

Running head: SELF- AND PARENT-RATINGS

Self- Versus Parent-Ratings of Industriousness, Affect, and Life Satisfaction in Relation to

Academic Outcomes

Gerard J. Fogarty & Janet E. Davies

University of Southern Queensland &

Carolyn MacCann

University of Sydney &

Richard D. Roberts

Educational Testing Service

Author Note

We thank Patrick Kyllonen for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. We also thank three anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback. All statements expressed in this paper are the authors' and do not reflect the official opinions or policies of the any of the authors' host affiliations.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gerard J. Fogarty, Faculty of Sciences, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Queensland 4350, Australia.

Contact: fogarty@usq.edu.au

The correct APA citation for this paper is:

Fogarty, G.J., Davies, J.E., MacCann, C., Roberts, R.D. (2014). Self- Versus Parent-Ratings of Industriousness, Affect, and Life Satisfaction in Relation to Academic Outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 281-293. DOI: 10.1111/bjep.12024

Abstract

Background. Parents consult with schools on how to help their children succeed but schools rarely consult with parents, even though most parents have considerable expertise concerning their children's thoughts, feelings, and abilities.

Aims. The present study compares the prediction of academic achievement from self- and parent-ratings of feelings towards school (both positive and negative), life satisfaction, and the conscientiousness facet of industriousness for 357 adolescents.

Sample. The student sample consisted of 383 participants (194 males) mostly aged between 12 and 14. The parent sample consisted of 374 participants, 83% of whom were mothers.

Method. Self-report and other-report scales measuring the above-mentioned constructs were administered to students and parents. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test hypotheses concerning the incremental validity of parent-ratings.

Results. Self-ratings explained 28.6% of the variance in GPA with parent-ratings explaining an additional 12.1%. The incremental effect was strongest for industriousness.

Conclusion. These results suggest that parent-reports are often more accurate than adolescent self-reports but that both methods of assessment make unique contributions to the explanation of variance in school grades. Parental understanding constitutes a relatively untapped reservoir of knowledge available to teachers, school counsellors and administrators, education policy makers, and beyond. It makes sense to ask parents about their children when assessing those individual differences that contribute to better educational outcomes.

Keywords: Self-other agreement; academic achievement; industriousness; life satisfaction; positive affect; negative affect; personality ratings

Self- Versus Parent-Ratings of Industriousness, Affect, and Life Satisfaction in Relation to Academic Outcomes

Despite certain methodological and substantive problems, psychological and educational assessment continues to rely heavily on self-report methodology for any construct that is not related to cognitive ability. It is efficient, convenient, and often the only means of gathering information about constructs of interest to employers, educators, counsellors, and clinicians. Nonetheless, response distortion in the shape of impression management and self-deceptive enhancement can be a major threat to the validity of these assessments (e.g., Paulhus, Bruce, & Trapnell, 1995; Paulhus & Reid, 1991; Ziegler, MacCann, & Roberts, 2011). One method of countering this problem is to use ratings supplied by another person (i.e., other-ratings). Research to date indicates that self- and other-ratings converge to some extent, correlating at about .50 for adults and .30 for adolescents (Barbaranelli, Caprara, Rabasca, & Pastorelli, 2007; Connolly, Kavanagh, & Viswesvaran, 2007; Laidra, Allik, Harro, Merenäkk & Harro, 2006). In adult samples, there is some evidence that both self- and other-ratings show evidence of predictive validity, and that other-reports show incremental predictive validity beyond what is predicted by self-reports (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012; Fiedler, Oltmanns, & Turkheimer, 2004). If other-ratings tap unique, trait-relevant information, there is an argument for including them in educational assessments (Connelly & Ones, 2010).

This topic is of particular importance in educational settings due to the growth of interest in the role of noncognitive constructs in educational achievement and the widespread use of self-report instruments to assess these skills (e.g., Lee & Shute, 2010; MacCann, Fogarty, & Roberts, 2012; Wang, MacCann, Zhaung, Liu, & Roberts, 2009). Existing research suggests that other-ratings of personality may predict academic achievement more strongly than self-ratings, and may even incrementally predict academic achievement beyond

self-ratings (e.g., Connelly & Ones, 2010; MacCann, Lipnevich, & Roberts, 2012; Wagerman & Funder, 2006). However, most research to date has been limited to broad domain levels of personality (e.g., the Big Five), and has been conducted with university students or adults rather than children.

