Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12,* 887–898. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90177-D

Cutler, B. L., & Wolfe, R. N. (1985). Construct validity of the Concern for Appropriateness Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 318–323. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4903_19

Day, D. V., Shleicher, D. J., Unckless, A. L., & Hiller, N. J. (2002). Self-monitoring personality at work: A meta-analytic investigation of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 390–401. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.390

Ellis, R. J. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14,* 681–693. doi:10.1177/0146167288144004

Gana, K., & Brechenmacher, N. (2001). Structure latente et validité de la version française du Self-Monitoring Scale : Echelle de monitorage de soi/Latent structure and validity of the French version of the self-monitoring scale. *L'Année Psychologique, 101,* 393–420. doi:10.3406/psy.2001.1338

Gangestad, S., & Snyder, M. (1985). "To carve nature at its joints": On the existence of discrete classes in personality. *Psychological Review, 92,* 317–349. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.92.3.317

Gauthier, J., & Bouchard, S. (1993). Adaptation canadienne-française de la forme révisée du State–Trait Anxiety Inventory de Spielberger. [A French-Canadian adaptation of the revised version of Spielberger's State–Trait Anxiety Inventory.]. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 25,* 559–578. doi:10.1037/h0078881

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Anchor.

Heeren, A., Maurage, P., Rossignol, M., Vanhaelen, M., Peschard, V., Eeckhout, C., & Philippot, P. (2012). Self-report version of the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale: Psychometric properties of the French version. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 44,* 99.

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. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Ishihara, S., & Mizuno, K. (1992). A study of revised self-monitoring scale. *Japanese Journal of Psychology, 63,* 47–50.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Johnson, M. A. (1984). *Self-monitoring: Reliability of the Concern for Appropriateness Scale*. Saint Joseph, MO.

Johnson, M. A. (1989). Concern for Appropriateness Scale and behavioral conformity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 53,* 567–574. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5303_13

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33,* 159–174. doi:10.2307/2529310

Lennox, R. D. (1988). The problem with self-monitoring: A two-sided scale and a one-sided theory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52,* 58–73. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_5

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 1349–1364. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.6.1349

Malikiosi-Loizos, M., & Anderson, L. R. (1992). Reliability data on a Greek translation of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale. *Psychological Reports, 71,* 544–546. doi:10.2466/pr0.1992.71.2.544

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. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90185-E

Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Teel, J. E. (1992). Consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence and attributional sensitivity. *Psychology & Marketing, 9,* 379–394. doi:10.1002/mar.4220090504

O'Cass, A. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of a revised version of the Lennox and Wolfe Revised Self-Monitoring Scale. *Psychology & Marketing, 17,* 397–419. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(200005)17:5 397::AID-MAR33.0.CO;2-D

Pelletier, L. G., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). L'Échelle Révisée de Conscience de Soi: Une traduction et une validation canadienne-française du

Revised Self-Consciousness Scale. [The Revised Self-Consciousness Scale: A translation and a French-Canadian validation of the Revised Self-Consciousness Scale.] *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/ Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 22,* 191–206. doi: 10.1037/h0078983

Plaisant, O., Courtois, R., Réveillère, C., Mendelsohn, G. A., & John, O. P. (2010). Validation par analyse factorielle du Big Five Inventory français (BFI-Fr). Analyse convergente avec le NEO-PI-R. *Annales Médico-Psychologiques, Revue Psychiatrique, 168,* 97–106. doi:10.1016/j.amp .2009.09.003

Plaisant, O., Srivastava, S., Mendelsohn, G. A., Debray, Q., & John, O. P. (2005). Relations entre le Big Five Inventory français et le manuel diagnostique des troubles mentaux dans un échantillon clinique français. [Relations between the French version of the Big Five Inventory and the DSM classification in a French clinical sample of psychiatric disorders.] *Annales Médico-Psychologiques, 163,* 161–167. doi:10.1016/j.amp .2005.02.002

Rolland, J.-P. (1993). Validité de construct de "marqueurs" des dimensions de personnalité du modèle en cinq facteurs. [Construct validity of "Big Five" personality dimension markers.] *European Review of Applied Psychology/Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée, 43,* 317–338.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent child*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). The Self-Consciousness Scale: A Revised Version for Use with General Populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15,* 687–699. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1985 .tb02268.x

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization model. *Psychological Bulletin, 92,* 641–669. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.92.3.641

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge Academic.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30,* 526–537. doi:10.1037/h0037039

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (form Y)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Steiger, J. H. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modeling. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42,* 893–898. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017

Tournois, J., Mesnil, F., & Kop, J. L. (2000). Autoduperie et hétéroduperie: Un instrument de mesure de la désirabilité sociale. *European Review of Applied Psychology, 50,* 219–233.

