

BIELEFELDER ARBEITEN ZUR SOZIALPSYCHOLOGIE

Psychologische Forschungsberichte,
herausgegeben von Hans Dieter Mummendey,
Universität Bielefeld

Nr. 104

(Oktober 1983)

Daniele Kammer
und Wolf Nowack:

Self-Monitoring: Construction
and Validation of a German
Two-Factor Scale

Abstract

A reliable German Self-Monitoring Scale is developed. The scale is shown to encompass the aspects that are central to Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring concept. Subdivision of the German scale into two uncorrelated subscales of equal length is shown to provide additional conceptual clarity. The Social Skills subscale taps various social and acting skills and has substantial overlap with extraversion. The Inconsistency subscale measures the discrepancy between an individual's expressive behavior and his/her underlying feelings, and relates to social anxiety, sensibility to situational cues, and self-reported situational inconsistency. The two subscales are similar to the factors recently found for the American original scale.

This work was supported by funds from the University of Bielefeld (OZ 3096). Part of the data were collected within a research project by Andrea Abele whose support is gratefully acknowledged.

Introduction

The recent research interest in individual differences concerning self-presentational tendencies has led to the development of Snyder's (1974) Self-Monitoring construct. The prototypic high self-monitoring individual is said to be a person who "out of a concern for the situational and interpersonal appropriateness of his or her social behavior is particularly sensitive to the expression and self-presentation of others in social situations and uses these cues as guidelines for monitoring (that is, regulating and controlling) his or her own verbal and nonverbal self-presentation" (Snyder, 1979, p.89). As an operational definition of this construct, Snyder (1974) has developed the Self-Monitoring Scale, a personality inventory which consists of 25 true-false items. Evidence for the validity of the scale was provided by correlations with related personality measures and peer ratings, by a comparison of the scores obtained from criterion groups of actors and psychiatric ward patients as well as by the investigation of expressive behavior (for recent reviews see Snyder 1979 a,b).

Ever since, Self-Monitoring has proven a fruitful moderating variable in the areas of person perception, research on attitudes and behavior as well as dyadic interaction (Berscheid, Graziano, Monson, & Dermer, 1976; Ickes, & Barnes, 1977; Jones, & Baumeister, 1976; Snyder, & Tanke, 1976). High self-monitoring individuals, as compared to their low self-monitoring counterparts, were shown to display more situational variability in their behaviors (Snyder, & Monson, 1975; Rarick, Soldow, & Geizer, 1976) and to be less predictable in terms of their underlying dispositions

(Lippa, 1976; Lippa, 1978). Taken together, Self-Monitoring has been stimulating in various research areas so that there is a genuine interest in a German version of the Self-Monitoring scale.

One additional remark is in order, concerning the dimensionality of the Self-Monitoring concept. A variety of different aspects seem to be involved in the definition of the concept, e.g. an ability to control one's self-presentation on one hand and a sensitivity to situational cues, especially to the emotional messages sent by others, on the other hand. However, research on the communication of emotion (see Cunningham, 1977, for a review) has shown that being good at sending emotional messages does not necessarily entail being good at receiving them from others. Indeed, Snyder's (1974) high self-monitors were better senders of emotional messages than their low self-monitoring counterparts, but no better receivers. Nor is it clear whether a person who owns good social skills tends to stage-manage his behavior in a way to conceal his true inner feelings. Altogether, a dimensionality check of the Self-Monitoring Scale will help to provide more theoretical clarity.

Accordingly, the purpose of the present article is 1. to adapt the Self-Monitoring concept to German usage; 2. to check the dimensionality of the German scale version, and 3. to provide first evidence for the validity of the German Self-Monitoring scale.

Overview

Two strategies are pursued simultaneously throughout the construction and the validation of the German Self-Monitoring Scale.

On one hand, an attempt is made to develop a German adaptation which approximates the original Self-Monitoring Scale as closely as possible. To this end, Snyder's (1974) construction strategy is followed, i.e. classical item analysis is performed on a German translation of the 25 original items. On the other hand, the items of the scale are factor-analysed to check the dimensionality of the Self-Monitoring Scale. Here, the aim is to identify a factor pattern that is interpretable and stable across different subject samples.

Considering the two resulting scale versions, indicators for their respective construct and criterion validities are gained in a second step. Among these are correlations with related personality measures, self-descriptions on adjective lists, ratings of situational characteristics, self-ratings of cross-situational consistency as well as measures of expressive behavior and behavioral consistency during a structured interview.

Finally, the two Self-Monitoring scale versions are compared to each other in terms of their respective scale characteristics and validities.

Scale Construction

Method:

The construction of the German Self-Monitoring Scale proceeded in two steps.