The present study was designed to address these limitations by examining both self- and parent-ratings of affect (school feelings), life satisfaction, and industriousness in students aged between 12 and 15 years. We selected these variables on the basis that they have been shown to be related to academic achievement and have also been the subject of self-other studies. In the literature review that follows, we draw together the largely separate fields of determinants of educational achievement and self- versus other-reports. For each of the three constructs listed above, we begin by reviewing research linking them to academic achievement before reviewing the literature on self- versus other-ratings (including the possible incremental validity of other-ratings over self-ratings).

1.1. Personality and Academic Achievement

The Big Five model of personality (e.g., Goldberg, 1990) separates personality into the broad domains of *Extraversion*, *Agreeableness*, *Conscientiousness*, *Neuroticism*, and *Openness*. Of these five domains, only *Conscientiousness* consistently predicts academic achievement across all educational levels (Poropat, 2009). Some underlying facets of *Conscientiousness* show stronger prediction of academic achievement than others (Nofle & Robins, 2007). In high school students, the *Conscientiousness* facet of *Industriousness* shows the strongest relationship with academic achievement (MacCann, Duckworth, & Roberts, 2009; MacCann et al., 2012), and it is this facet of personality that we examine in the current study.

Research comparing self- and other-ratings of personality shows that other-ratings exhibit stronger correlations with academic outcomes than self-reports (Connelly & Ones,

2010; Wagerman & Funder, 2006). In addition, Connelly and Ones (2010) found that other-rated personality incrementally predicted academic achievement beyond self-ratings, but not vice-versa (i.e., self-ratings did *not* incrementally predict beyond other ratings). The evidence for the validity of other-ratings is even stronger when those being rated are children or adolescents and the raters are parents or teachers. Bratko, Chamorro-Premuzic, and Saks (2006) found that peer-ratings of Conscientiousness explained an additional 9% of academic achievement beyond self-reports. MacCann et al. (2012) found that parent-ratings of Conscientiousness explained over twice as much variation in grades than self-rated Conscientiousness.

1.2. Feelings about School and Academic Achievement

Feelings about school are an expression of affect, which has been described as the emotional component of subjective well-being (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003). These feelings, whether positive or negative, are closely tied to academic goals and their attainment, to test anxiety, and to the school environment (Schutz & DeCuir, 2002). Suldo, Shaffer, and Riley (2008) found a positive relationship ($r = .35$) between academic achievement and high school attachment. Gilman and Heubner (2006) found that students who were highly satisfied with their school life showed higher levels of adaptation in both academic and psychosocial realms.

Regarding the relative merits of self- versus other-ratings, the ability of parents to accurately judge their children's feelings about school is difficult to gauge. Whereas personality tends to manifest itself in behaviour, feelings are private and must be disclosed before they become evident to others (Dobewall, Realo, Allik, Esko, & Metspalu, 2012). The self-disclosure literature suggests that as adolescence progresses, self-disclosure to parents decreases (Keijsers, Frijns, Branje, & Meeus, 2009; Kerr & Stattin, 2000). Thus, the amount

mothers and fathers know about their children begins to change with adolescence, as young people become less willing to disclose information.

On this basis, one might expect self-reports to have higher validity in this area and there is some empirical support for this proposition. Watson, Hubbard, and Wiese (2000) reported that self-other agreement was consistently higher for personality than for affect measures. Similarly, Spain et al. (2000) found that self-judgments were more accurate in predicting aspects of personality that were more internal in nature, such as the tendency to experience negative emotional states. Vazire (2010) found that self-reports were consistently more accurate when judging low observability traits such as anxiety and self-esteem. The best judge of how the child feels about school may be the individual, as it appears that the individual has an advantage over the observer when it comes to knowledge of emotional experience. The present study helps to clarify what is still an uncertain area in self- versus other-ratings by exploring parent-reports of both positive and negative feelings about school.

