THE USE OF SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY AND A PEER MENTORING PROGRAM TO INCREASE SELF-PERCEPTION IN INTRAMURAL EMPLOYEES

By

ALEXA NELSON

Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering

Purdue University

West Lafayette, Indiana

2017

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May 2020

THE USE OF SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY AND

A PEER MENTORING PROGRAM TO INCREASE

SELF-PERCEPTION IN INTRAMURAL EMPLOYEES

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Taryn Price

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Donna Lindenmeier

Dr. Jason Linsenmeyer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my committee members for their support throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr. Taryn Price for working hard alongside me throughout this entire process. Thank you for continually pushing me to explore new ideas and approaches as I attempted to convert my thoughts into words and sound research. I would like to thank Dr. Donna Lindenmeier for guiding me through learning new statistical approaches and helping me create my questionnaire in a usable format. Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Jason Linsenmeyer for not only supporting me along this process but for providing me with the opportunity to continue to grow professionally. This final product would not be here with out the three of you and for that I am incredibly grateful.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Susan Harter at the University of Denver for allowing me to use her instrument and for providing guidance in the application of the instrument.

I would also like to thank Carley VanOverberghe and Rachael Rayford at Purdue University for allowing me to use their peer mentoring program as the foundation of this research and for always being available to answer any questions regarding the program logistics.

I am also very grateful for my friends and colleagues for providing many much-needed breaks from this grind while pushing me to stay focused and conduct quality research.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my family. Thank you to my mom and dad who provide countless edits on every draft and who asked questions I never thought of. Thank you to my three brothers and my sister-in-law for providing endless amounts of support throughout this entire process.

Name: Alexa Nelson

Date of Degree: MAY 2020

Title of Study: THE USE OF SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY AND A PEER MENTORING PROGRAM TO INCREASE SELF-PERCEPTION IN INTRAMURAL EMPLOYEES

Major Field: LEISURE

Abstract: This study focuses on the effect that a peer mentoring program can have on the self-concept of intramural sports supervisors. The research was informed by Social Learning Theory and utilized the Self-Perception Profile for College Students to determine if participation in a peer mentoring program produced a statistically significant increase in self-perception assessment scores. Data was collected from intramural sports programs at two large, public universities. Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to determine statistical significance. No statistical significance was found when comparing mentor to non-mentors, students with no mentor to students with mentors, and underclassmen with mentors to upperclassmen with mentors. Implications and future areas of assessment are provided to support campus recreation professionals' mentorship program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Employment within campus recreation provides students with the opportunity to develop multiple transferrable skills. Some of these transferable skills include organizing, planning, and delegating; balancing academic, personal, and professional roles; mentor/role model and motivating others; problem-solving and decision making; communication skills; working with others/diversity; and giving and receiving feedback (Anderson, Ramos, & Knee, 2018; Bolton & Rosselli, 2017; Hall, Forrester, & Borsz, 2008;). These skills have been identified as desirable to future employers but are skills that are frequently learned outside of the classroom (Griffin, 2016). Students working in campus recreation can be employed in numerous areas including facilities and operations, fitness, outdoor education, and intramural sports. While all these areas promote recreation and wellness, each area focuses on specific experiences within recreation. For example, intramural sports promote recreation and wellness through individual or team competitions in a large variety of sports.

Within campus recreation, intramural sports programs employ many students as intramural officials. Intramural officials are placed in a conflict rich environment nightly, allowing them to develop communication and conflict resolution skills. Students who excel as officials frequently have the opportunity to be promoted to an intramural supervisor position. Since they have experience officiating, intramural supervisors have a

general understanding of sports rules, officiating, and conflict management. Intramural supervisors undergo additional training that often includes on-campus training, off-site retreats, and biweekly meetings (Tingle, Cooney, Asbury, & Tate, 2013). These trainings include a review of policies and procedures and leadership development while fostering mentorship and teamwork. Additionally, mentoring programs are commonly used for intramural officials as a tool for continuous training and to increase engagement and retention of inexperienced officials (Gaskins, Petty, & Rey, 2002). Mentoring programs that focus on officials have been utilized by some universities as a continuous training tool (Titlebaum, Haberlin, & Titlebaum, 2009). At other universities, mentoring programs are used to create a community among student officials (Faircloth & Cooper, 2007). Other resources exist to develop mentor relationships between experienced professionals, young professionals, and student officials, such as NIRSA Championship Series (NCS) events (Tingles, Hazlett, & Flint, 2016). Beyond the success in mentoring programs within NIRSA and the officiating profession, peer mentor programs that are utilized at universities have been found to have multiple benefits (Colvin & Ashman, 2010; Tingles, Hazlett, & Flint, 2016). Colvin and Ashman (2010) found that peer mentor programs benefitted mentors by developing relationships and increasing academic performance. Mentees felt that the program helped them with their classwork and feel more connected to others on campus.

Mentoring programs within intramural sports programs cultivate a continuous learning environment among peers. To coordinate a successful mentorship program, the tenets of social learning theory (SLT) have been observed as a useful framework for mentorship program designs. Social learning theory indicates that new behaviors can be

learned through observing and imitating a model (Bandura, 1977). Models are typically admired by the observer. Therefore, it is expected that through a mentoring program, mentees will observe and imitate their mentors, learning behaviors and attitudes that may lead to higher self-concept. Self-concept is a person's self-perceptions that are formed through experience and the observation of one's environment (Marsh & Martin, 2011). Students with high self-concept have shown to have higher levels of academic achievement (Choi, 2005). Self-concept in college-aged students is complex and extends beyond academics and into personal and social characteristics (Neemann & Harter, 2012). The effect that mentoring relationships have on self-concept can be measured using the Self-Perception Profile for College Students (SPPCS). The SPPCS breaks self-perception into 12 domains that focus on two main categories: competencies or abilities and relationships. While the academic impact of high self-concept is known, it can be anticipated that increased self-concept in each of the 12 domains could provide benefits to the student.

Employing the SPPCS framework, the current study will focus on domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, close relationships, and social acceptance. The SPPCS will be provided to intramural student employees as a pretest and posttest as a means to determine if a mentoring program causes a significant increase in self-concept. Two large, public universities will be used in this study to determine the impact of mentoring programs. One university currently utilizes a mentoring program and will be the treatment group, while the other university does not currently utilize a mentoring program and will be the control group.

