The Influence of Personality on HE Students'
Confidence in their Academic Abilities

Briony D. Pulford
University of Leicester, UK

Harjit Sohal
University of Wolverhampton, UK

Abstract

Students' confidence in their academic abilities, measured with the Individual Learning Profile (ILP) scale, was examined in relation to their personality traits and grades. To validate the ILP, in Study 1, factor analysis of data from 3003 students extracted six factors (Reading and Writing, Hard IT, Numeracy, Time Management, Speaking, and Easy IT) with good internal reliability. Subsequently, in Study 2, 130 students completed the refined ILP, and scales measuring the Big Five, Perfectionism, Anxiety, and Self-Esteem. Between 10% and 31% of the variance in four ILP factors, but not IT skills, could be predicted by personality traits, but Self-Esteem and Anxiety were not influential. Higher conscientiousness and openness positively predicted higher confidence in reading and writing, while agreeableness and three aspects of perfectionism predicted confidence in numeracy skills. Being introvert and female were predictive of lower confidence in speaking, as were low conscientiousness and the perfectionistic desire to be organised. Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and the perfectionistic desire to be organised were strong predictors of confidence in time-management skills, which in turn predicted first year GPA. The reliability of the ILP was examined over the course of a one-year interval.

Keywords: Personality, Confidence, Big Five, Self-beliefs, Individual Learning Profile, Academic Achievement, Individual Differences.

When things get tough for students in Higher Education they need the self-belief that they can succeed, and the confidence to keep persevering, or else they may be more likely to give up. The beliefs that students hold about their academic abilities are important, but may be influenced not only by the student's true ability but also by their personality. While self-perceptions of academic competence have been investigated in children (cf. Kinard, 2001), little is known about how adult HE students perceive their academic strengths and weaknesses and whether these relate to personality. The current work seeks to address this gap.

In 2001 the University of Wolverhampton introduced the Individual Learning Profile (ILP) questionnaire to first year students, in an attempt to identify students at risk of failure and enhance personal tutoring practices to build confidence and motivation. The ILP was broadly based on a questionnaire developed by De Montfort University to help examine why students underachieve, and asks questions about students' confidence in speaking and listening, reading and researching, time-management, IT Skills, numeracy skills, and writing. The current study was designed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the ILP as an instrument to measure students' perceived academic strengths and weaknesses. The influence of personality traits on students' perceived academic strengths and weaknesses (as measured by the ILP) will also be examined as perceptions of abilities can be biased. Ehrlinger and Dunning (2003) suggest that the general views held by people about their abilities, more than the task itself, influence how well people perceive they have performed. In their series of four studies, people with high opinions of their ability thought they

had done well on several tests, overestimating performance, whereas those with unfavourable self-views thought they had done poorly. Thus we decided to investigate whether factors such as self-esteem and anxiety influence ILP scores or mediate the relationship between the Big Five and the ILP scores. Of the Big Five personality factors (Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) Conscientiousness predicts actual academic achievement (Busato, Prins, Elshout, & Hamaker, 2000), but how confidence in abilities is influenced by these personality factors remains to be seen.

Another factor that may influence how people perceive their abilities is their level of perfectionism. The most perfectionistic students may be the most critical of their abilities and under-report their strengths. Hewitt and Flett (1991) define perfectionism as the tendency to engage in 'setting unrealistic standards and trying to attain these standards, selective attention to and overgeneralization of failure, stringent self-evaluations, and all or none thinking where only total success or total failure exist as outcomes' (p. 456). Setting high standards is often beneficial for performance, but when nothing but perfect performance is perceived to be good enough these originally positive expectations may instead lead to the development of a negative self-concept, and a fear–of–failure syndrome.