1.3. Life Satisfaction

If feelings are the emotional component of subjective well-being, then life satisfaction is the cognitive component (Diener et al., 2003). Life satisfaction is the subjective appraisal of one's contentment with life either globally or within specific domains such as family, work, or school (Suldo, Riley, & Shaffer, 2006). Rode et al. (2005) found that life satisfaction significantly predicted GPA in college students after controlling for traditional predictors such as IQ and gender. Gilman and Huebner (2006) found that adolescent students reporting high levels of global life satisfaction also reported higher GPAs than students with low life satisfaction. Salmela-Aro and Tynkkynen (2010) tracked a group of 954 Finnish ninth-graders as they moved into post-comprehensive schooling. They found that adolescents with high GPAs were more likely to report high levels of life satisfaction across the period of

the study. Lewis, Huebner, Malone, and Valois (2011) also found a positive relationship between life satisfaction and GPA.

The literature on self-other ratings of life satisfaction is rather expansive. For example, Judge, Locke, Durham and Kluger (1998; see also Lepper, 1998) reported substantial correlations between self-reports and significant other-reports on measures of life satisfaction among adults. A meta-analysis by Schneider and Schimmack (2009) found that the average correlation between self- and other-ratings of life satisfaction was .42. These authors also drew attention to a range of moderator variables, such as the closeness of the relationship between the subject and the observer. More recently, Dobewall, Realo, Allik, Esko, & Metspalu (2012) examined self-other agreement in subjective well-being and found a correlation of .55 between the two measures. We are unaware of any comparisons of self-versus other-reports in the domain of educational achievement. The present study will help to fill this gap in the literature.

1.4. Research Aims

The primary aim of this study was to determine whether parent-ratings of their child's positive feelings towards school, negative feelings towards school, life satisfaction, and industriousness could help to explain variance in academic achievement. To accomplish this goal, it was firstly necessary to demonstrate that these four variables were related to academic achievement and, secondly, to demonstrate that parent ratings provided a new and valuable source of information. Accordingly we hypothesised that: (a) all four constructs will predict students' GPA, for both self- and parent-reports; and (b) other-reports will explain additional variance in GPA above and beyond what is accounted for by self-reports.

Method

2.1. Participants

The student sample consisted of 383 participants (194 males). Participants were aged between 12 and 15 years with the majority aged 13 (73.4%) or 14 (22.7%). Most participants reported living in a rural/suburban setting (62%) and were Black (13.3%), White/Other (70.8%), or Hispanic (15.1%).

The parent sample consisted of 374 participants (data were missing for 9 individuals). Mothers accounted for 83% of parents and fathers 13%, with the remainder related to the student as either extended family or legal guardian. Parent ages ranged from 29 to over 60 with 58.5% falling in the 40 to 49 year-old age group.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Demographics

The demographics section of both student and parent questionnaires contained items on age, gender, ethnicity, and whether the student lived in an urban or a rural area. The parent questionnaire also asked about the primary language spoken at home and the relationship of the accompanying adult to the student (e.g., mother, father, guardian).

2.2.2 Grade Point Average (GPA)

Students and parents reported the students' letter grades in four subjects (language, mathematics, science, and social studies) and these were transformed into numerical scores (from A+ = 12 to F = 0). The average score across all four subjects was calculated separately for self-reported GPA and parent-reported GPA.

2.2.3. Feelings about School Questionnaire

This 44-item scale measures positive affect (19 items) and negative affect (25 items) associated with school-related activities (Lipnevich, MacCann, Bertling, Naemi, & Roberts, 2012). Students rated how frequently they experienced specific emotions in the past month

when doing after school activities (18 items), homework (14 items), and class work or tests (12 items). Items were contextualized for each activity (e.g., “When doing homework: I have felt TIRED”). Items were rated on a four-point Likert scale: (1) *Never or rarely*, (2) *Sometimes*, (3) *Often*, and (4) *Usually or Always*.

2.2.4. Student’s Life Satisfaction Scale

These seven items (e.g., “I have a good life”) were taken from Heubner (1991). The scale employs a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) *Strongly disagree* to (6) *Strongly agree*.