Statement of the Problem

Peer mentoring programs are known to provide academic and social benefits to college students (Colvin & Ashman, 2010). These programs have primarily been utilized in campus recreation as a training tool for intramural officials, however, there is a lack of research supporting that a peer mentoring program would benefit intramural supervisors (Titlebaum, Haberlin, & Titlebaum, 2009). Following the tenets of SLT, campus recreation professionals can design purposeful peer mentorship programs that could increase self-concept amongst their student employees. An increased self-concept could benefit intramural sports supervisors, as increased self-concept has been proven to result in higher levels of academic success in college students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand the effects mentoring programs have on the self-concept of intramural sports supervisors. This study may provide insight into additional benefits that a peer mentoring program can provide to the development of intramural sports supervisors. Professionals within campus recreation, specifically intramural sports professionals, may be able to use the results of this study to encourage the incorporation of mentoring opportunities within their intramural sports program for the development of their intramural sports supervisors.

Limitations

The current study is limited by the participating institutions and the time frame of the study. Data was collected from intramural sports supervisors in the fall semester to determine if mentoring programs can increase self-concept. As a result of an explicit short-term study, this study only analyzes the specific mentoring program already in place at one of the universities. The results of this study may not be generalizable to the campus recreation population or to other institutions. The intramural sports supervisors that are participating are from two large, public universities, which limits the results' applicability to students at smaller universities or private institutions. This study will only be conducted in the fall semester; therefore, study participants will only include short-term benefits of a peer mentoring program.

Assumptions

It was assumed that all participants will respond honestly when completing the assessment tool. It was also assumed that participants would take their time to complete the assessment correctly and not misinterpret questions.

Definition of Terms

- Peer Mentor: "a helping relationship in which two individuals of similar age and/or experience come together, either informally or through formal mentoring schemes, in the pursuit of fulfilling some combination of functions" (Terrion & Leonard, 2007, p. 150).

- Intramural Sports Supervisor: Intramural supervisors manage nightly sports programming including sport set up and tear down, participant check-in, and official evaluations
- Intramural Head Supervisor: Intramural head supervisors oversee nightly programming for the entire intramural sports program. Responsibilities include staff management, problem-solving, and intramural supervisor evaluations. Intramural head supervisors peer mentor a group of four to five intramural sports supervisors.
- Self-Concept: "a person's self-perceptions that are formed through experience with and interpretations of one's environment" (Marsh & Martin, 2011, p. 61).
- Scholastic Competence: "whether one feels competent that he or she is mastering the coursework" (Nemann & Harter, 2012, p. 8).
- Intellectual Ability: "whether one feels just as smart or smarter than other students" (Neemann & Harter, 2012, p. 8).
- Job Competence: "whether one feels proud of the work one does, and feels confident one can do a new job" (Neemann & Harter, 2012, p. 8).
- Social Acceptance: "being satisfied with one's social skills, and the ability to make friends easily" (Neemann & Harter, 2012, p. 8).
- Close Friendship: "whether one gets lonely because one doesn't have a close friend to share things with, and whether one has the ability to make close friends." (Neemann & Harter, 2012, p. 8).
- Upperclassman: Students who have completed at least two full years of undergraduate course work.

- Underclassman: Students who have not yet completed two full years of undergraduate course work.

Hypothesis

H1 – Mentors will report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than students who do not mentor other students for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

H0 – Mentors will not report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than students who do not mentor other students for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

H2 – Student supervisors who have a peer mentor will report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than student supervisors who do not have a peer mentor for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

H0 - Student supervisors who have a peer mentor will not report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than student supervisors who do not have a peer mentor for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

H3 – Underclassman student supervisors who are assigned peer mentors will report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than upperclassmen who are assigned peer mentors for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

H0 - Underclassman student supervisors who are assigned peer mentors will not report a statistically significant change in the self-perception assessment score than upperclassmen who are assigned peer mentors for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship.

Conclusion

Campus recreation professionals are often tasked with developing transferable skills for their intramural sports supervisors. The current study will examine the effect of a mentoring program guided by the tenets of SLT. Results from the participants' evaluation on the SPPCS may provide intramural sports professionals with information about the benefits of mentoring programs for intramural sports employees, allowing intramural sports professionals to further prepare intramural supervisors for their future careers.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employment in Campus Recreation

Campus recreation is one of the largest employers of students on campus (Anderson, Ramos, & Knee, 2018). Student employees at a campus recreation center are given the opportunity for the development of skills that will transfer to their future careers. A benchmarking study focusing on where students learn a set of 11 transferable skills (teamwork, decision making, problem-solving, workflow planning, verbal communication, information processing, quantitative analysis, career-specific knowledge, computer software skills, writing and editing reports, and selling and influencing) indicates that the percentage of students who learn individual skills outside of the classroom ranges from 55 to 75 percent (Griffin, 2016). Anderson, Ramos, and Knee (2018) found that teamwork, decision making, and problem-solving were the skills most developed through employment within campus recreation.

In 2015, NIRSA and the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) partnered to "identify ways students are gaining skills that make them desirable to employers" (Peck et al, 2015, pg. 30). NIRSA and NACA utilized the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) annual Job Outlook Survey from 2014 to identify the top ten transferable skills that employers desire: the ability to work in a

team structure, ability to make decisions and solve problems, ability to verbally communicate with persons inside and outside the organization, ability to plan, organize and prioritize work, ability to obtain and process information, ability to analyze quantitative data, technical knowledge of the job, proficiency with computer software programs, ability to create and/or edit written reports, and ability to sell or influence others were identified. Bolton and Rosselli (2017) used the NACE top ten skills to determine if employment within campus recreation developed transferable skills. Of the ten skills, 80 percent of students indicated that they used the skill daily or almost daily for every skill except analyzing quantitative data and creating and editing written reports. In addition to these transferable skills, intramural supervisors develop the skills of communication, leadership, and conflict management due to the high intensity, conflict rich environment that is present in intramural sports (Schuh, 1999).

Employment in intramural sports typically begins in an entry-level position as an intramural official. Intramural officials receive training through pre-season clinics and in-service training that cover the topics of rules, positioning and mechanics, court awareness, and game management (Gaskins, 2004). After working as an intramural official, some students have the opportunity to become an intramural supervisor. As most intramural supervisors have a basic understanding of sports rules and officiating, intramural supervisor training focuses on other topics, such as policies and procedures and leadership development (Tingle, Cooney, Asbury, & Tate, 2013). Intramural supervisor training can take many forms, but often includes on-campus training, off-site retreats, scavenger hunts, and biweekly meetings. On-campus training and biweekly meetings focus on policies and procedures accompanied by leadership development,

while off-site retreats can be used to hone leadership skills, foster mentorship and teamwork.

Mentor Programs

Mentoring programs are commonly used for intramural officials as a tool to increase engagement and retention of young officials while improving the knowledge and skills of the mentee official. Peer mentoring programs within intramural officials were emphasized as early as 1990 when Gaskins and McCollum (1990) indicated that veteran officials can be used as valuable mentors to rookie officials. Titlebaum, Haberlin, & Titlebaum (2009) suggested that mentor relationships can be used as an evaluation tool and a form of continuous training. This application of mentoring relationships implies that they can be a valuable tool for developing job-related competencies. Furthermore, Faircloth and Cooper (2007) studied the importance of community within officials' development programs and it was found that shared learning goals help to form a community. Faircloth and Cooper also stated that new mentor relationships are the most valuable benefit of creating an officiating community.

