

Self-Monitoring as a Mediator Between Peer Pressure and Behavioral Conformity

Arjun. Deshmukh¹, Neha. Sharma^{2*}

¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India

² Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

* Corresponding author email address: neha.sharma@psych.du.ac.in

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic ¹ Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Hooman Namvar ¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Elham Azarakhsh ¹ Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Qom Branch, Qom, Iran. Email: elhamazarakhsh@qom.iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This important point would benefit from deeper elaboration on mechanisms (e.g., social identity theory or cognitive dissonance) that explain how internalization of norms occurs under peer pressure.

The rationale for choosing the Indian adolescent population is strong; however, consider explicitly justifying the developmental relevance of the 16–25 age range in relation to self-monitoring capacity and peer conformity literature.

Please indicate the theoretical or normative ranges for each scale to help interpret the meaning of “moderate” levels reported for peer pressure, self-monitoring, and behavioral conformity.

While these values are acceptable, it would enhance transparency to provide skewness and kurtosis statistics for each individual variable rather than a range across variables.

Please report the confidence interval for RMSEA, as it is a standard practice in SEM reporting and important for evaluating precision.

The beta values are well-reported, but please include a brief note on whether the indirect effect significance was tested using bootstrapping procedures, as this adds robustness.

The figure is informative, but it lacks labels for residual variances and measurement errors. Adding these would enhance model interpretability and meet SEM reporting standards.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The use of RPIS as a proxy for peer pressure through reverse-coding is innovative, but you should clarify how psychometric integrity was maintained when interpreting scores in the reverse-coded format.

The scale by Snyder (1974) contains outdated items; please confirm whether any cultural or linguistic adaptations were made for the Indian context, as this affects content validity.

It would be helpful to include specific thresholds or cutoff values used to assess multicollinearity (e.g., tolerance or VIF) and clarify the criteria for Mahalanobis outlier removal.

Consider reporting effect size interpretations (e.g., small, medium, large) for each correlation coefficient using Cohen's guidelines to contextualize the strength of relationships.

Consider integrating cross-cultural theory (e.g., Hofstede's dimensions or Triandis's theory of individualism-collectivism) to support claims about cultural influences on conformity.

This idea is conceptually rich but would benefit from being tied to dual-process models (e.g., reflective vs. impulsive systems) to explain how self-monitoring might both help and hinder adolescent development.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.