Recent research has found an association between perfectionism and computer anxiety (King, Bond, & Blandford, 2002) and statistics anxiety (Walsh & Ugumba-Agwunobi, 2001) among students. Because basic computer skills are an important component of many different university courses, computer related anxiety can induce an unsuccessful university experience and may result in academic under achievement. Onwuegbuzie and Daley (1999) found that other-oriented perfectionism (i.e., unrealistic standards and perfectionistic motivations for others) and socially prescribed perfectionism (i.e., the belief that significant others expect oneself to be perfect) positively predict interpretation anxiety, computational self-concept, and fear of asking for help.

The aims of these two studies are firstly to examine the reliability of the ILP, then to determine which personality traits predict how confident students feel about their studying-related abilities via scores on the ILP subscales. Students' perceptions about their academic strengths and weaknesses will be monitored over a one–year period as they experience university life, to see if they change. Finally, we aim to discover if the ILP is a useful predictor of academic success, as measured by first year grades and GPA score on the Psychology degree.

<div align="center">Study 1</div>
<div align="center">*Method*</div>

Participants

To investigate the dimensionality of the ILP, the responses of 3003 first-year undergraduate students were collected in large group testing sessions in their first week at a large British university.

Materials and Procedure

Students' perceived academic strengths and weaknesses were assessed using the Individual Learning Profile (ILP) questionnaire. The 43 items are designed to measure perceived abilities in: Speaking and Listening (6 items), Reading and Researching (6 items), Writing (6 items), Time management (6 items), Numeracy Skills (8 items) and IT Skills (11 items). Students indicated to what extent each question/statement was descriptive of their academic competence on the scale 1 'Never', 2 'Sometimes', 3 'Mostly', 4 'Always'. To date, there are no published factor structure or reliability reports of this scale.

<div align="center">*Results*</div>

Principal components analysis (PCA) with oblique rotation resulted in six factors that had eigenvalues greater that 1 and accounted for 54.06% of the observed variance in scores. The 6–factor solution was also supported by Cattell's scree plot. The factor loading of the items ranged

from a minimum of .40 up to .87. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .925.

The new 12–item factor 'Reading and Writing' accounted for 24.6% of the variance, covering ability to read and understand, and to express oneself accurately in writing. Five items based on advanced levels of computer literacy, 'Hard IT Skills' such as using databases, PowerPoint, and spreadsheets, explained 9.3% of the variance. 'Numeracy Skills', eight items asking about confidence working with numbers, fractions, decimals etc., explained 7.7% of the variance. There were six items measuring 'Time Management', the ability to hand in work on time, use a timetable to plan work and leaving time to proofread work etc. that accounted for 5.4% of variance in scores. Four items accounting for 4.1% of variance in the scores covered 'Speaking', which asked about the ability to join into group discussions, give a talk, and ask questions in class. A more general level of computer knowledge, use of the Internet, email and Word, was reflected in the 5–item factor 'Easy IT Skills' which only explained 2.9% of the variance. The final ILP scale thus comprised only 40 items while three items that did not load onto any of the above 6 factors were not used in subsequent analyses. The Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficients of these six factors are .88, .87, .93, .74, .74, .80 respectively, indicating satisfactory to excellent internal consistency reliability (Nunnally, 1978).

FOR MORE DETAILS SEE: http://www.le.ac.uk/pc/bdp5/ILPstructure.htm

Study 2
Method
Participants

130 undergraduate psychology students volunteered as part of a course requirement. 102 students (84 women, 18 men) completed the refined ILP in their first year, and 81 in their second year of studies (67 women, 14 men). Of these students, 53 completed the ILP in both years. They ranged in age from 18 to 46 years, with a mean age of 21.94 (*SD* = 5.64) in year 1 and 22.95 (*SD* = 5.78) in year 2.

Materials

The Individual Learning Profile (ILP). The final 40 items that were validated in Study 1 were answered by the participants in the main study using the 1–4 rating scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were almost identical to those reported in the first Study.