If mentoring relationships strengthen community within officials, they may also strengthen community and create relationships amongst intramural supervisors. When studying leadership development in intramural and sport club participants, it was found that faculty mentoring had a strong positive impact on each component of student leadership development (Dugan, Turman, & Torrez, 2015). Peer mentoring amongst this group positively impacted only two components of leadership development: leadership capacity and social perspective-taking. While research has been conducted regarding the

benefits of mentoring for intramural officials and intramural and sport club participants, there is little research that indicates the benefits of peer mentoring for intramural sports supervisors (Dugan, Turman, & Torrez, 2015).

The NIRSA Championship Series (NCS) is a widely utilized mentorship program for campus recreation professionals and students. The NCS is a development opportunity for intramural sports professionals and students to enhance their skills through hosting and volunteering at regional and national flag football, basketball, soccer, and tennis tournaments. Student officials from multiple universities serve as the officiating staff at NCS events while campus recreation professionals from across the nation provide feedback and evaluation. Participants in the NCS have indicated that the mentoring relationships they developed at NCS events have led to their personal and professional growth (Tingle, Hazlett, & Flint, 2016). When asked about his mentoring relationship that grew from the NCS, one student stated, "They build you up and build your confidence" (Tingle, Hazlett, & Flint, 2016, pg. 8). These results indicate the importance of mentoring relationships between campus recreation professionals and student employees. However, there is a lack of research indicating the benefits of peer mentoring among campus recreation student employees (Titlebaum, Haberlin, & Titlebaum, 2009).

Peer mentoring among college students has proven to provide benefits to both the mentor and the mentee. Beltman and Schaeben (2012) investigated the benefits to peers that served specifically as mentors and found that most mentors felt a sense of achievement and satisfaction after mentoring another student. In addition to altruistic benefits, mentors also cite an array of cognitive, social, and personal growth benefits (Beltman & Schaeben, 2012). Further mentor benefits have been outlined by Colvin and

Ashman (2010) including providing support for other students, reapplying concepts to their own lives, and developing connections on campus. Mentees also listed campus connections as a benefit of their mentor relationship along with academic success. Colvin and Ashman (2010) identified five roles that mentors took while mentoring other students: connecting links, peer leader, learning coach (life and academic), student advocate (personal and academic), and trusted friend. Some of these roles such as peer leader and a trusted friend indicate that mentors serve as role models for their mentees, therefore, the tenets of social learning theory may be a useful framework to guide peer mentoring programs.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory states that behaviors are learned through two modes: direct experience and observation (Bandura, 1977). Learning through direct experience occurs through a series of consequences, both positive and negative, that influence future behaviors. Social learning also occurs through modeling, observing what others do and imitating those behaviors based on the consequences others faced. "Most of the behaviors that people display are learned, either deliberately or inadvertently, through the influence of example" (Bandura, 1977, p. 5). Learning through observation is much more effective than learning by consequence and is, therefore, the primary source of behavioral learning. Modeling relies on reinforcement for observed behaviors to become action. Imitation of behavior must be positively reinforced for the behavior to be learned. Furthermore, a person is more likely to give attention to a model that has strong interpersonal attraction. For example, intramural supervisors display a strong passion for sports. This common passion allows for a mentee to develop a stronger relationship with their mentor than

someone who does not share a common interest. Additionally, people rarely use one model as a primary source of behavior and will choose different models to imitate depending on the situation (Bandura, 1977).

Social learning theory is particularly applicable to social relationships as, "the actions of others can also serve as social cues that influence how others will behave at any given time" (Bandura, 1977, p. 11). Just as social learning theory requires the interpretation of the behaviors of others, self-concept is understood and developed through experience and perception of one's environment (Marsh & Martin, 2011). Therefore, this theory of learning through modeling aligns well with peer mentor relationships and could increase self-concept.

Self-Concept

Many theories and terms exist regarding the way in which one views oneself. Self-efficacy, self-esteem, and self-concept are similar in that they involve a cognitive analysis of one's own behavior. Self-concept is "a person's self-perceptions that are formed through experience with and interpretations of one's environment" (Marsh & Martin, 2011, p. 60). Self-concept differs slightly from self-efficacy and self-esteem because it is both cognitive and affective (Choi, 2005). Self-esteem and self-efficacy are primarily cognitive as self-esteem focuses on valuing oneself and self-efficacy focuses on comparing oneself to past performances (Choi, 2005). The affective component of self-concept compliments a peer mentoring program well, as the program allows mentors and mentees to discuss work, school, and personal experiences with the shared goal of learning from those experiences.

Self-concept in college students is complex, but one known benefit of high self-concept is academic achievement (Choi, 2005; Neemann & Harter, 2012). Choi (2005) found that students with higher self-concept received better term grades. Understanding the benefit of possessing a higher self-concept can also support the development of campus recreation student employees. Intramural professional staff can employ social learning theory in the development of mentoring programs to help strengthen the self-concept of their student employees, leading to academic benefits.

Self-Perception Profile for College Students

The Self-Perception Profile was originally developed for children and was designed to measure a child's perception of themselves across six domains of life: scholastic competence, social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance, behavioral conduct, and global self-worth (Keith & Bracken, 1996). Since self-concept becomes more complex with age, Neemann and Harter (2012) developed additional instruments focusing on adolescents, college students, and adults. The scale for college students, extended from six domains of life to thirteen (Keith & Bracken, 1996). The thirteen domains include creativity, intellectual ability, scholastic competence, job competence, athletic competence, appearance, romantic relationships, social acceptance, close friendships, parent relationships, humor, morality, and global self-worth (Neemann & Harter, 2012). Except for global self-worth, each domain can be placed into one of two categories: competencies or abilities and social relationships. The question format for the SPPCS requires students to determine which of the two groups of students they most identify. Students must then determine the degree to which they identify with that group of students. When administering the questionnaire, "it is critical that those who use this

instrument do not alter the question format" (Neemann & Harter, 2012, pg. 10). However, each question is associated with a specific domain. Therefore, questions coded to domains that are not being researched can be removed from the administered questionnaire.