In the first step, the original items were translated as literally as possible.¹⁾ Table 1 gives the wordings of the original and the translated items and their scorings.

The translated scale (with true-false scoring and order of items preserved, cf. Snyder, 1974) was administered to two samples of male university students (sample 1, N= 372; sample 2, N= 121) for construction and crossvalidation purposes respectively. The data obtained from each of the two samples were submitted to separate item and factor analyses.

In the second step, a modified scale version with 4 reformulated items was administered to a third sample of male university students (sample 3, N= 80). The resulting data were again submitted to item and factor analyses.

Results and discussion²⁾

Item analyses. Classical item analyses were performed on the sets of data obtained from the three samples. Moreover, D-values (Snyder, 1974) were calculated to allow for better comparison with the data of the American original. The analysis aimed at a reconciliation of the two goals of (a) maximizing the internal consistency of the resulting scale and (b) optimally approximating the American Self-Monitoring Scale.

Concerning the first scale version, fulfillment of the first criterion was achieved after elimination of four items

Table 1

Items of the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974)
and their German Translations

Original item and scoring key	Translated item (Reformulation)
1 I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people (F)	Ich kann andere Leute schlecht nachmachen
2 My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (F)	Im allgemeinen verhalte ich mich so, wie es meinen Gefühlen, Einstellungen und Überzeugungen auch tatsächlich entspricht spricht (Ich verhalte mich grundsätzlich so, wie es meinen Gefühlen, Einstellungen und Überzeugungen auch tatsächlich entspricht)
3 At parties and social gatherings I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like (F)	Auf Festen und bei anderen sozialen Anlässen versuche ich nicht, den Leuten nach dem Mund zu reden

T=true; F=false

Table 1 (continued)

4 I can only argue for ideas which I already believe (F)	Ich kann nur für die Ideen eintreten, von denen ich auch schon überzeugt bin	oder mich so zu verhalten, wie sie es gerne haben wollen
5 I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information (T)	sogar dann über etwas reden, wenn ich darüber so gut wie nicht informiert bin	Ich kann aus dem Stegreif
6 I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people (T)	Ich glaube, dass ich eine Schau abziehe, um andere Leute zu beeindrucken oder zu unterhalten	
7 When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues (T)	Wenn ich nicht weiss, wie ich mich in einer Situation verhalten soll, schaue ich, was die anderen machen	
		(Wenn ich mir nicht ganz sicher bin, wie ich mich in einer Situation verhalten soll, schaue ich, was die anderen machen)

Table 1 (continued)

8	I would probably make a good actor (T)	Ich wäre wahrscheinlich ein ganz guter Schauspieler
9	I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music (F)	Ich brauche selten Rat-schläge meiner Freunde, um Filme, Bücher oder Musik auszuwählen (Ich frage selten meine Freunde um Rat, wenn es darum geht, Filme, Bücher oder Musik auszuwählen)
10	I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am (T)	Ich wirke auf andere Leute manchmal so, als ob ich stärkere Gefühle hätte, als tatsächlich bei mir vorhanden sind
11	I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone (T)	Ich lache mehr, wenn ich ein lustiges Stück mit anderen Leuten zusammen sehe, als wenn ich es allein anschau-e (Ich lache bedeutend mehr, wenn ich ein lustiges Stück mit anderen Leuten zusammen

Table 1 (continued)

12	In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention (F)	Ich stehe selten im Mittelpunkt, wenn ich mit mehreren Leuten zusammen bin
13	In different situations and with different people, I often act like very different persons (T)	Je nach Situation und beteiligten Personen verhalte ich mich oft so, als ob ich ein völlig anderer Mensch wäre
14	I am not particularly good at making other people like me (F)	Ich schaffe es nicht bei anderen Leuten beliebt zu machen
15	Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time (T)	Selbst wenn ich mich nicht amüsiere, tue ich oft so, als ob es mir gefallen würde
16	I'm not always the person I appear to be (T)	Ich bin häufig nicht die Person, die ich vorgebe zu sein
17	I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor (F)	Um jemandem zu gefallen oder mich bei ihm beliebt zu machen, würde ich nicht meine Meinung

T=true; F=false

Table 1 (continued)