Trower, P., & Gilbert, P. (1989). New theoretical conceptions of social anxiety and social phobia. *Clinical Psychology Review, 9,* 19–35. doi: 10.1016/0272-7358(89)90044-5

Vallières, E. F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Traduction et validation Canadienne-Française de l'Echelle de l'Estime de Soi de Rosenberg. *International Journal of Psychology, 25,* 305–316. doi:10.1080/ 00207599008247865

Walters, K. S., & Hope, D. A. (1998). Analysis of social behavior in individuals with social phobia and nonanxious participants using a psychobiological model. *Behavior Therapy, 29,* 387–407. doi:10.1016/ S0005-7894(98)80039-7

Wolfe, R. N., Lennox, R. D., & Cutler, B. L. (1986). Getting along and getting ahead: Empirical support for a theory of protective and acquisitive self-presentation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 356–361. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.356

Yao, S.-N., Fanget, F., Albuisson, E., Bouvard, M., Jalenques, I., & Cottraux, J. (1999). L'anxiété sociale chez les phobiques sociaux: Validation de l'échelle d'anxiété sociale de Liebowitz. *L'Encéphale: Revue de Psychiatrie Clinique Biologique et Thérapeutique, 25,* 429–435.

(*Appendix follows*)

Appendix

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale and the Concern for Appropriateness Scale

Item number	Scale (subscale)	Item (English original version)
1	RSMS (AMSP)	En société, j'ai la capacité de modifier mon comportement si je sens qu'un autre comportement est attendu. (In social situations, I have the ability to alter my behavior if I feel that something else is called for.)
2	RSMS (SEBO)	Je suis souvent capable de lire correctement les vraies émotions des gens dans leurs yeux. (I am often able to read people's true emotions correctly through their eyes.)
3	RSMS (AMSP)	J'ai la capacité de contrôler la façon dont j'apparais aux yeux des gens en fonction de l'impression que je souhaite leur donner. (I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them.)
4	RSMS (SEBO)	Dans les conversations, je suis sensible au moindre changement dans les expressions du visage de la personne avec qui je parle. (In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I'm conversing with.)
5	RSMS (SEBO)	Mon pouvoir d'intuition est assez bon quand il s'agit de comprendre les émotions et les motivations des autres. (My powers of intuition are quite good when it comes to understanding others' emotions and motives.)
6	RSMS (SEBO)	Je peux habituellement savoir lorsque les autres considèrent qu'une blague est de mauvais goût, même lorsqu'ils y rient de manière convaincante. (I can usually tell when others consider a joke to be in bad taste, even though they may laugh convincingly.)
7	RSMS (AMSP)	Quand je sens que l'image que je renvoie n'est pas adaptée, je peux facilement la changer pour qu'elle le soit. (When I feel that the image I am portraying isn't working, I can readily change it to something that does.)
8	RSMS (SEBO)	Je sais quand j'ai dit quelque chose d'inapproprié en le lisant dans les yeux de mon interlocuteur. (I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes.)
9*	RSMS (AMSP)	J'ai des difficultés à modifier mon comportement pour qu'il convienne à différentes personnes et à différentes situations. (I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.)
10	RSMS (AMSP)	J'ai remarqué que je peux ajuster mon comportement pour répondre aux exigences de n'importe quelle situation dans laquelle je me trouve. (I have found that I can adjust my behavior to meet the requirements of any situation I find myself in.)
11	RSMS (SEBO)	Si quelqu'un me ment, habituellement je le sais aussitôt dans sa manière de s'exprimer. (If someone is lying to me, I usually know it at once from that person's manner of expression.)
12*	RSMS (AMSP)	Même lorsque cela pourrait me servir, j'ai des difficultés à me mettre en valeur. (Even when it might be to my advantage, I have difficulty putting up a good front.)
13	RSMS (AMSP)	Une fois que je sais ce que la situation demande, je peux facilement réguler mes actions en conséquence. (Once I know what the situation calls for, it's easy for me to regulate my actions accordingly.)
1	CAS (CSV)	J'ai tendance à montrer à des personnes différentes des facettes différentes de moi-même. (I tend to show different sides of myself to different people.)
2	CAS (ATSCI)	J'ai le sentiment que si tout le monde dans un groupe se comporte d'une certaine manière, cela doit être la bonne manière de se comporter. (It is my feeling that if everyone else in a group is behaving in a certain manner, this must be the proper way to behave.)
3	CAS (ATSCI)	J'évite activement de porter des habits qui ne sont pas à la mode. (I actively avoid wearing clothes that are not in style.)
4	CAS (CSV)	Dans différentes situations et avec différentes personnes, j'agis souvent comme des personnes très différentes. (In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons.)
5	CAS (ATSCI)	Dans les soirées, j'essaie habituellement de me comporter de manière à m'intégrer. (At parties I usually try to behave in a manner that makes me fit in.)
6	CAS (ATSCI)	Quand je ne suis pas certain(e) de comment agir en société, j'observe le comportement des autres pour avoir des repères. (When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.)
7	CAS (CSV)	Bien que je me connaisse moi-même, je trouve que les autres ne me connaissent pas. (Although I know myself, I find that others do not know me.)
8	CAS (ATSCI)	J'essaie de faire attention aux réactions qu'ont les autres face à mon comportement pour éviter d'être inadapté. (I try to pay attention to the reactions of others to my behavior in order to avoid being out of place.)
9	CAS (ATSCI)	Je trouve que j'ai tendance à adopter les expressions d'argot des autres et à les utiliser comme faisant partie de mon propre vocabulaire. (I find that I tend to pick up slang expressions from others and use them as part of my own vocabulary.)
10	CAS (CSV)	Des situations différentes peuvent me faire me comporter comme des personnes très différentes. (Different situations can make me behave like very different people.)