International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). Goldberg's (1999) 50–item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) inventory was used to assess the Big Five personality traits: Openness to experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism (OCEAN). The items are based on one's behaviours and reactions, answered on a 5–point scale, ranging from 1 'Very Accurate' to 5 'Very Inaccurate'. 16 items are reverse-scored. Goldberg (1999) reported a mean α coefficient of .84 for each of the five 10–item scales. A 10–item anxiety subscale was also used from the IPIP with higher scores indicating higher levels of anxiety.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). Self-esteem was assessed using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), a unidimensional measure of global self-esteem consisting of 10 items that are positive or negative statements about self-worth. Respondents rated their level of agreement using a 4–point scale ranging from 0 'Strongly Disagree' to 3 'Strongly Agree', with higher scores representing superior levels of global self-esteem. RSES has high reliability; test–retest correlations typically range from .82 to .88 and Cronbach's alpha (α) for various samples range from .77 to .88 (Rosenberg, 1986).

Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS). Perfectionism was assessed with the 35–item Frost Multi-dimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990). Ratings on the scale 1 'Strongly Disagree' to 5 'Strongly Agree' are broken down into four subscales: Concerns over Mistakes and Doubts (CMD; α = .88); Parental Expectations and Criticism (PEC; α = .89); Personal Standards (PS; α = .78) and Organisation (O; α = .86), based

on the research by Stöber (1998) and Stumpf and Parker (2000). Higher composite subscale scores represent higher levels of perfectionism on each respective dimension. This instrument has been shown to have adequate validity for the individual scales and the whole instrument.

Academic Performance. The grade scale ranges from F0 to A16, with D5 designating a pass. Grades A, B, C and D indicate first class, upper second, lower second and third class grades respectively. The student's final grade for each module was recorded and the grade point average (GPA) computed (the mean of four core and four elective modules studied in their first year, range 4.25 to 14.00, $M = 10.04$, $SD = 1.94$).

Design and Procedure

The participants were given a booklet consisting of the measures, outlined above, in a counterbalanced order, which took around 45 minutes to complete. Testing was in small groups. Confidentiality was assured and ethical guidelines adhered to.

Results

Outliers were examined and five scores on the personality variables that were more than three standard deviations from the mean were reduced to the value three SD from the mean.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Personality Traits and Sex on Year 1 ILP scores

Standard multiple regressions (Enter) were performed to explore the influence of the Personality traits and Sex on the ILP factors. Anxiety was excluded from the regressions as it was highly correlated with neuroticism ($r = .95$). Table 1 shows the standardized beta (β) coefficients for the variables that significantly predict the first-year students' confidence in their academic abilities (ILP scores). Openness and Conscientiousness are positively related to higher Reading and Writing scores, adjusted $R^2 = .10$, $F(11, 90) = 1.97$, $p = .041$. No significant predictors of either Hard IT skills, or Easy IT skills are apparent.

[Table 1 about here]

Agreeableness plus three subscales of perfectionism, Organisation, Personal Standards and Concerns Over Mistakes and Doubts, significantly predict scores on Numeracy Skills, adjusted $R^2 = .23$, $F(11, 90) = 3.76$, $p < .001$. High Organization scores are associated with low perceptions of ability in Speaking, while higher Extraversion and Conscientiousness scores are associated with higher perceptions of speaking ability, and male students (coded as 1) perceived that they were more confident at speaking than female students (coded as 2), adjusted $R^2 = .29$, $F(11, 90) = 4.77$, $p < .001$. Students who score higher on Conscientiousness, Extroversion, and Organisation, are significantly more confident in their Time Management Skills, adjusted $R^2 = .31$, $F(11, 90) = 5.13$, $p < .001$.

Changes in ILP Scores Between First and Second Year

The highly significant correlations between first- and second-year scores for all of the six ILP factors in Table 2 indicate that people who believe themselves to be weak in an area are likely to maintain that belief into the following year of study, concomitantly those with better beliefs about their abilities also maintain these. The *t* test results show that confidence in Numeracy Skills and Reading and Writing skills did not significantly change after a year. IT skills, however, were perceived to have improved significantly after a year on the psychology course. The Easy IT skills scores were already high at the start of the first year, at the top of the range, indicating that most students possessed these skills when they entered university. Conversely, perceptions of Speaking skills and Time Management skills show a significant drop after a year. The six test–retest reliability coefficients range from .49 to .75 over the one year interval. The slightly lower test–retest reliability coefficients for the IT factors may be due to the weaker students becoming more confident in their abilities.