18	I have considered being an entertainer (T)	-oder die Art, wie ich Dinge erledige- ändern Ich habe mir schon einmal überlegt, Schauspiel-er zu werden
19	I order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else (T)	Um beliebt zu sein und gut mit Leuten auszu- kommen, neige ich dazu, eher so zu sein, wie sie es von mir erwarten, als anders
20	I have never been good at games like charades or im- provisational acting (F)	Bei Ratespielen oder in Spielen, in denen es auf Improvisation ankommt, war ich noch nie gut
21	I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situa- tions (F)	Ich habe Schwierigkeiten, mein Verhalten auf ver- schiedene Leute und ver- schiedene Situationen einzustellen
22	At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going (F)	Bei Festen überlasse ich es anderen Leuten, für Stimmung zu sorgen
23	I feel a bit awkward in comp- any and do not show up quite so well as I should (F)	In Gesellschaft fühle ich mich ein bisschen unbeholfen und zeige

T=true; F=false

Table 1 (continued)

24	I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end) (T)	mich nicht so vorteil- haft, wie ich es sollte Wenn es um eine gute Sa- che geht, kann ich jeden mit dem ehrlichsten Ge- sicht anlügen
25	I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dis- like them (T)	Es kann sein, dass ich Leute, die ich wirklich nicht mag, täusche, in- dem ich freundlich zu ihnen bin

(items 2, 7, 9, 11), resulting in a maximal internal consistency (Kuder-Richardson 20) of $\alpha = .66$. To fulfill the second criterion, the four critical items were reformulated and included in a second scale version. The reformulation was done in a way to shift the prospective item difficulties closer to the value of .50.

As revealed by the item analysis of the second scale version, this strategy was partly successful. The internal consistency of the second scale version was maximized at $\alpha = .73$, following elimination of only two of the critical items (items 7 and 9). The final scale thus contains 23 items. Their respective item difficulties, item-test correlations, and D-values are shown in Table 2, together with the corresponding values of the American original items.

Factor analyses. For the dimensionality check of the Self-Monitoring Scale, three factor analyses (principal factoring with iteration and subsequent varimax rotation) were performed on the item intercorrelation matrices obtained from each of the three subject samples. Two factors were retained, based on the consideration of four criteria: (a) all eigenvalues well over one (b) percentage of total variance explained by each of the factors (13.5 resp. 12.2 in sample 1 and 12.4 resp. 15.1 in sample 3); (c) fulfillment of the Scree test criterion (Überla, 1971, p. 127) and (d) stability of the factor patterns across the different subject samples. Items were excluded subject to one of the following exclusion criteria: (a) no factor loading $>.20$ (items 7, 9); (b) absolute value of the difference between the two factor loadings $<.10$ (items 11, 17, 23, 24); and (c) instability of item loadings across the different subject samples (item 6).

Table 2

Scoring Key, Difficulty, and Discrimination Indices
for the items of the German Self-Monitoring Scale, Full
Version (Corresponding Values for the Original Items in
Parentheses, cf. Snyder, 1974)

Item	Scoring key ^a	Discrimination ^b			
		p	D	X_D	r_{it}
1	F	.40 (.27)	.27 (.50)	1.77 (32.07)	.24 ⁺ (.33)
2	F	.56 (.33)	.38 (.23)	3.51 (7.26)	.28 ⁺ (.13)
3	F	.19 (.83)	.36 (.21)	6.38 ⁺ (.8.23)	.32 ⁺ (.34)
4	F	.24 (.57)	.27 (.29)	2.36 (8.91)	.26 ⁺ (.22)
5	T	.28 (.31)	.50 (.21)	10.65 ⁺ (6.41)	.42 ⁺⁺ (.32)
6	T	.28 (.35)	.70 (.44)	15.02 ⁺⁺ (26.50)	.47 ⁺⁺ (.45)
8	T	.28 (.31)	.60 (.36)	12.39 ⁺⁺ (17.80)	.50 ⁺⁺ (.43)
10	T	.29 (.43)	.41 (.20)	5.61 ⁺ (4.78)	.27 ⁺ (.39)
11	T	.75 (.67)	.41 (.23)	5.61 ⁺ (6.51)	.36 ⁺⁺ (.29)
12	F	.45 (.36)	.72 (.32)	15.44 ⁺⁺ (13.09)	.54 ⁺ (.40)
13	T	.30 (.60)	.71 (.22)	18.34 ⁺⁺ (5.54)	.46 ⁺⁺ (.40)
14	F	.60 (.70)	.66 (.27)	12.25 ⁺⁺ (10.12)	.47 ⁺⁺ (.22)
15	T	.33 (.39)	.39 (.21)	4.22 ⁺ (5.67)	.32 ⁺ (.24)
16	T	.36 (.74)	.61 (.23)	21.04 ⁺⁺ (7.17)	.55 ⁺⁺ (.33)
17	F	.35 (.39)	.30 (.34)	2.08 (15.50)	.29 ⁺ (.34)