2.2.5. Industriousness

Participants completed the 10-item Industriousness scale developed and validated by MacCann et al. (2009). Items (e.g., “I make an effort”) were rated on a 5-point Likert scale from (1) *Not at all like me*, to (5) *Very much like me*.

2.2.5. Parent-Ratings

The set of measures described above were all completed by the students. To achieve the aims of this study, parallel versions of each instrument were created for completion by the accompanying parent/guardian. These parallel versions contained the same items but with the word “I” replaced by “my child” (e.g., “My child makes an effort”). Parents were also asked for the student’s most recent GPA. Throughout this paper, we use the term “parent-ratings” to refer to ratings of the students made by the parents and “self-ratings” to refer to the ratings made by the students.

2.2.6. Other Measures

Additional measures included questions relating to health and wellness, food habits, and emotional management. These data were not analysed in the current paper.

2.3. Procedure

Students took up to 90 minutes to complete the proctored, self-paced, computerized test battery. Whilst they were doing so, parents completed paper-and-pencil versions of the same measures. Tests and protocols were approved by the Educational Testing Service Human Ethics Review Committee.

3. Results

3.1 Data Screening

A total of 14 cases were deleted because they were: (a) deemed to be multivariate outliers, or (b) contained out-of-range values, or (c) contained inconsistent response patterns (e.g., all 1's, even where the direction of the item had been reversed). As part of the data screening process, student- and parent-ratings of GPA were compared to see how much student scores differed from parent scores. A total of 12 cases with a score difference greater than 3 points (equal to one full grade) were deleted, leaving a sample of 357. These 26 deletions had little impact on the demographic composition of the sample.

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for all variables are shown in Table 1.

A comparison of mean scores for self- versus parent-reports showed that self-reports were significantly lower for life satisfaction but significantly higher for negative school feelings and for industriousness. Self-reports were significantly more reliable for life satisfaction, but significantly less reliable for industriousness and for positive feelings towards school (with no differences in reliability for negative feelings towards school). Despite these differences, reliability estimates for all ratings were high enough to suggest that correlations were not unduly attenuated.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Key Study Variables

Variable	<i>N</i>	# Items	α	Mean	SD	Cohen's <i>d</i>	<i>M</i> (compares α)
GPA (self-report)	350	na	na	9.02	1.70		
GPA (parent-report)	350	na	na	8.99	1.74		
Positive Feelings (self-report)	354	19	.91	2.63	.55		
Positive Feelings (parent-report)	333	19	.95	2.67	.57	-0.07	28.64**
Negative Feelings (self-report)	354	25	.93	1.98	.51		
Negative Feelings (parent-report)	334	25	.92	1.60	.37	0.85**	1.52
Life Satisfaction (self-report)	356	7	.86	4.67	.94		
Life Satisfaction (parent-report)	347	7	.81	4.92	.77	-0.29**	7.07**
Industriousness (self-report)	354	10	.86	3.67	.65		
Industriousness (parent-report)	344	10	.94	3.43	.86	0.31**	52.94**

Note. Significant differences self- vs parent-reported mean scores were calculated using *t*-tests. Significant differences between self- versus parent-reported alpha values were calculated using Hakstian and Whalen's (1976) significance test.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

3.2 Correlation and Regression Analysis

Pearson correlations between all variables are shown in Table 2. The upper triangle represents self-reports and the lower triangle represents parent-reports. Correlations between self- and parent-ratings for each variable are shown in the main diagonal.

Table 2.

Correlations for Self-Ratings (upper triangle) and Parent-Ratings (lower triangle)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. GPA	(.90 ^{**})	.07	-.23 ^{**}	.19 ^{**}	.50 ^{**}
2. Positive Feelings	.28 ^{**}	(.30 ^{**})	-.06	.41 ^{**}	.44 ^{**}
3. Negative Feelings	-.19 ^{**}	-.47 ^{**}	(.27 ^{**})	-.36 ^{**}	-.23 ^{**}
4. Life Satisfaction	.25 ^{**}	.47 ^{**}	-.46 ^{**}	(.39 ^{**})	.39 ^{**}
5. Industriousness	.55 ^{**}	.57 ^{**}	-.20 ^{**}	.32 ^{**}	(.55 ^{**})

Note. $N = 331$ to 356 due to pairwise exclusion.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

With the exception of parent-reported positive feelings, all four noncognitive constructs predicted GPA, whether student or parent ratings were used. Hypothesis 1 was therefore supported. The highest correlation in both cases involved Industriousness. Self- and parent-reports showed much the same magnitude of correlations with GPA. In fact, they were statistically equivalent except for the bivariate relations between GPA and Positive School Feelings where a Fisher's z -test revealed a difference between the coefficients ($z = 2.67$, $p = .004$, one-tailed).