[Table 2 about here]

Relationships Between the Six ILP Factors

Table 3 shows the results of Pearson correlations between the six ILP factors. All of the significant correlations are positive, indicating that perceived strengths tend to be general across

several factors, as are perceived weaknesses. The strong correlation between Hard and Easy IT skills is predictable, as people with advanced IT skills should obviously have mastered the basics beforehand, and those who are less experienced will not have mastered the advanced software packages. People who perceived that they were good at Hard IT reported being better at Numeracy and Speaking skills, but there is no perceived relationship with Time Management or Reading and Writing. Those people who thought that they were strong/weak at Reading and Writing also felt that they were strong/weak at Numeracy, Time Management, and Speaking, but this perception of strengths did not influence perceptions of Hard or Easy IT skills. The only relationships with Easy IT skills are Hard IT and Speaking, which are positive correlations. The Speaking factor significantly and positively correlates with all of the other five factors at around r = .2 to .3.

[Table 3 about here]

In order to clarify these relationships a second-order factor analysis was performed, PCA with oblimin rotation, KMO = .61. The first factor explained 34.5% of the variance and was made up of Easy IT and Hard IT. The second factor explained 21.9% of the variance and was made up of the other four factors; Time Management, Reading and Writing, Speaking, and Numeracy. The two factors correlated r = .17 with each other. We propose that these factors represent the level of experience with computers, and a more general feeling of confidence in ones' academic ability.

Relationships Between Perceptions and Actual Performance

To further investigate the predictive ability of the ILP the grades for four individual core psychology modules and overall first-year GPA scores were entered as criterion variables in multiple linear regressions with the six ILP scores, age and gender as predictor variables.

[Table 4 about here]

Neither age nor sex significantly helped to predict grades on these modules when the other factors had been accounted for, and the ILP factors Reading and Writing and Speaking Skills were not significant predictors of any of the core modules, or the GPA. Thus, students' perceptions about their speaking skills and their reading and writing abilities appear to be unrelated to their actual ability to use these skills to obtain higher grades.

Students who are confident that they have good Time Management and Numeracy Skills performed better in PS1000 (Introduction to Psychology), but higher confidence in Hard IT Skills was associated with lower grades. These three ILP scores explain 13% of the variance of the grades achieved on this module. Ten percent of the variance in achievement on PS1106 (Methods in Psychology) is predicted by higher perceived Numeracy Skills on the ILP, which is consistent with the module's aims to teach and assess statistical skills. The only predictor of grades on PS1107 (Psychology Practicals 1) is Time Management, which accounts for 8% of the variance. Time Management is also the only significant predictor of Level 1 GPA, explaining 4.9 % of the variance in the GPA over all eight modules. Finally, the ILP scores, from 81 participants who completed it in their second year, were entered into a multiple regression with age and gender as predictor variables, but these did not significantly predict the student's second-year GPA.

General Discussion

Our results show that the ILP has good internal reliability, if the 40 items and the six factors identified in this study are used instead of the originally proposed groupings. The ILP measures students' perceptions, and not objective facts about strengths or weaknesses. The results show that personality traits clearly have an influence on how much confidence students have in their academic strengths and weakness, apart from their IT skills, which seem to be more objectively reported. The multiple regression analyses revealed that perceptions of reading and writing abilities are influenced by openness and conscientiousness, with those students who are more conscientious and open having more confidence in their reading and writing abilities.