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Scoring key ^a	P	D	χ_D	r_{it}
18	T	.23 (.21)	.18 (.28)	.62 (12.64)	.26+ (.46)
19	T	.33 (.21)	.71 (.25)	18.34++ (9.96)	.53++ (.29)
20	F	.58 (.48)	.26 (.45)	1.40 (25.96)	.30+ (.31)
21	F	.61 (.64)	.49 (.38)	6.56+ (19.35)	.41++ (.45)
22	F	.34 (.35)	.39 (.24)	4.22+ (6.80)	.36++ (.36)
23	F	.45 (.46)	.27 (.21)	1.77 (11.05)	.32+ (.32)
24	T	.45 (.42)	.63 (.38)	11.21++ (19.25)	.45++ (.33)
25	T	.58 (.54)	.77 (.35)	17.51++ (15.07)	.52++ (.32)

a) Items keyed in the direction of high Self-Monitoring

b) N = 80

T = true; F = false

+ p < .05; ++ p < .001

p: Item difficulty = proportion of individuals responding in
Self-Monitoring-keyed direction

D: Discrimination = difference between proportion of individuals
in upper and lower thirds of total score distribution,
responding in high Self-Monitoring direction

χ_D : Calculated from the contingency table which compares
frequencies of item T resp. F responses for the two subject
groups who scored in the upper resp. lower third of the
distribution of the total Self-Monitoring Score.

r_{it} : Point-biserial correlation between individual item and
total score (part-whole corrected for the American original
item)

The items of the first factor are presented in Table 3. The factor was labelled Social Skills factor (Fertigkeitenfaktor) since the items represent various social and acting skills when scored in the direction of high Self-Monitoring. Typical items are the following: "I would probably make a good actor" and "At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going".

The second factor also contains 9 items (cf. Table 4) which tap the discrepancy between the feelings as they are actually experienced and their overt expression. A typical item reads "I'm not always the person I appear to be". The factor was labelled Inconsistency factor (Inkonsistenzfaktor).

The items of the two-factor solution are also contained in the full scale version. The factors can thus be considered as subscales consisting of 9 items each. The two subscales are not correlated ($r = -.04$).

Comparison of the two scale version . Clearly, the two-factor scale version is more economical than the full scale version as obtained via item analyses. However, as can be seen from Table 5, the internal consistencies (Kuder-Richardson 20) of the two factor subscales are in the range of the German full scale version as well as in the range of the American original.

Thus, according to formal statistical criteria, the two-factor Self-Monitoring scale version is preferred to the full scale version. The final decision, however, should rely on the results of validation studies.

Table 3
Items of the Social Skills Factor

	Item and scoring key ^a	Factor loadings	
		Sample 2 (N = 121)	Sample 3 (N = 80)
1	Ich kann andere Leute schlecht nachmachen (F)	.27	.20
5	Ich kann aus dem Stegreif sogar dann über etwas reden, wenn ich darüber so gut wie nicht infor- miert bin (T)	.34	.27
8	Ich wäre wahrscheinlich ein ganz guter Schauspieler (T)	.65	.59
12	Ich stehe selten im Mittelpunkt, wenn ich mit mehreren Leuten zusammen bin (F)	.48	.52
14	Ich schaffe es nicht besonders gut, mich bei anderen Leuten beliebt zu machen (F)	.40	.52
18	Ich habe mir schon einmal überlegt, Schauspieler zu werden (T)	.40	.45
20	Bei Ratespielen oder in Spielen, in denen es auf Improvisation ankommt, war ich noch nie gut (F)	.40	.45
21	Ich habe Schwierigkeiten, mein Verhalten auf verschiedene Leute und verschiedene Situationen einzustellen (F)	.27	.45
22	Bei Festen überlasse ich es anderen Leuten, für Stimmung zu sorgen (F)	.67	.50

a) Items keyed in the direction of high Self-Monitoring
T = true; F = false

Table 4
Items of the Inconsistency Factor

Item and scoring key ^a	Factor loadings	
	Sample 2	Sample 3
	(N = 121)	(N = 80)
2 Ich verhalte mich grundsätzlich so, wie es meinen Gefühlen, Einstellungen und Überzeugungen auch tatsächlich entspricht (F) ^b	.30	.35
3 Auf Festen und bei anderen sozialen Anlässen versuche ich nicht, den Leuten nach dem Mund zu reden oder mich so zu verhalten, wie sie es gerne haben wollen (F)	.30	.38
4 Ich kann nur für Ideen eintreten, von denen ich auch schon überzeugt bin (F)	.27	.31
10 Ich wirke auf andere Leute manchmal so, als ob ich stärkere Gefühle hätte, als tatsächlich bei mir vorhanden sind (T)	.21	.43
13 Je nach Situation und beteiligten Personen verhalte ich mich oft so, als ob ich ein völlig anderer Mensch wäre (T)	.51	.44
15 Selbst wenn ich mich nicht amüsiere, tue ich oft so, als ob es mir gefallen würde (T)	.47	.44
16 Ich bin häufig nicht die Person, die ich vorgebe zu sein (T)	.56	.76
19 Um beliebt zu sein und gut mit Leuten auszukommen, neige ich dazu, eher so zu sein, wie sie es von mir erwarten, als anders (T)	.66	.74
25 Es kann sein, dass ich Leute, die ich wirklich nicht mag, täusche, indem ich freundlich zu ihnen von (T)	.21	.51