The main aim of the current study was to determine whether parent-ratings could explain additional variance in GPA once student self-ratings had been considered. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to address this question. The student ratings for industriousness, positive school feelings, negative school feelings, and life satisfaction were therefore entered at Step 1. Collectively, the four variables accounted for 28.6% of the variability in student-reported GPA, $\Delta F(4, 318) = 31.91$, $p < .001$. Entering parent ratings of all four variables at Step 2 accounted for an additional 12.1% of the variance, $\Delta F(4, 314) =$

16.01, $p < .001$. In order to gauge the consistency of this effect, four sets of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with each analysis focussing on a separate variable.

Table 3

Results of Four Separate Hierarchical Regression Analyses Showing Incremental Variance in GPA Contributed by Parent-Ratings

Variable	ΔR^2	ΔF	df_1	df_2	Sig. ΔF
Regression 1. Positive School Feelings					
Step 1: Self-report	.01	1.75	1	320	.19
Step 2: Parent-report	.08	24.93	1	319	.00
Regression 2. Negative School Feelings					
Step 1: Self-report	.05	17.45	1	324	.00
Step 2: Parent-report	.02	6.04	1	323	.01
Regression 3. Life Satisfaction					
Step 1: Self-report	.03	12.18	1	341	.00
Step 2: Parent-report	.04	13.73	1	340	.00
Regression 4. Industriousness					
Step 1: Self-report	.25	114.86	1	337	.00
Step 2: Parent-report	.11	56.84	1	336	.00

The results of these individual analyses, which are shown in Table 3, demonstrate that the incremental effect of parent-ratings was strongest for positive school feelings and industriousness and also present to a lesser extent in the case of negative school feelings and life satisfaction.

4. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to compare self- and parent-reports of life satisfaction, feelings about school, and industriousness in terms of their relationship with GPA. In general, our hypotheses were supported: Both self- and parent-reports predicted GPA (with the one

exception of self-reported positive feelings towards school), and parent-reports incrementally predicted GPA above and beyond self-reports with the effect being strongest in the case of industriousness. We discuss the findings for each variable separately before dealing with the limitations of this study and the implications of our findings for assessment practices in education.

4.1. Industriousness

Self-ratings for industriousness were higher than parent-ratings, perhaps reinforcing a popular stereotype that parents do not think their children work hard enough. It should be noted, however, that the parent-ratings were still above the midpoint of the scale, suggesting that their ratings were not motivated by reluctance to acknowledge the efforts of their children. A more accurate interpretation of these data is that children think they are working harder than their parents think they are working. There are several possibilities for this discrepancy. First, parental judgments of effort are likely to be based on observable characteristics such as the amount of time spent studying versus time spent doing other activities. Second, parents may rely on alternate sources of information such as their child's current and previous school performance, teacher reports, and comparisons with other students. Thus, when asked to rate effort and to report achievement separately, there may have been some criterion contamination, especially for parents. Put differently, when parents were asked to rate industriousness, their ratings may have been partly influenced by knowledge of the student's GPA history.

In addition to the construct-related sources of variation, self-enhancing bias may also be operating in the case of the student ratings (MacCann et al., 2010; Paulhus & Reid, 1991). In fact, it could be operating for both parents and students but the effect may be more pronounced for students, giving rise to the mean difference.

The correlation between self- and parent-ratings was in line with meta-analytic estimates for self-other correlations of adult personality (Connelly & Ones, 2010; Connolly et al., 2007), suggesting that adolescents may be as accurate as adults in rating their levels of Conscientiousness. The prediction of GPA was quite high for both self- and parent-reports – considerably higher than reported in previous research (e.g., MacCann et al., 2009; Poropat, 2009). A plausible explanation for the elevated validity coefficients is the use of a common methodology to obtain ratings of Industriousness and academic grades. However, we must point out that the common methodology does not appear to have inflated other validity coefficients, some of which are below levels reported in the literature.