The hypothesis that perfectionism may be a factor that reduces confidence in appraisals of one's ability was not true for three factors of the ILP; Reading and Writing and the Hard and Easy IT factors. The PEC subscale did not predict any of the ILP scores, but PS and CMD and O were related to confidence in Numeracy and O was also associated with Speaking and Time Management. Students who are less perfectionistic, having fewer concerns over mistakes and doubts and about being organised, but who have higher personal standards, tended to be more confident in their numeracy skills. Those students who had many concerns over their mistakes were more critical and doubtful about their numeracy skills.

Considering confidence in speaking skills, being female was associated with lower confidence in speaking ability. Also, as expected, less extraverted individuals reported lacking confidence when participating in class discussions, giving presentations and speaking to other people. Lower confidence in speaking was also associated with being less conscientious and more perfectionistic about being organised.

Finally, students who were highly conscientious, perfectionist about organisation, or extravert, reported being more confident in their time-management skills. Self-esteem and neuroticism, and thus anxiety–which was almost perfectly correlated with neuroticism, were not found to influence confidence in any perceptions of academic abilities. The fact that the perceptions of IT skills were unaffected by any of the personality traits measured suggests that they may be more objectively reported skills, which may thus possibly reflect the abilities of the student more accurately.

Perceptions and Actual Performance

Students' perceptions, as measured by the ILP did bear some relation to their performance on modules, but surprisingly their confidence in Reading and Writing did not predict any of the grades they achieved. This may indicate that their perceptions of their abilities are unrealistic, and future research could investigate this further with larger sample sizes and a wider range of students studying different subjects. Higher confidence with numbers, which probably reflects better ability, does appear to predict higher grades on the statistics and methodology module PS1006. The students who felt they had good Time Management skills obtained higher grades on PS1007, possibly because only the most organised students who plan their time well can manage to successfully complete the large number of written reports, with tight deadlines. It would also be interesting for future researchers to examine whether the ILP predicts performance on specific skills, rather than just on whole module grades.

The importance of confidence in one's time management has been clearly illustrated from the present results, as it was the sole predictor of Level 1 GPA. Undoubtedly, this supports earlier findings (Campbell & Svenson, 1992) that effective time-management is likely to increase academic performance, as we found that it does relate to a higher overall GPA at the end of the first year. The concept of time management is defined in terms of clusters of behaviours that are deemed to facilitate productivity and alleviate stress (Lay & Schouwenburg, 1993). We would thus encourage the teaching of time-management strategies, which may both increase the ability to manage one's tasks on time as well as improving self-confidence. The ILP might prove to be a useful measure of changes in time-management ability, but whether the self-reported beliefs are truly matched by objective behaviour needs to be investigated.

The correlations between ILP scores in the first and second years provide evidence for the reliability of the measures, and indicate that peoples' confidence in their skills do not tend to alter radically over a year. There is some improvement in confidence in abilities in IT skills, but worryingly the students' confidence in their ability to manage their time and to speak confidently declined over the first year of their studies, perhaps because these skills were being more heavily demanded of them than before and they had become more aware and critical of their abilities. Whether a reduction in confidence causes problems for the students is a question still to be

investigated, for example data on student attrition, course satisfaction, degree classification and career choices could be collected and examined in relation to the ILP.

The students' confidence in reading and writing and numeracy did not alter significantly from year one to two, perhaps indicating that it is the pressure on their time with increasing coursework loads that stretches them in time-management, but that they still feel academically able to cope with the work. The personal tutoring that the students received in their first year does not appear to have increased their self-confidence, as evidenced by most of the second-year ILP scores, apart from IT, not having increased. A replication of these results would be advisable since in our study there was quite a lot of attrition of students between the first and second years of the study, which could possibly have influenced these correlations.

Conclusions

This study has shown the ILP to have good internal reliability, but further research is needed, including larger numbers of male students and evaluating its predictive validity in subjects other than psychology. The theoretical reasons why personality should influence students' confidence and perceptions of ability still remain an interesting avenue for future research. The ILP, we believe, could be used to help students in their personal development planning (PDP) process, as perceptions of their abilities are recorded and thus can be evaluated by the tutor in relation to more objective evidence about the student's progress on the course. Highly overconfident students who do not perceive their own weaknesses need the help of tutors to recognise the areas in which they are weak and need help. Skill deficits may be perceived accurately or inaccurately by students, and this study has shown that personality does influence these perceptions and the student's degree of confidence, hence the tutor may play an important role in determining where the student's confidence is misplaced and whether help is really needed or not. The ILP may also be a useful ice-breaker, to develop rapport between the tutor and student and start a dialogue about how to succeed in HE.