a) Items keyed in the direction of high Self-Monitoring

b) Item wording in the final form

T = true; F = false

Table 5
Internal Consistencies of the Different
Scale Version (N = 80)

Self-Monitoring	Internal Consistency
Inconsistency Factor	.74
Social Skills Factor	.68
German Full Scale Version	.74
American Original (Snyder, 1974)	.70

Validation

This section of the paper provides evidence for the construct and criterion validities of the German Self-Monitoring full scale version as well as for each of the factor subscales. The selection of the constructs and criteria was on one hand guided by the results obtained for the American original, and by the face-value interpretation of each of the two German Self-Monitoring factors on the other.

Correlations with related personality measures

Method. The following German personality measures were selected: social desirability as measured by the SDS-CM Scale (Lück, & Timaeus, 1969), social anxiety as measured by the SAP scale (Lück, 1971; Lück, & Ortlieb, 1973) and several subscales of the Freiburger Persönlichkeitsinventar (FPI, Fahrenberg, Selg, & Hampel, 1978) in their short forms

(Neurotizismus, Extraversion, Geselligkeit, Gelassenheit, Gehemmtheit, Dominanz, Aggressivität). The data were obtained from two different samples of male university students (N= 121³) and N= 40).

Results and discussion. For each of the personality measures involved, five different correlations were calculated: Pearson correlations with the full Self-Monitoring scale version, with each of the two factor subscales as well as with the subscale consisting of the items of both factors combined, and finally the multiple correlation of the personality construct with the two factor subscales. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Neither the full Self-Monitoring scale version nor any of the two factor subscales is related to social desirability. As hypothesized, people scoring high on the Social Skills factor are also more likely to score high on the FPI subscales of Extraversion, Geselligkeit, and Gelassenheit and to score lower on Neurotizismus and Social Anxiety. On the other hand, people scoring high on the Inconsistency factor show a tendency to have higher Neurotizismus scores and are more likely to score high on Gehemmtheit and Aggressivität, the latter scale measuring hostility rather than overt aggression. No significant correlations with the Dominanz subscale were found. Taken together, these correlations seem to indicate that a person high in Inconsistency who behaves in a way not to reveal the true inner feelings does so because of shyness, social anxiety, and hostility rather than out of a motive to dominate others.

A comparison of the correlations for the full scale version (23 items) with those obtained for the sum of the two factors

Table 6
Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
Related Personality Measures

Personality Measure X	Self - Monitoring				
	$r_{X.IC}$	$r_{X.SK}$	$r_{X.SM}$	$r_{X.IC+SK}$	$r_{X.IC,SK}$
SDS-CM ^a	-.10	-.02	-.16	-.09	.11
SAP ^a	.17	-.59++	-.33+	-.30+	.60++
Neurotizismus ^a	.24	-.35+	-.06	-.07	.42++
Extraversion ^a	.05	.59++	.48++	.45++	.59++
Geselligkeit ^b	-.14	.64++	.38++	.37++	.66++
Gelassenheit ^b	-.06	.27++	.18+	.16+	.28++
Gehemmtheit ^b	.38++	-.40++	-.06	-.03	.55++
Dominanz ^b	.10	-.02	.12	.06	.11
Aggressivität ^b	.28++	.18+	.33++	.32++	.33++

+) p .05; ++) p .001

a) N = 40

b) N = 121

$r_{X.IC}$; $r_{X.SK}$; $r_{X.SM}$; $r_{X.IC+SK}$: Pearson correlations between personality measure X and the scores from the Inconsistency factor, the Social Skills factor, the full scale version, and the sum of the two factor subscales respectively

$r_{X.IC,SK}$: multiple correlation of personality measure X with scores from the two factor subscales

(18 items) reveals no substantial differences (see Table 6). Thus the additional five items of the full scale version do not contribute much to the whole concept beyond the two factors, at least as far as the relationship of the Self-Monitoring construct with the personality measures investigated is concerned. Moreover, there are fewer and less substantial correlations for the full scale version, as compared to the correlations obtained for the two factors. Obviously, the full scale combines two independent aspects of the Self-Monitoring construct. Accordingly, the multiple correlation gives best results.