Conclusion

In conclusion, campus recreation employs many students and allows the opportunity to develop skills that are desired by future employers. Peer mentoring programs are commonly utilized in the development of intramural sports officials and are proven to be an effective training tool and to increase community within an officiating group. However, peer mentoring programs are rarely implemented for intramural sports supervisors, despite the known personal benefits they provide both the mentor and mentee. A foundational component of SLT is the observation of role models that are interpersonally attractive. Therefore, assigning peer mentors to students that share a common interest would allow mentees to learn the behaviors of their mentor. Mentors are chosen because they have excelled as intramural supervisors. It would be expected that these mentors exhibit behaviors that correlate with high self-concept. As high self-concept leads to academic success, the behaviors learned from mentors could positively impact students' academic experiences in addition to the personal benefits that are associated with a peer mentoring program. Through researching the impact that a peer mentoring program have on self-concept, more information may be gained to help campus recreation professionals provide personal and professional development to student employees.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Based on experimental design, this study utilized the pretest, posttest method to determine if a mentoring program increased the self-concept of intramural sports supervisors. Two midwestern universities were evaluated, one with a mentorship program and one without. Both universities were large, public, four-year universities. The university that did not possess an existing mentorship program was used as the control group. The study aimed to determine if implementing a formal mentor program results in a significant increase in self-concept when guided by the tenets of social learning theory.

Participants

The participants for this research were intramural sports supervisors working for campus recreation facilities. Intramural sports programs at two universities were chosen for the study through convenience sampling. Intramural sports supervisors are part-time employees who are enrolled at least part-time at the university. A total of 62 intramural sports supervisors were asked to participate in the study. Of the 62 participants, eight participants were intramural head supervisors and served as mentors in the peer mentoring program. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 23 years old and varied in experience level from zero semesters to four semesters.

Mentoring Program

Intramural sports supervisors at one university participated in a mentoring program in which each intramural head supervisor selected a group of four or five intramural sports supervisors that they mentored throughout the semester. Mentors and mentees conducted monthly one-on-one meetings with specific topics discussed each month. The length of each meeting ranged from 30 minutes to one hour. Topics coincided with categories on the performance evaluation tool that each intramural sports supervisor completed at the beginning and end of each semester. The topics for September, October, and November were customer service and decision-making, problem-solving and conflict resolution, and semester takeaways and leadership. In addition to one-on-one meetings, mentors evaluated mentees on job performance throughout the semester. Intramural supervisors received an evaluation from a head supervisor each night they worked, although the evaluation was not always from their assigned mentor for the semester. Mentor groups competed in an incentive program where students gained points for above and beyond job performance and lost points for poor job performance. For example, a student who receives the highest score on bi-monthly quizzes would receive four points, but a student who arrives late to a shift may lose two points. Intramural supervisors at the other university did not participate in a peer mentoring program. Upon completion of the study, the university that did not have an established peer mentoring program was provided the details of the program to implement for intramural supervisors that did not have formal mentors.

Procedures

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was gained after the Assistant Director at both institutions agreed to participate in the study (Appendix A, Appendix B). This research was conducted using a pretest and posttest survey. Participants at two large, midwestern universities were asked to participate in the study. The questionnaire was distributed to students via email at the beginning of the fall semester and at the end of the fall semester.

Data Collection

A pretest was distributed to all mentors and intramural sports supervisors on September 23, 2019. The instrument was distributed by the Assistant Director at each university. The Assistant Directors were given a script that was utilized when distributing the instrument to students (Appendix C). The instrument was distributed via email through a fillable form (Appendix D). A posttest was distributed to all mentors and student intramural supervisors on December 2, 2019. The posttest was distributed in the exact manner as the pretest. The researcher recorded the results into SPSS software following the pretest and posttest for analysis.

Instrumentation

To assess self-esteem, the SPPCS was utilized. The profile consists of 54 questions that require the student to rate how well a statement describes themselves (Appendix E). The profile is divided into 12 specific domains, split into two main categories: competency domains and social domains. The profile also scores a thirteenth domain, global self-worth. The questions used by this instrument are written to encourage

students to reflect on the overall perception of their worth (Neemann & Harter, 2012). For the purpose of this study, only five domains were used: scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. These domains were selected because of the current literature on the known benefits of peer mentoring programs that target college students. Campus connections have been listed as a benefit of peer mentoring programs; therefore, the social acceptance and close friendship domains were studied (Colvin & Ashman, 2010). Scholastic competence and intellectual ability are being studied because academic success is another known benefit of mentoring programs. As the mentoring program in this study is a workplace program, job competence was also studied. According to Neemann and Harter (2012), the test is still valid and reliable if only the desired domains are evaluated while omitting the other domains. As such, the administered questionnaire contained a total of 20 questions.

Validity. Keith and Bracken (1996) tested the SPPCS for construct validity by comparing the results to the Social Support Scale. The results indicate that construct validity is present for the Self-Perception Profile for College Students.

Reliability. Coefficient alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. The SPPCS was analyzed for reliability on the subscale level, looking at all 13 domains. The reliability for each subscale ranged from 0.76 to 0.92. Only one subscale, job competence, falls below the desired 0.80 threshold (Neemann & Harter, 2012). The job competence subscale was used in this study since this subscale had a reliability below 0.80, there may be some variance in the job competence pretest and posttest scores that is caused by the questionnaire and not the mentoring program.

In addition to the variable of self-perception, other variables considered in this study included academic classification, university, experience level, and gender. These variables were collected at the beginning of the questionnaire for both the pretest and posttest.

Data Analysis

Once data was collected using the SPPCS, the pretest and posttest from each participant were paired using the last five digits of the participant's student identification number. The change in score was calculated for each participant in each of the five domains. Participants that completed a pretest but did not complete a posttest were removed from the study. The results were divided into two subgroups: mentors and intramural sports supervisors *and* upperclassmen and underclassmen. In both cases, a Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the data using SPSS version 24.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

Data was collected for this research to determine the effect that a peer mentoring program has on the self-concept of intramural sports supervisors. Data was collected from two universities using pretest, posttest methodology. A total of 63 students were sent the pretest. Of these participants, 17 (26.98%) responded with completed surveys. Due to the termination of one employee, only 62 students were sent the posttest. Of these participants, 13 (21.97%) responded with completed surveys. Table 1 indicates the response rate of both universities for the pretest and posttest phases of the study. Only those that participated in both the pretest and posttest phase were considered in the study.

Table 1 Response Rate

Category	Pretest	Posttest	Both
University A	26.32%	27.78%	22.22%
University B	27.27%	18.18%	15.91%

The change in assessment score from pretest to posttest for each of the five subdomains was calculated for each participant. Participants were then divided into different groups for each hypothesis. Hypotheses one and two utilized students from University A as the control group. Students from University B were separated into two

categories: intramural head supervisors (those who are a peer mentor) and intramural supervisors (those who have a peer mentor). The third hypothesis focused on students who are assigned peer mentors, so only intramural supervisors from University B were used. These students were divided into two categories: underclassmen and upperclassmen. A Mann-Whitney U was used to analyze this data and determine if a significant difference was present for each comparison.

Demographics

Of those who participated in the study, 27.27% of respondents reported their sex as female, while 72.73% of respondents reported their sex as male (Table 2).