REFERENCES

Busato, V. V., Prins, F. J., Elshout, J. J., & Hamaker, C. (2000). Intellectual ability, learning style, personality, achievement motivation and academic success of psychology students in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29,* 1057–1068.

Campbell, R. L., & Svenson, L. W. (1992). Perceived level of stress among university undergraduate students in Edmonton, Canada. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 75,* 552–554.

Ehrlinger, J., & Dunning, D. (2003). How chronic self-views influence (and potentially mislead) estimates of performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 5–17.

Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14,* 449–468.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7 (pp. 7–28). Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 456–470.

Kinard, E. M. (2001). Perceived and actual academic competence in maltreated children. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 25*, 33–45.

King, J., Bond, T., & Blandford, S. (2002). An investigation of computer anxiety by gender and grade. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 18,* 69–84.

Lay, C. H., & Schouwenburg, H. C. (1993). Trait procrastination, time management, and academic behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 84,* 647–662.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory.* McGraw-Hill, New York.

Onwuegbuzie, A., & Daley, C. (1999). Perfectionism and statistics anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26,* 1089–1102.

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

Rosenberg, M. (1986). *Conceiving the self.* Kreiger: Malabar.

Stöber, J. (1998). The Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale revisited: More perfect with four (instead of six) dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24,* 481–491.

Stumpf, H., & Parker, W. D. (2000). The hierarchical structural analysis of perfectionism and its relation to other personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 837–852.

Walsh, J. J., & Ugumba-Agwunobi, G. (2001). Individual differences in statistics anxiety: The roles of perfectionism, procrastination and trait anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33,* 239–251.

Author Note

Table 1

Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Perceived Academic Strengths and Weaknesses in First Year Students

| | Individual Learning Profile (ILP) Factors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Predictors | Reading & Writing | | Hard IT Skills | | Numeracy Skills | | Time Management | | Speaking | | Easy IT Skills | |
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
Openness	.24	2.16*										
Conscientiousness	.34	2.35*					.43	3.41**	.31	2.43*		
Extraversion							.27	2.77*	.47	4.78**		
Agreeableness					.22	2.28*						
Neuroticism												
Organisation					-.36	2.75*	.25	2.04*	-.28	2.18*		
Concerns Over Mistakes & Doubts					-.36	2.22*						
Personal Standards					.29	2.21*						
Parental Expectations & Criticism												
Self Esteem												
Sex									-.21	2.30*		

Note: $N = 102$. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics, t, and r for the Six Factors of the Individual Learning Profile (ILP) for First and Second Year Students

Measure	Year	Mean	S.D.	*t*	*r*
Reading & Writing (RW)	Year 1	35.56	4.13	-1.02	.61**
(range 12–48)	Year 2	34.97	5.14		
Hard IT Skills (HITS)	Year 1	12.07	3.95	5.05**	.50**
(range 5–20)	Year 2	14.77	3.84		
Numeracy Skills (NS)	Year 1	21.99	4.61	-0.29	.73**
(range 8–32)	Year 2	21.83	5.80		
Time Management (TM)	Year 1	17.38	2.56	-2.55*	.67**
(range 6–24)	Year 2	16.53	3.27		
Speaking (S)	Year 1	10.00	2.32	-4.30**	.75**
(range 4–16)	Year 2	9.08	2.02		
Easy IT Skills (EITS)	Year 1	17.23	2.78	4.99**	.49**
(range 5–20)	Year 2	18.91	1.77		

Note: Statistics are based on 53 participants who completed the ILP in both their first and second years. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