4.2. Positive and Negative School Feelings

Although the mean scores for parent- and student-rated positive school feelings did not differ and the two sets of ratings were positively correlated, parent-ratings were significantly associated with GPA whereas student self-ratings were not. Furthermore, the two correlation coefficients were significantly different. The unexpected finding here was the lack of relationship between student-rated positive school feelings and GPA. The literature (e.g., Gilman & Heubner, 2006) led us to believe that a positive association would be found for both student- and parent-ratings. Because the students did not feel any more or less positive than their parents indicated (the means were the same), it is most probable that the source of these ratings differed. One likely possibility is that the positioning of this survey very early in the school year meant that academic concerns were not uppermost in the minds of the students. They were about to commence a new school year, a time of re-engagement with classmates. At this time of the year, positive social considerations rather than academic concerns may have been more relevant for adolescents. For parents, by contrast, academic concerns may always be relevant.

Adolescents reported significantly greater negative school feelings than their parents, a finding that is consistent with other research showing that adolescents are unlikely to report problems to their parents (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). The correlation between the self- and parent-ratings was significant and there were no differences in correlations with GPA. Taken together, these findings indicate that parent-ratings are at least as valid as student ratings, an outcome that was not anticipated on the basis of research showing that self-ratings of feelings tend to be more accurate (e.g., Vazire, 2010). A possible explanation is that parents are more sensitised to the feelings of their children in relation to school because so many family interactions are based around the demands of school life. The parents are often forced to adopt coaxing roles and cues are available to help them understand how the child feels about different school activities.

4.3. Life Satisfaction

Self-ratings of life satisfaction were lower for students than parents but were still normal for this age group (Proctor, Linley, & Maltby, 2009). It was a case of parent-ratings being high, rather than student self-ratings being low. Parents conceivably made optimistic life satisfaction judgments based on favourable aspects of their child's life while discounting less favourable negative aspects which, as discussed above, they may not even know about. The difference in means may also have been the consequence of a halo effect. The halo effect happens when judgments are made based on one or two prominent qualities that may overshadow less prominent qualities. Parent and student ratings were moderately correlated and both sets of ratings were significantly correlated with GPA.

4.4 Predicting Academic Outcomes: Self- Versus Parent-Ratings

The psychometric data for the individual scales support the findings of other studies. That is, self-ratings of industriousness, positive and negative school feelings, and life satisfaction are correlated with school grades. We have seen in this study that parent-ratings

of these same traits are also correlated with school grades. From a pragmatic viewpoint, the key question is then whether parent-ratings can tell us anything that we do not already know from the student self-ratings. The answer is “yes”. The hierarchical regression analyses indicated that, overall, parent-ratings explain an additional 12.1% of the variance in school grades. Quite clearly, the best situation is to have access to both student self- and parent other-ratings. These findings supporting the use of other-ratings in education are consistent with the outcomes of the meta-analysis conducted by Connelly and Ones (2010), particularly in relation to the predictive validity of other-ratings of Conscientiousness.

4.5. Limitations and Future Research Directions

In the current study, academic achievement was measured using self-reported GPA. This measure correlated strongly with parent-reported GPA, suggesting that the measure was valid. Furthermore, the results of this study did not change, whether a combined measure of parent and student reports of GPA was used or just parent or student GPA reports. However, an objective measure of GPA using a time lapse between testing and academic outcomes would reduce concerns about criterion contamination.

In terms of other future research directions, Connelly and Ones (2010) stressed the benefits of securing ratings from more than one other person. In the present study, we obtained ratings from whichever parent brought the student to the testing site. That led to a large imbalance in favour of mothers (83%). Although we have not reported the details because of the low power involved in the analyses, we found no differences in study outcomes, whether ratings were provided by a father or whether the child was a male or a female. Future research could determine whether gender of parent and child has any effect on the validity of other-ratings. The nature of the relationship between parent and child is another interesting avenue for future research. It is conceivable that dysfunctional parenting styles (e.g., Parker, Roussos, Hadzi-Pavlovic, Mitchell, Wilhelm, & Austin, 1997) would lead

to situations where parent-reports are a poor source of information about the child's psychological profile.