Table 2 Reported Sex of Respondents

Category	Percentage
Female	27.27%
Male	72.73%

Participants were asked to report their age. The majority of respondents were 19 or 20 years old, with 36.36% of participants reporting either age. Participants that were 21 years old accounted for 18.18% and participants that were 23 years old accounted for 9.09%. No respondents indicated that they were 22 years old (Table 3).

Table 3 Age

Category	Percentage
19	36.36%
20	36.36%
21	18.19%
22	0.00%
23	9.09%

Participants were asked to report the number of years they had completed at their current university. This information was used to determine if the student was an underclassmen or upperclassmen. Of the respondents, 81.82% reported that they had completed zero to two years, classifying them as an underclassman. Participants that reported completing more than two years accounted for 18.18% of respondents and were classified as an upperclassman (Table 4).

Table 4 Completed Years at University

Category	Percentage
0-2	81.82%
More than 2	18.18%

Participants were asked the number of semesters they had worked in their current position. The majority of participants had worked for only one semester accounted for 45.45% of the respondents. Participants that had worked for two semesters accounted for 18.18% of the respondents. The remaining 36.36% of respondents had worked in their current position for three semesters (Table 5).

Table 5 Semester in Current Position

Category	Percentage
1	45.45%
2	18.18%
3	36.36%

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I assessed whether mentors will see a statistically significant increase in the self-perception score than students who do not mentor other students for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance,

and close friendship. A total of two mentors from the university with an established mentoring program participated in the study, while four total student participated from the control university. Using a Mann-Whitney U test, intramural head supervisors (mentors) were compared to intramural supervisors who did not participate in a mentoring program. When comparing mentors to non-mentors, no statistically significant difference was present between the two groups. However, when analyzing the average change in self-perception assessment score for each domain, mentors saw a larger increase than non-mentors in four of the five categories: scholastic competence, intellectual ability, social acceptance, and job competence. Non-mentors saw a larger increase in close friendship then mentors (Table 6).

Table 6 Average Difference in Reported Self-Perception Scores for Mentors

Category	Mentored others	Did not mentor others
Scholastic Competence	0.125	0.000
Intellectual Ability	0.375	0.063
Job Competence	0.750	0.063
Social Acceptance	0.500	0.000
Close Friendship	-0.125	0.250

Through Mann-Whitney U testing, the ranked mean was determined for each domain. For mentors the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 3.75, intellectual ability – 4.50, job competence – 5.25, social acceptance – 5.25, and close friendship – 3.00. For students who did not mentor others, the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 3.38, intellectual ability – 3.00, job competence – 2.63, social acceptance – 2.63, close friendship – 3.00 (Table 7). All five domains produce an alpha value greater than 0.05, therefore, the first null hypothesis is retained.

Table 7 Ranked Means for Reported Self-Perception Scores for Mentors		
Category	Mentored others	Did not mentor others
Scholastic Competence	3.75	3.38
Intellectual Ability	4.50	3.00
Job Competence	5.25	2.63
Social Acceptance	5.25	2.63
Close Friendship	3.00	3.00

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II assessed whether student supervisors who have a peer mentor will see a larger increase in self-perception assessment scores than student supervisors who do not have a peer mentor for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. Using a Mann-Whitney U test, intramural supervisors with mentors were compared to intramural supervisors who did not participate in a mentoring program. When comparing those with mentors to those without mentors, it was found that no statistically significant difference was present between the two groups. However, when analyzing the average change in self-perception assessment score for each domain, intramural supervisors with mentors saw a larger increase than intramural supervisors without mentors in two of the five categories: scholastic competence and job competence. Intramural supervisors with mentors saw a larger increase in intellectual ability and close friendship then students without mentors. The change in self-perception assessment score for social acceptance was the same for intramural supervisors with mentors and intramural supervisors without mentors (Table 8).

Table 8 Average Difference in Reported Self-Perception Scores for Mentees		
Category	Had a mentor	Did not have a mentor
Scholastic Competence	0.117	0.000
Intellectual Ability	-0.250	0.063
Job Competence	0.300	0.063
Social Acceptance	0.000	0.000
Close Friendship	-0.100	0.250

Through Mann-Whitney U testing, the ranked mean was determined for each domain. For intramural supervisors that had mentors, the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 5.50, intellectual ability – 4.30, job competence – 5.80, social acceptance – 5.40, and close friendship – 4.50. For intramural supervisors who did not have a mentor, the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 4.38, intellectual ability – 5.88, job competence – 4.00, social acceptance – 4.50, close friendship – 5.63 (Table 9). All five domains produce an alpha value greater than 0.05, therefore, the first null hypothesis is retained.

Table 9 Ranked Means for Reported Self-Perception Scores for Mentees		
Category	Had a mentor	Did not have a mentor
Scholastic Competence	5.50	4.38
Intellectual Ability	4.30	5.88
Job Competence	5.80	4.00
Social Acceptance	5.40	4.50
Close Friendship	4.50	5.63

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III assessed whether underclassman student supervisors who are assigned peer mentors will see a larger increase in the self-perception assessment score than upperclassmen who are assigned mentors for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. Using a

Mann-Whitney U test, underclassmen with mentors were compared to upperclassmen with mentors. When comparing underclassmen to upperclassmen, it was found that no statistically significant difference was present between the two groups. However, when analyzing the average change in self-perception assessment score for each domain, underclassmen saw a larger increase than upperclassmen in one of the five categories: close friendship. Upperclassmen saw a larger increase in scholastic competence, social acceptance, and job competence. The change in self-perception assessment score for intellectual ability was the same for intramural supervisors with mentors and intramural supervisors without mentors (Table 10).

Table 10 Average Difference in Reported Self-Perception Scores by Classification

Category	Underclassman	Upperclassman
Scholastic Competence	0.111	0.125
Intellectual Ability	-0.250	-0.250
Job Competence	0.250	0.375
Social Acceptance	-0.167	0.250
Close Friendship	0.000	-0.250

Through Mann-Whitney U testing, the ranked mean was determined for each domain. For underclassmen intramural supervisors who were assigned mentors, the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 3.33, intellectual ability – 3.00, job competence – 2.83, social acceptance – 2.67, and close friendship – 3.00. For upperclassmen intramural supervisors who were assigned mentors, the ranked means were as follows: scholastic competence – 2.5, intellectual ability – 3.00, job competence – 3.25, social acceptance – 3.50, close friendship – 3.00 (Table 11). All five domains produce an alpha value greater than 0.05, therefore, the first null hypothesis is retained.