Table 3

Correlations Among Factors of the ILP for First-year Students

Measure	RW	HITS	NS	TM	S	EITS
Reading & Writing (RW)	1.00	.06	.23*	.22*	.26**	.09
Hard IT Skills (HITS)		1.00	.31**	-.00	.30**	.59**
Numeracy Skills (NS)			1.00	.10	.29**	.13
Time Management (TM)				1.00	.22*	-.03
Speaking (S)					1.00	.23*
Easy IT Skills (EITS)						1.00

Note: Pearson *r* correlation. * $p < .05$ level and ** $p < .01$ level. $N = 102$.

Table 4

Multiple Regression Statistics and Standardised Beta Values of the Predictors

of Level 1 GPA and Core Module Performance

| Predictors | Level 1 Core Modules & GPA | | | | |
	PS1000	PS1001	PS1106	PS1107	L1-GPA
Constant	5.89	-	4.94	4.75	7.60
Adjusted R^2	.13	-	.10	.08	.05
F	6.14***	-	12.60***	9.13**	6.18*
Age					
Sex					
Reading & Writing					
Hard IT Skills	-.28**				
Numeracy Skills	.28**		.33***		
Time Management	.19*			.29**	.24*
Speaking Skills					
Easy IT Skills					

* *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01; *** *p* < .001

The Individual Learning Profile

This is not a test. It is confidential and will be seen by a restricted number of people.
Please answer honestly. Do not worry if any section does not seem to apply to you. Please complete it anyway.
Please cross the appropriate box

Section 1: Speaking	always	mostly	sometimes	never
Are you confident about talking* to people you don't know?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you join in class or group discussions?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you ask questions when you don't understand something?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you feel comfortable giving a 'talk' or presentation to a group?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Section 2: Numeracy skills	always	mostly	sometimes	never
Are you confident about working with:				
Numbers	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fractions	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decimals	☐	☐	☐	☐
Percentages	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ratios	☐	☐	☐	☐
Statistics	☐	☐	☐	☐
Graphs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Charts	☐	☐	☐	☐
Section 3: Reading and Writing	always	mostly	sometimes	never
Are you confident about your reading skills?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you able to read fast and understand what you are reading?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you confident in the use of punctuation and grammar?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you able to make sense of a text on first reading?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you confident about your spelling?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can you find information easily by reading?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can you get your own ideas onto paper easily, and find the right words?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Can you put information into your own words without copying big chunks?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you confident about taking notes in lectures?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you confident about using a dictionary and/or thesaurus?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you enjoy writing?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you find it easy to explain what you mean (e.g. find the right words*)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

* = or signs/signing if BSL is your preferred language

Section 4: Time Management

	always	mostly	sometimes	never
Do you consider yourself well organised?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you work to deadlines or hand work in on time?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you know when you study best (e.g. early morning, evening etc)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you complete tasks before your friends?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you use a diary/timetable to help you plan your work?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Do you leave time to check and/or proof read your work?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section 5: IT skills

	always	mostly	sometimes	never
Do you have access to a computer outside of the university?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Have you used computers to support your studies or at work?	☐	☐	☐	☐
Are you confident using computers for:				
word processing	☐	☐	☐	☐
email	☐	☐	☐	☐
internet information (the Web)	☐	☐	☐	☐
spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐	☐
accessing library catalogues and stock	☐	☐	☐	☐
databases	☐	☐	☐	☐
presentations (e.g. Powerpoint)	☐	☐	☐	☐
statistics	☐	☐	☐	☐

ILP Scoring:

Assign 1 point for each 'never'
Assign 2 points for each 'sometimes'
Assign 3 points for each 'mostly'
Assign 4 points for each 'always'

The 6 factors are:

Speaking – 4 items in section 1
Numeracy - 8 items in section 2
Reading and Writing   - 12 items in section 3
Time Management   - 6 items in section 4
Easy IT - first 5 items of section 5
Hard IT - last 5 items of section 5

Take the total score for each factor.