In sum, considering the two factors instead of the full scale version clearly provides more conceptual clarity.

Expressive behavior and sensitivity to situational cues

By the definition of the Self-Monitoring construct, high self-monitoring individuals are more sensitive to situational cues than their low self-monitoring counterparts. A structured interview situation was chosen to relate an individual's Self-Monitoring score to his/her sensitivity to the varying degrees of intimacy of the questions that were posed. Individuals scoring high on the full scale version were expected to show more sensitivity to the intimacy cues than individuals scoring low on the full scale version. Moreover, following inspection of the items, it was predicted that this relationship would be found with the Inconsistency factor and not with

the Social Skills factor.

On the other hand, concerning the subjects' expressive behaviors during the interview, differential predictions were made for each of the two factors. Subjects scoring high on the Social Skills factor, as compared to those scoring low, were expected to behave in a more outgoing way. Subjects scoring high on the Inconsistency factor, as compared to those scoring low, were assumed to behave rather timidly during this social interaction. Since the predictions for the two factors point into opposite directions, no behavioral differences related to the full scale version should be found.

Method. Forty-one university students were interviewed. They were videotaped when they answered nine questions in a fixed order. Questions varied as to their degree of intimacy. Following the interview, subjects completed the Self-Monitoring items and rated the intimacy of each of the questions (1 = intimate, 7 = not intimate). For each subject, the variance of his/her intimacy ratings across the nine questions was taken as the subject's sensitivity index. On the other hand, each subject's total speaking time as well as the percentage of time which the subject spent in mutual gaze with the interviewer were assessed from the videotapes. Low scores on these two behavioral measures were taken as an indicator of social shyness.

Results and discussion. Neither the full scale version

nor the Social Skills factor had any effect on the dependent variables, partly contradicting the assumption .

Concerning the Inconsistency factor, the hypotheses were corroborated. Individuals scoring high on this factor ($x > 3$) showed a tendency to be more sensitive to the differing degrees of intimacy of the nine questions ($F(1,31) = 3.80$, $p < .06$). On the other hand, they talked less ($F(1,31) = 4.40$, $p < .05$) and spent less time in mutual gaze ($F(1,31) = 4.93$, $p < .05$), as compared to individuals who scored low on this factor ($x \leq 3$). Taken together, the results fit into the picture of the high Inconsistency subject as a person who is rather timid during social interaction and more sensitive to varying situational cues. The results moreover show that the sensitivity aspect of the Self-Monitoring concept is only incorporated in the Inconsistency factor. No additional information concerning the psychological meaning of the Social Skills factor was obtained.

Behavioral variability ratings and trait ascriptions

The original Self-Monitoring scale was shown to moderate the variability of the behaviors which an individual displays in different situations. This property seems to be incorporated in the Inconsistency factor whose items tap the individual's sensitivity to situational cues. Thus it is predicted that individuals who score high on the Inconsistency factor will report more variability in their behaviors across different

situations than do individuals who score low on this factor. The effect should be less pronounced for the full scale version since no contribution is expected from the Social Skills factor.

Finally, trait ascriptions to self are considered as a means to add to the interpretation of each of the two factors.

Method. After answering the Self-Monitoring items, 80 male university students described themselves with respect to 16 traits in the following way: using two separate 7-point rating scales for each trait, subjects indicated (a) how much they would ascribe the trait in question to themselves (1= not at all, 7= very much), and (b) how much their behavioral expression of this trait would vary from one situation to another (1= not at all, 7= very much). For each subject, the mean of the 16 individual variability ratings was taken as the global measure of self-reported behavioral variability.

Results and discussion. As hypothesized for the behavioral variability ratings, individuals who scored high on the Inconsistency factor ($x \geq 3$, following a median split) described their behaviors as more variable than did individuals who scored low ($x < 3$) on this factor ($F(1,78) = 9.04, p < .05$). The Social Skills factor had no effect on the variability ratings, and the difference found for the full scale version did not reach significance.

Concerning the trait ascriptions, the correlations with

the full scale version as well as each of the two factors are given in Table 7.

Subjects scoring high on the Inconsistency factor tended to see themselves as less frank and as somewhat more hostile, as compared to those scoring low on this factor. On the other hand, individuals scoring high on the Social Skills factor described themselves as more joyful, flexible, spontaneous, friendly, helpful, and sympathetic, as compared to those scoring low on this factor. Again, fewer trait ascriptions were related to the full Self-Monitoring scale version than to the two subscales.