Table 11 Ranked Means for Reported Self-Perception Scores by Classification		
Category	Underclassman	Upperclassman
Scholastic Competence	3.33	2.50
Intellectual Ability	3.00	3.00
Job Competence	2.83	3.25
Social Acceptance	2.67	3.50
Close Friendship	3.00	3.00

Conclusion

In conclusion, using Mann-Whitney U analysis and statistics of central tendencies in this study did not find that the assessed mentoring program did not have a statistically significant impact on self-perception assessment scores. However, some domains were seen to have a larger average increase in scores than other domains based on participation in a mentoring program. In this study, the first hypothesis tested was: mentors will see a larger increase in the self-perception score than students who do not mentor other students for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. No statistical significance was found, therefore, the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. Hypothesis II assessed whether student supervisors who have a peer mentor will see a larger increase in self-perception assessment scores than student supervisors who do not have a peer mentor for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. This hypothesis did not find statistical significance, therefore; the study failed to reject the null hypothesis. Hypothesis III assessed whether underclassman student supervisors who are assigned peer mentors will report a larger change in the self-perception assessment score than upperclassmen who are assigned peer mentors for the domains of scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance,

and close friendship. No statistical significance was found, therefore; the study failed to reject the null hypothesis.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the benefits of a peer mentoring program within campus recreation among intramural supervisors. Specifically, the study sought to assess if a peer mentoring program could positively affect self-concept for intramural supervisors. Using Mann-Whitney U testing, this study compared the increase in self-perception assessment score in five domains: scholastic competence, intellectual ability, job competence, social acceptance, and close friendship. Mentors were compared to non-mentors, students with mentors were compared to students without mentors, and underclassmen and upperclassmen within a mentoring program were compared. No statistical significance was found in any of the three comparisons. However, statistics of central tendencies indicate the scores were higher for mentors and students with mentors for some of the five domains.

According to SLT, "a model who repeatedly demonstrates desired responses, instructs others to reproduce them, physically prompts the behavior when it fails to occur, and then administers powerful rewards will eventually elicit matching responses in most people" (Bandura, 1977, p. 8). However, the numbers of demonstrations can depend on the model and learner. Demonstrations of behavior within this mentoring program occur during monthly one-on-one meeting with formal mentors. Behavior demonstrations also

occur when intramural sport supervisors interact with other head supervisors during a work shift. The other head supervisors serve as informal mentors, providing verbal and written feedback throughout a work shift. Therefore, intramural supervisors are subjected multiple situations weekly that could elicit a social learning response. While not all these interactions occur with an individual's formal head supervisor, SLT indicates that modeling can still occur from these informal mentors. Bandura (1977) states that "observers may select one of more of the models as the primary source of behavior, but they rarely restrict their imitation to a single source, nor do they adopt all of the characteristics of the preferred model" (p. 11). Thus, all interactions that occur between an intramural sports supervisor and an intramural head supervisor allow for modeling and mimicry of desired behaviors. As the exact number of demonstrations is variable, but a interactions occur multiple times a week, future research may consider extending the length of the study to span multiple semesters.

Implications

The results of this study did not indicate that a statistically significant difference was present in self-perception assessment scores for students who participated in a mentoring program compared to students who did not participate in a mentoring program. However, statistics of central tendencies indicate that the mentoring program may influence student's self-perception, especially for students who are responsible for mentoring other students. As SLT dictates, modeled behavior occurs after a variety of number of observed behaviors (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, this study may not have covered a long enough period to allow for the appropriate number of behavioral observations for the students that participated in the study. These results could help

inform campus recreational professionals on the benefits that a peer mentoring program can provide to all students who participate in the program.

Limitations

Some limitations to this study were present including low participation numbers. A total of eleven students participated in the study, with only two students serving as peer mentors. Since participation was so low in each of the categories, the results may not be representative of the population.

Additionally, the instrument that was used had a reliability value below the 0.80 threshold for the job competence domain. This low reliability could indicate that any differences that occur between groups in the job competence domain are from the instrument and not the peer mentoring program.

This study was conducted over the course of one semester, while students who are involved in the mentor program are involved for multiple semesters. This short-term period may have limited the statistical significance of the results.

Finally, the research studied students at two large, public four-year universities. Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalizable to students at small, private, or two-year institutions.

Future Research

This research may indicate that a peer mentoring program increases self-concept for intramural supervisors. For future research, it may be beneficial to include the SPPCS assessment as part of the mentoring program. By allowing students to opt-out of the

research instead of asking students to opt into the study, a larger sample size may be gained. As SLT indicates that numerous behavioral observations may need to occur, this study could be modified to be more longitudinal by having intramural supervisors complete the assessment tool upon being hired and at the end of their last semester (Bandura, 1977). Increasing the length of the study may help demonstrate the long-term effects of a peer mentoring program. The assessment tool could be administered at the conclusion of every semester in order to fully understand the benefits that a peer mentoring program may have on self-concept.

The results of this study were from two large, public four-year universities. Future studies could include participants from other universities that utilize a peer mentoring program. This modification will allow the study to be more generalizable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there were no statistically significant changes in self-perception assessment score based on participation in a peer mentoring program. However, the statistics of central tendency indicate that students who mentor others on average have a larger increase in self-perception. The results of this study can provide a base of exploratory research on the effects of a peer mentoring program within intramural sports programs. This study in conjunction with future research may help campus recreation professionals better understand the potential benefits of a peer mentoring program.

REFERENCES

Anderson, A.R., Ramos, W.D., & Knee, E. (2018). Practice makes perfect: Student employee transferable skill utilization in campus recreation. *Recreational Sports Journal, 42,* 174-192. doi: 10.1123/rsj2017-0038

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Beltman, S., & Schaeben, M. (2012). Institution-wide peer mentoring: Benefits for mentors. *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education, 3*(2)*,* 33-44. doi: 10.5204/intjfyhe.v3i2.124

Bolton, C., & Rosselli, A.C. (2017). The assessment of transferable skills in a campus recreation program: An exploratory case study on how professionals teach and how student employees learn. *Recreational Sports Journal, 41,* 125-143. doi: 10.1123/rsj.2016-0029

Choi, N. (2005). Self-efficacy and self-concept as predictors of college students' academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*(2), 197-205. doi: 10.1002/pits.20048

Colvin, J.W., & Ashman, M. (2010). Roles, risks, and benefits of peer mentoring relationships in higher education. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18*(2), 121-134. doi: 10.1080/13611261003678879

Dugan, J.P., Turman, N.T., & Torrez, M.A. (2015). When recreation is more than just sport: Advancing the leadership development of students in intramurals and club sports. *Recreational Sports Journal, 39*, 37-48. doi: 10.1123/rsj.2015-0008.

Faircloth, S., & Cooper, N. (2007). Communities of practice in campus recreation: A framework for developing student intramural officials. *Recreational Sports Journal, 31,* 43-50.