4.5. Conclusions and Implications

Our findings indicate that while self-reports remain useful and informative, the utility of other-reports, and in particular parent-reports, should not be underrated. Both the self and others possess unique insights (Vazire & Mehl, 2008). Parents, as observers of their children since birth, know a great deal about their children's attitudes and behaviours. Parental understanding constitutes a relatively untapped reservoir of knowledge available to teachers, school counsellors and administrators, education policy makers, and beyond. The average parent (or guardian) knows his or her child better than just about anyone else; it makes sense to ask parents about their children when assessing those individual differences that contribute to better educational outcomes.

References

- Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., Rabasca, A., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). A questionnaire for measuring the Big Five in late childhood. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 645-664. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00051-X
- Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 613–636. doi: 10.1037/a0026739
- Bratko, D., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Saks, Z. (2006). Personality and school performance: Incremental validity of self- and peer-ratings over intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*, 131-142. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.12.015

- Connelly, B. S., & Ones, D. S. (2010). An other perspective on personality: Meta-analytic integration of observers' accuracy and predictive validity. *Psychological Bulletin, 36*, 1092-1122. doi: 10.1037/a0021212
- Connolly, J. J., Kavanagh, E. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2007). The convergent validity between self and observer ratings of personality: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*, 110-117. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2389.2007.00371.x.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55*, 34-43. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.34
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 403-425. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056
- Dobewall, H., Realo, A., Allik, J., Esko, T., & Metspalu, A. (2012). Self-other agreement in happiness and life satisfaction: The role of personality traits. *Social Indicators Research. doi: 10.1007/s11205-012-0157-y*
- Fiedler, E. R., Oltmanns, T. F., Turkheimer, E. (2004). Traits associated with personality disorders and adjustment to military life: Predictive validity of self and peer reports. *Military Medicine, 169*, 207-211. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00066-7
- Gilman, R., & Huebner, E. S. (2000). Review of life satisfaction measures for adolescents. *Behaviour Change, 17*, 178-195. doi: 10.1375/bech.17.3.178
- Gilman, R., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Characteristics of adolescents who report very high life satisfaction. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*, 311-319. doi:10.1007/s10964-006-9036-7
- Hakstian, A. R., & Whalen, T. E. (1976). A k-sample significance test for independent alpha coefficients. *Psychometrika, 41*, 219-231.

- Huebner, E. S. (1991). Correlates of life satisfaction in children. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *6*, 103-111. doi:10.1037/h0088805
- Huebner, E. S., Suldo, S. M., Smith, L. C., & McKnight, C. G. (2004). Life satisfaction in children and youth: Empirical foundations and implications for school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, *41*, 81-93. doi:10.1002/pits.10140
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 17-34. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.17
- Keijsers, L., Frijns, T., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W. (2009). Developmental links of adolescent disclosure, parental solicitation, and control with delinquency: Moderation by parental support. *Developmental Psychology*, *45*, 1314-1327. doi:10.1037/a0016693
- Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, *36*, 366-380. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.36.3.366
- Laidra, K., Allik, J., Harro, M., Merenäkk, L., & Harro, J. (2006). Agreement among adolescents, parents, and teachers on adolescent personality. *Assessment*, *13*, 187-196. doi:10.1177/1073191106287125
- Lee, J., & Shute, V. (2010). Personal and socio-contextual factors in K-12 academic performance: An integrative perspective on student learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *45*, 185-202. doi:10.1080/00461520.2010.493471
- Lepper, H. S. (1998). Use of other-reports to validate subjective well-being measures. *Social Indicators Research*, *44*, 367-379. doi:10.1023/A:1006872027638
- Lipnevich, A. A., MacCann, C., Bertling, J. P., Naemi, B., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). Emotional reactions toward school situations: Relationships with academic outcomes.

Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 30, 387-401.

doi:10.1177/0734282912449445

Lewis, A. D., Huebner, E. S., Malone, P. S., & Valois, R. F. (2011). Life satisfaction and student engagement in adolescents. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 40, 249-262.

doi:10.1007/s10964-010-9517-6

MacCann, C., Duckworth, A. L., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). Empirical identification of the major facets of conscientiousness. *Learning & Individual Differences*, 19, 451-458.

doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2009.03.007

MacCann, C., Fogarty, G. J., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). Strategies for success in education: Time management is more important for part-time than full-time community college students. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22, 618-623.

doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2011.09.015

MacCann, C., Wang, L., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2010). Emotional intelligence and the eye of the beholder: Comparing self- and parent-rated situational judgments in adolescents. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 673-676.

doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.08.009

MacCann, C., Lipnevich, A. A., & Roberts, R. D. (2012) Parents know best! Comparing self- and parent-reported personality in predicting academic achievement. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Noftle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93,

116-130. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.1.116

Parker, G., Roussos, J., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Mitchell, P., Wilhelm, K., & Austin, M-P. (1997). The development of a refined measure of dysfunctional parenting and

- assessment of its relevance in patients with affective disorders. *Psychological Medicine*, 27, 1193-1203. doi: 10.1017/S003329179700545X
- Paulhus, D. L., Bruce, N. M., & Trapnell, P. D. (1995). Effects of self-presentation strategies on personality profiles and their structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 100-108. doi: 10.1177/0146167295212001
- Paulhus, D. L., & Reid, D. B. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 307-317.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.2.307
- Poropat, A. E. (2009). A meta-analysis of the five-factor model of personality and academic performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 322-338. doi:10.1037/a0014996
- Proctor, C. L., Linley, P. A., & Maltby, J. (2009). Youth life satisfaction: A review of the literature. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10, 583-630.
doi:10.1007/s10902-008-9110-9
- Rode, J. C., Arthaud-Day, M. L., Mooney, C. H., Near, J. P., Baldwin, T. T., Bommer, W. H., & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Life satisfaction and student performance. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4, 421-433. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2005.19086784
- Salmela-Aro, K., & Tynkkynen, L. (2010). Trajectories of life satisfaction across the transition to post-compulsory education: Do adolescents follow different pathways? *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39, 870-81. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9464-2
- Schimmack, U., Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Life-satisfaction is a momentary judgment and a stable personality characteristic: The use of chronically accessible and stable sources. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 345-384. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.05008
- Schutz, P. A., & DeCuir, J. T. (2002). Inquiry on emotions in education. *Educational Psychologist*, 37, 125-134. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3702_7

- Spain, J. S., Eaton, L. G., & Funder, D. C. (2000). Perspectives on personality: The relative accuracy of self versus others for the prediction of emotion and behavior. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 837-867. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00118
- Suldo, S. M., Riley, K. N., & Shaffer, E. J. (2006). Academic correlates of children and adolescents' life satisfaction. *School Psychology International, 27*, 567-582. doi:10.1177/0143034306073411
- Suldo, S. M., Shaffer, E. J., & Riley, K. N. (2008). A social-cognitive-behavioral model of academic predictors of adolescents' life satisfaction. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 56-69. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.56
- Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person? The self–other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 281-300. doi:10.1037/a0017908
- Vazire, S. (2006). Informant reports: A cheap, fast, and easy method for personality assessment. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40*, 472-481. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.003
- Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2008). Knowing me, knowing you: The accuracy and unique predictive validity of self-ratings and other-ratings of daily behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1202–1216. doi: 10.1037/a0013314
- Wagerman, S. A., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Acquaintance reports of personality and academic achievement: A case for conscientiousness. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*, 221-229. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.03.001
- Wang, L., MacCann, C., Zhuang, X., Liu, O. L., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). Assessing teamwork skills: A multi-method approach. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 24*, 108-124. doi:10.1177/0829573509335470

Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D. (2000). Self-other agreement in personality and affectivity: The role of acquaintanceship, trait visibility, and assumed similarity.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, 546-558. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.78.3.546

Ziegler, M., MacCann, C., & Roberts, R. D. (Eds.) (2011). *New perspectives on faking in personality assessment*. New York: Oxford University Press.