Taken together, the previous interpretation of the two factors was corroborated by the trait ascriptions. Moreover, the Inconsistency factor accounted for the central Self-Monitoring aspect of behavioral variability even more than did the full scale version. The Results clearly point to the superiority of the two-factor solution.

Conclusion

Comparisons were made between a full Self-Monitoring scale version which consists of 23 items and a shorter scale version with two independent subscales, each containing 9 items. It was shown that the shorter scale version is superior

Table 7
 Substantial Correlations between Self-Monitoring
 Scores and Trait Ascriptions to Self
 (N = 80)

Trait	Self-Monitoring		
	Inconsistency Factor	Social Skills Factor	Full Scale Version
fröhlich		.39++	.20+
flexibel		.34++	
hilfsbereit		.27++	
geduldig			
zuverlässig			
realistisch			
egoistisch			
ehrlich	-.36++		-.21+
ernst		-.38++	-.23+
freundlich		.30+	
aggressiv			
spontan		.40++	
höflich			
feindselig	.19+		
sympatisch		.35++	.23+
misstrauisch			

+) $p < .05$

++) $p < .001$

in terms of its economy, reliability, and validity. The German Self-Monitoring scale thus contains 18 items, 9 of which belong to the Social Skills subscale and 9 of which belong to the Inconsistency subscale.

The data are very consistent. The SocialSkills factor taps various social and acting skills and has substantial overlap with extraversion. The Inconsistency factor measures the discrepancy between expressive behavior and underlying feelings. It is related to social anxiety, sensibility to situational cues, and self-reported situational variability.

Interestingly, recent reanalyses of the American original scale (Briggs, Cheek & Buss, 1980; Gabrenya & Arkin, 1980) report similar results. The German two-factor version resembles the three-factor solution proposed by Briggs et al. (1980). The present Inconsistency factor essentially corresponds to the Other-Directedness factor as proposed by these authors. The present Social Skills factor is represented partly in their Extraversion factor and partly in their Acting factor. Since these two factors are reported to be correlated ($r = .31$), it seems reasonable to combine them into a single factor.

Altogether, a reliable German Self-Monitoring Scale was developed. The scale was shown to encompass aspects that are central to the Self-Monitoring concept. Subdivision of the German scale into two uncorrelated subscales of equal length was shown to provide additional conceptual clarity.

References

- Bem, D.J. & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time. Psychological Review, 81, 506-520.
- Berscheid, E., Graziano, W., Monson, T., & Dermer, M. (1976). Outcome dependency: Attention, attribution, and attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 978-989.
- Briggs, S.R., Cheek, J.M., & Buss, A.H. (1980). An analysis of the Self-Monitoring Scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 679-686.
- Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Psychology, 24, 349-354.
- Cunningham, M.R. (1977). Personality and the structure of the nonverbal communication of emotion. Journal of Personality, 45, 564-584.
- Fahrenberg, J., Selg, H., & Hampel, R. (1978). Freiburger Persönlichkeitsinventar (FPI). Göttingen: Verlag für Psychologie, Hogrefe.
- Gabrenya, W.K. & Arkin, R.M. (1980). Self-Monitoring Scale: Factor Structure and Correlates. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 6, 13-22.
- Ickes, W. & Barnes, R.D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interactions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 315-330.

- Jones, E.E. & Baumeister, R. (1976). The self-monitor looks at the ingratiation. Journal of Personality, 44, 654-674.
- Lippa, R. (1976). Expressive control and the leakage of dispositional introversion-extraversion during role-played teaching. Journal of Personality, 44, 541-559.
- Lippa, R. (1978). Expressive control, expressive consistency, and the correspondence between expressive behavior and personality. Journal of Personality, 46, 438-461.
- Lück, H.E. (1971). Entwicklung eines Fragebogens zur Messung der Angst in sozialen Situationen (SAP). Diagnostica, 17, 53-59.
- Lück, H.E. & Ortlieb, P. (1973). Zur Validierung des Fragebogens zur Messung der Angst in sozialen Situationen (SAP). Diagnostica, 19, 3-8.
- Lück, H.E. & Timaeus, E. (1969). Skalen zur Messung Manifeste Angst (MAS) und sozialer Wünschbarkeit (SDS-D und SDS-CM). Diagnostica, 15, 134-141.
- Rarick, D.L., Soldow, G.F., & Geizer, R.S. (1976). Self-Monitoring as a mediator of conformity. Central States Speech Journal, 27, 267-271.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.
- Snyder, M. (1979a). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 85-128.