Gaskins, D. (2004). Cultivating intramural sports officials for success beyond the basics. *Recreational Sports Journal, 28,* 9-18. doi:10.1123/rsj.28.2.9

Gaskins, D.A., & McCollum, T.B. (1990) Energizing officiating programs through extramural sports. *Recreational Sports Journal, 15*, 16-18. doi: 10.1123/nirsa.15.1.16

Gaskins, D., Petty, B., Rey, S. (2002). Cutting Edge Techniques in Intramural Sports Officials' Development. *Recreational Sports Journal, 26,* 54-64. doi:10.1123/rsj.26.1.54

Griffin, K. (2016). Project CEO: The potential value of beyond-the-classroom-experiences for developing career competencies [PDF File]. Retrieved from https://www.campusintelligence.com/assets/downloads/papers/project-ceo-beyond-the-classroom-experiences.pdf

Hall, S.L., Forrester, S., Borsz, M. (2008). A constructivist case study examining the leadership development of undergraduate students in campus recreational sports. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(2), 125-140. doi:10.1353/csd.2008.0010

Keith, L. K., & Bracken, B. A. (1996). Self-concept instrumentation: A historical and evaluative review. In B. A. Bracken (Ed.), *Handbook of self-concept: Developmental, social, and clinical considerations* (pp. 91-170). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Marsh, H.W., & Martin, A.J. (2011). Academic self-concept and academic achievement: Relations and causal ordering. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 59-77. doi: 10.1348/000709910X503501

Neemann, J., & Harter, S. (2012). Self-perception profile for college students: Manual and questionnaires. Denver, CO.

Peck, A. (ed.), Cramp, C., Croft, L., Cummings, T., Fehring, K., Hall, D., Hnatusko, P., & Lawhead, J. (2015). Considering the impact of participation and employment of students in campus activities and collegiate recreation on the development of the skills employers desire most. A joint whitepaper from the National Association for Campus Activities, Columbia, SC and National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association, Corvallis, OR.

Schuh, J.H. (1999). Student learning and growth resulting from service as an intramural official. *Recreational Sports Journal, 23,* 51-61. doi: 10.1123/nirsa.23.2.51

Terrion, J.L., & Leonard, D. (2007). A taxonomy of the characteristics of student peer mentors in higher education: Findings from a literature review. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 15*(2), 149-164.

Tingle, J.K., Cooney, C., Asbury, S.E., & Tate, S. (2013). Developing a student employee leadership program: The importance of evaluating effectiveness. *Recreational Sports Journal, 37,* 2-13. doi: 10.1123/rsj.37.1.2

Tingle, J.K., Hazlett, D., Flint, A. (2016). Exploring NIRSA championship series professional development opportunities: Understanding their perceived value to the association. *Recreational Sports Journal, 40,* 2-20. doi:10.1123/rsj.2015-0045

Titlebaum, P., Haberlin, N., Titlebaum, G. (2009). Recruitment and retention of sports officials. *Recreational Sports Journal, 33,* 102-108. doi:10.1123/rsj.33.2.102

APPENDIX A

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	09/23/2019
Application Number:	ED-19-112
Proposal Title:	The Use of Social Learning Theory and Peer Mentoring Programs to Increase Self-Concept in Intramural Employees
Principal Investigator:	Alexa Nelson
Co-Investigator(s):	
Faculty Adviser:	Taryn Price
Project Coordinator:	
Research Assistant(s):	
Processed as:	Exempt
Exempt Category:	

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in 45CFR46.

This study meets criteria in the Revised Common Rule, as well as, one or more of the circumstances for which continuing review is not required. As Principal Investigator of this research, you will be required to submit a status report to the IRB triennially.

The final versions of any recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are available for download from IRBManager. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be approved by the IRB. Protocol modifications requiring approval may include changes to the title, PI, adviser, other research personnel, funding status or sponsor, subject population composition or size, recruitment, inclusion/exclusion criteria, research site, research procedures and consent/assent process or forms.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any unanticipated and/or adverse events to the IRB Office promptly.
4. Notify the IRB office when your research project is complete or when you are no longer affiliated with Oklahoma State University.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact the IRB Office at 405-744-3377 or irb@okstate.edu.

Sincerely,
Oklahoma State University IRB

APPENDIX B

Nelson, Alexa <anels11@ostatemail.okstate.edu> Aug 30, 2019, 11:20 AM

to Carley

Carley,

I am wondering if I would be able to use the student supervisors in your program as students in my thesis research on peer mentoring programs?

Thank you,

Alexa

Alexa Nelson
Competitive Sports Graduate Assistant
Oklahoma State University Department of Wellness
104 Colvin Recreation Center
Stillwater, OK 74078
Phone | 405-744-7407

VanOverberghe, Carley L <cvanover@purdue.edu> Sep 3, 2019, 9:48 AM

to me

Hi Alexa,

Yes, we should be able to assist you with this.

Thank you,
Carley

Carley VanOverberghe
Assistant Director, Intramural Sports
Purdue University Recreation & Wellness
Phone: 765.496.3331

Nelson, Alexa <anels11@ostatemail.okstate.edu> Fri, Aug 30, 2019, 11:18 AM

to Jason

Jason,

I am wondering if I would be able to use the student supervisors in your program as students in my thesis research on peer mentoring programs?

Thank you,

Alexa

Alexa Nelson
Competitive Sports Graduate Assistant
Oklahoma State University Department of Wellness
104 Colvin Recreation Center
Stillwater, OK 74078
Phone | 405-744-7407

Linsenmeyer, Jason <jasonjl@okstate.edu> Aug 30, 2019, 11:59 AM

to Alexa

Absolutely!

Jason Linsenmeyer

APPENDIX C

Hello,

My name is Alexa Nelson and I am collecting data for my Master's thesis. Your participation will be extremely helpful in helping to better understand peer mentoring programs within campus recreation. The survey will take between 5-10 minutes to complete. No personal identification information will be asked. If you so choose to participate, please complete the attached survey and return it to jasonjl@okstate.edu. If you have any questions or concerns do not hesitate to contact me at (405)744-7407 or alexa.nelson@okstate.edu.
Thank you,

Alexa Nelson

Hello,

My name is Alexa Nelson and I am collecting data for my Master's thesis. Your participation will be extremely helpful in helping to better understand peer mentoring programs within campus recreation. The survey will take between 5-10 minutes to complete. No personal identification information will be asked. If you so choose to participate, please complete the attached survey and return it to cvanover@purdue.edu. If you have any questions or concerns do not hesitate to contact me at (405)744-7407 or alexa.nelson@okstate.edu.
Thank you,

Alexa Nelson

APPENDIX D

What I Am Like

Last 5 Digits of CWID/PUID: Click or tap here to enter text.

Age: Click or tap here to enter text.

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

University: ☐ Purdue ☐ Oklahoma State

Completed Years at this University: Choose an item.

Position: ☐ Supervisor ☐ Head Supervisor

Semesters in this Position: Choose an item.