(*table continues*)

(*Appendix continues*)

Appendix (*continued*)

Item number	Scale (subscale)	Item (English original version)
11	CAS (ATSCI)	J'ai tendance à faire attention aux vêtements que les autres portent. (I tend to pay attention to what others are wearing.)
12	CAS (ATSCI)	Le moindre regard de désapprobation dans les yeux d'une personne avec qui j'interagis suffit à me faire changer mon approche. (The slightest look of disapproval in the eyes of a person with whom I am interacting is enough to make me change my approach.)
13	CAS (CSV)	Des personnes différentes ont tendance à avoir des impressions différentes à propos du type de personne que je suis. (Different people tend to have different impressions about the type of person I am.)
14	CAS (ATSCI)	Il est important pour moi de m'intégrer au groupe avec lequel je suis. (It's important to me to fit in to the group I'm with.)
15	CAS (ATSCI)	Mon comportement dépend souvent de ce qu'il me semble que les autres attendent. (My behavior often depends on how I feel others wish me to behave.)
16	CAS (CSV)	Je ne suis pas toujours la personne que je parais être. (I am not always the person I appear to be.)
17	CAS (ATSCI)	Si j'ai la moindre incertitude sur comment agir en société, j'observe le comportement des autres pour avoir des repères. (If I am the least bit uncertain as to how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.)
18	CAS (ATSCI)	Je suis régulièrement les changements de mode vestimentaire en observant ce que les autres portent. (I usually keep up with clothing style changes by watching what others wear.)
19	CAS (CSV)	J'ai parfois le sentiment que les gens ne savent pas qui je suis vraiment. (I sometimes have the feeling that people don't know who I really am.)
20*	CAS (ATSCI)	En société, j'ai tendance à ne pas suivre la foule, mais à me comporter suivant mon humeur du moment. (When in a social situation, I tend not to follow the crowd, but instead behave in a manner that suits my particular mood at the time.)

Note. RSMS = Revised Self-Monitoring Scale; AMSP = Ability to Modify Self-Presentation; SEBO = Sensitivity to Expressive Behavior of Others; CAS = Concern for Appropriateness Scale; CSV = Cross-Situational Variability; ATSCI = Attention to Social Comparison Information. Participants respond using a 6-point Likert scale (0 = totalement en désaccord; 1 = en désaccord; 2 = plutôt en désaccord; 3 = plutôt en accord; 4 = en accord; 5 = totalement en accord). Each item yields a score from 0 to 5. High scores indicate higher Self-Monitoring (RSMS) or higher Concern for Appropriateness (CAS).

* Reversed item.

Received October 2, 2012
Revision received April 10, 2013
Accepted April 12, 2013 ■