- Snyder, M. (1979b). Cognitive behavioral and interpersonal consequences of Self-Monitoring. In P. Pliner, K.R. Blankenstein, & I.M. Spigel (Eds.) Perception of emotion in self and others. New York: Plenum Press.
- Snyder, M. & Monson, T. (1975). Persons, situations, and the control of social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 637-644.
- Snyder, M. & Tanke, E.D. (1976). Behavior and attitude: Some people are more consistent than others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 501-517.
- Überla, K. (1971). Faktorenanalyse. Heidelberg: Springer.

Footnotes

¹We thank A. Weinert for his help with a retranslation check.

²All calculations were performed in the Hochschulrechenzentrum der Universität Bielefeld on a TR 440, using SPSS6.

³The Self-Monitoring data obtained from this sample (sample 2) involve two items in their original wording. The corresponding correlations should only slightly be affected by the difference.

BIELEFELDER ARBEITEN ZUR SOZIALPSYCHOLOGIE

Psychologische Forschungsberichte, herausgegeben von Hans Dieter Mummendey,
Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 8640, 48 Bielefeld 1 (pro Heft DM 2,50)

- Nr.83 R.Mielke: Mehrdimensionale Erfassungsmethoden interner/externer Kontrollüberzeugung (2/82)
- Nr.84 A.Mummendey & H.-J.Schreiber: Sozialer Vergleich und Begünstigung der Ingroup: Effekte unterschiedlicher Aspekte v.Ähnlichkeit zw.Gruppen
- Nr.85 R.Niketta: Zum Einfluß explorationstheoretischer Variablen auf die Rezeption von Rock-Musik (4/82)
- Nr.86 H.D.Mummendey, H.-G.Bolten & M.Isermann-Gerke: Experimentelle Überprüfung des Bogus-Pipeline-Paradigmas: Einstellungen gegenüber Türken
- Nr.87 A.Mummendey & H.-J.Schreiber: Besser oder anders? Positive soziale Identität durch Outgroup-Diskriminierung oder -Differenzierung (6/82)
- Nr.88 H.D.Mummendey, R.Riemann & B.Schiebel: Entwicklung eines mehrdimensionalen Verfahrens zur Selbsteinschätzung (7/82)
- Nr.89 V.Linneweber, A.Mummendey, M.Bornwasser & G.Löschper: Klassifikation feld- und verhaltensspezifischer Interaktionssituationen (8/82)
- Nr.90 H.D.Mummendey & G.Sturm: Eine fünfjährige Längsschnittuntersuchung zu Selbstbildänderungen jüngerer Erwachsener (9/82)
- Nr.91 G.Löschper, A.Mummendey, M.Bornwasser & V.Linneweber: Die Beurteilung von Verhaltensweisen als aggressiv und sanktionswürdig (10/82)
- Nr.92 R.Riemann: Eine Untersuchung zur Validität von mit Hilfe der Gridtechnik gewonnenen Repräsentationen kognitiver Strukturen (10/82)
- Nr.93 H.D.Mummendey: Attitudes and Behavior - A Review of the German Literature (11/82)
- Nr.94 H.-G.Bolten, H.D.Mummendey, M.Isermann-Gerke & E.Hemmert: Bericht und Bewertung von Verhalten im Straßenverkehr unter Bogus-Pipeline (12/82)
- Nr.95 R.Niketta: Kontrasteffekte in der Rezeption von Rockmusik unterschiedlicher Komplexität (1/83)
- Nr.96 B.Schiebel, R.Riemann & H.D.Mummendey: Eine aktualisierte deutschsprachige Form der Konservatismus-Skala von Wilson & Patterson (2/83)
- Nr.97 H.D.Mummendey: Sport und Persönlichkeit - Versuch einer Tertiäranalyse (3/83)
- Nr.98 H.-G.Bolten, H.D.Mummendey & M.Isermann-Gerke: Die Theorie der objektiven Selbstaufmerksamkeit im experimentellen Vergleich.. (4/83)
- Nr.99 D.Brackwede: Über Handlungsstrukturtheorie in der Psychologie (5/83)
- Nr.100 H.D.Mummendey & H.-G.Bolten: Die Impression-Management-Theorie von J.T.Tedeschi und B.R.Schlenker (6/83)
- Nr.101 A.Mummendey, V.Linneweber & G.Löschper: Actor or victim of aggression: Divergent perspectives - divergent evaluations (7/83)
- Nr.102 R.Niketta & J.Stiensmeier: Zum Einfluß der Erregung auf die Beurteilung von Musikstücken unterschiedlicher Komplexität (8/83)
- Nr.103 A.Mummendey & H.D.Mummendey: Aggressives Verhalten im Fußball als soziale Interaktion (9/83)
- Nr.104 D.Kammer & W.Nowack: Self-monitoring: Construction and validation of a German two-factor scale (10/83)