Faculty of Sport and Physical Education completed HEXACO-PI-R personality questionnaire and R-SPQ-2 approaches to learning questionnaire (deep and surface approach). Additionally, data about high school GPA was collected. Academic performance was assessed through GPA. Personality traits explain 27.4% of the variance in deep approach, $F(6, 61) = 5.221, p < .01$, with Honesty, $\beta = .305$, $t = 2.605, p < .05$, and Openness, $\beta = .395$, $t = 3.626, p < .01$, as significant predictors, and 36.7% of the variance in surface approach $F(6, 61) = 7.460, p < .01$, with Emotionality, $\beta = .243$, $t = 2.408, p < .05$, Agreeableness, $\beta = .233$, $t = 2.211, p < .05$, Conscientiousness, $\beta = -.337$, $t = -3.144, p < .01$, and Openness, $\beta = -.420$, $t = 4.126, p < .01$. Together, previous achievement, personality and approaches to learning explain 47.9% of the variance of academic performance, $F(9, 56) = 7.653, p < .01$, with previous achievement, $\beta = .476$, $t = 5.046, p < .01$, Emotionality, $\beta = .299$, $t = 2.903, p < .01$ and surface approach, $\beta = -.339$, $t = 2.732, p < .01$, as significant predictors. Also, both personality and learning approaches have incremental value over and above previous achievement. Our results go in line with the findings that personality and approaches to learning are related, and that both have incremental value in predicting AP. Furthermore, HEXACO traits were as good in predicting learning approaches and AP as Big five traits, with significant contribution of Honesty, Agreeableness and Emotionality – which are defined somewhat differently in HEXACO model. However, due to specific character and small size of our sample, further research is needed to disentangle the relationship between them.
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In this research, we present a factor validation of the BCS translation of the Meriden School Climate Survey—Student Version (MSCS-SV), which is one of the most recent school climate instruments. It was developed as a multidimensional measure of the quality and character of school life as
experienced by students. It consists of 38 Likert items, organized into 7 subscales: Adult Support at School, School Safety, Respect for Differences, Adult Support at Home, Academic Support at Home, Aggression Towards Others, and Peer Support. The sample comprised 1036 students (63.1% females) from the 4 Republic of Srpska high schools. An initial confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) revealed that a correlated 7-factor model had poor fit: $\chi^2(644) = 3020.86, p < .001$; CFI = .819, TLI = .802, RMSEA = .060, 90% CI [.058, .062]. Two items had to be removed due to low factor loadings, while many others showed very pronounced local dependency issues. This was the most obvious for the School Safety subscale, which had generally poor psychometric properties and had to be removed entirely. The final outcome was a reduced 23-item, 6-factor model, which had decent fit: $\chi^2(215) = 627.32, p < .001$; CFI = .941, TLI = .931, RMSEA = .043, 90% CI [.039, .047]. These values were actually better than the original fit reported by the MSCS-SV’s authors. However, internal consistencies were mostly poor, with 5 out of 6 $\omega$s being below .70, with the lowest being .60 and the highest being .77. Furthermore, 4 out of 6 average variances extracted (AVE) were below the desired .50 cutoff. The model had the same factor structure, equivalent loadings and thresholds for boys and girls, with only slight differences in factor means on 3 factors. This means that the questionnaire is largely gender invariant and there is likely no need for the separate gender norms. In conclusion, we obtained a better fitting, but less internally consistent shorter version of the original MSCS-SV questionnaire. The removal of the School Safety subscale is a notable limitation, given that feeling safe at school is thought of as being an important protective factor for student wellbeing. Thus, we can only give a reserved recommendation for the use of MSCS-SV in the BCS speaking area. The questionnaire should be improved, namely by expanding the existing item base with newly written items, including the whole new set of the School Safety items.
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