The following are statements that allow college students to describe themselves. There are no right or wrong answers since students differ markedly. Please read the entire sentence across. First decide which one of the two parts of each statement best describes you; then go to that side of the statement and check whether that is just *sort of true* for you or *really true* for you. You will check **ONE** of the four boxes for each statement. Think about what you are like in the college environment as you read and answer each one.

	Really True for me	**Sort of True for me**				**Sort of True for me**	**Really True for me**
1.	☐	☐	Some students are not very proud of the work they do on their job	**BUT**	Other students are very proud of the work they do on their job	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some students feel confident they are mastering their coursework	**BUT**	Other students do not feel so confident	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some students are not satisfied with their social skills	**BUT**	Other students think their social skills are just fine	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some students get kind of lonely because they don't really have a close friend to share things with	**BUT**	Other students don't usually get too lonely because they do have a close friend to share things with	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
5.	☐	☐	Some students feel like they are just as smart or smarter than other students	**BUT**	Other students wonder if they are as smart	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some students feel they are very good at their job	**BUT**	Other students worry about whether they can do their job	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some students do very well at their studies	**BUT**	Other students don't do very well at their studies	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some students find it hard to make new friends	**BUT**	Other students are able to make new friends easily	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some students are able to make close friends they can really trust	**BUT**	Other students find it hard to make close friends they can really trust	☐	☐
10.	☐	☐	Some students do not feel they are very mentally able	**BUT**	Other students feel they are very mentally able	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	Some students feel confident about their ability to do a new job	**BUT**	Other students worry about whether they can do a new job they haven't tried before	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some students have trouble figuring out homework assignments	**BUT**	Other students rarely have trouble with their homework assignments	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some students like the way they interact with other people	**BUT**	Other students wish their interactions with other people were different	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some students don't have a close friend they can share their personal thoughts and feelings with	**BUT**	Other students do have a friend who is close enough for them to share thoughts that are really personal	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
15.	☐	☐	Some students feel they are just as bright or brighter than most people	**BUT**	Other students wonder if they are as bright	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some students are not satisfied with the way they do their job	**BUT**	Other students are quite satisfied with the way they do their job	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some students sometimes do not feel intellectually competent at their studies	**BUT**	Other students usually do feel intellectually competent at their studies	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some students feel that they are socially accepted by many people	**BUT**	Other students wish more people accepted them	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some students are able to make really close friends	**BUT**	Other students find it hard to make really close friends	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	Some students question whether they are very intelligent	**BUT**	Other students feel they are intelligent	☐	☐

APPENDIX E

What I Am Like

Name or ID_____ Age____ ☐ Male ☐ Female

The following are statements that allow college students to describe themselves. There are no right or wrong answers since students differ markedly. Please read the entire sentence across. First decide which one of the two parts of each statement best describes you; then go to that side of the statement and check whether that is just *sort of true* for you or *really true* for you. You will just check ONE of the four boxes for each statement. Think about what you are like in the college environment as you read and answer each one.

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
1.	☐	☐	Some students like the kind of person they are	BUT	Other students wish that they were different	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	Some students are not very proud of the work they do on their job	BUT	Other students are very proud of the work they do on their job	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	Some students feel confident they are mastering their coursework	BUT	Other students do not feel so confident	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	Some students are not satisfied with their social skills	BUT	Other students think their social skills are just fine	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	Some students are not happy with the way they look	BUT	Other students are happy with the way they look	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	Some students like the way they act when they are around their parents	BUT	Other students wish they acted differently around their parents	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	Some students get kind of lonely because they don't really have a close friend to share things with	BUT	Other students don't usually get too lonely because they do have a close friend to share things with	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	Some students feel like they are just as smart or smarter than other students	BUT	Other students wonder if they are as smart	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	Some students often question the morality of their behavior	BUT	Other students feel their behavior is usually moral	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
10.	☐	☐	Some students feel that people they like romantically will be attracted to them	BUT	Other students worry about whether people they like romantically will be attracted to them	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	When some students do something sort of stupid that later appears very funny, they find it hard to laugh at themselves	BUT	When other students do something sort of stupid that later appears very funny, they can easily laugh at themselves	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	Some students feel they are just as creative or even more so than other students	BUT	Other students wonder if they are as creative	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	Some students feel they could do well at just about any new athletic activity they haven't tried before	BUT	Other students are afraid they might not do well at athletic activities they haven't ever tried	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	Some students are often disappointed with themselves	BUT	Other students are usually quite pleased with themselves	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	Some students feel they are very good at their job	BUT	Other students worry about whether they can do their job	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	Some students do very well at their studies	BUT	Other students don't do very well at their studies	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	Some students find it hard to make new friends	BUT	Other students are able to make new friends easily	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	Some students are happy with their height and weight	BUT	Other students wish their height or weight was different	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	Some students find it hard to act naturally when they are around their parents	BUT	Other students find it easy to act naturally around their parents	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
20.	☐	☐	Some students are able to make close friends they can really trust	BUT	Other students find it hard to make close friends they can really trust	☐	☐
21.	☐	☐	Some students do not feel they are very mentally able	BUT	Other students feel they are very mentally able	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	Some students usually do what is morally right	BUT	Other students sometimes don't do what they know is morally right	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	Some students find it hard to establish romantic relationships	BUT	Other students don't have difficulty establishing romantic relationships	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	Some students don't mind being kidded by their friends	BUT	Other students are bothered when friends kid them	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	Some students worry that they are not as creative or inventive as other people	BUT	Other students feel they are very creative and inventive	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	Some students don't feel that they are very athletic	BUT	Other students do feel they are athletic	☐	☐
27.	☐	☐	Some students usually like themselves as a person	BUT	Other students often don't like themselves as a person	☐	☐
28.	☐	☐	Some students feel confident about their ability to do a new job	BUT	Other students worry about whether they can do a new job they haven't tried before	☐	☐
29.	☐	☐	Some students have trouble figuring out homework assignments	BUT	Other students rarely have trouble with their homework assignments	☐	☐
30.	☐	☐	Some students like the way they interact with other people	BUT	Other students wish their interactions with other people were different	☐	☐
31.	☐	☐	Some students wish their body was different	BUT	Other students like their body the way it is	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
32.	☐	☐	Some students feel comfortable being themselves around their parents	BUT	Other students have difficulty being themselves around their parents	☐	☐
33.	☐	☐	Some students don't have a close friend they can share their personal thoughts and feelings with	BUT	Other students do have a friend who is close enough for them to share thoughts that are really personal	☐	☐
34.	☐	☐	Some students feel they are just as bright or brighter than most people	BUT	Other students wonder if they are as bright	☐	☐
35.	☐	☐	Some students would like to be a better person morally	BUT	Other students think they are quite moral	☐	☐
36.	☐	☐	Some students have the ability to develop romantic relationships	BUT	Other students do not find it easy to develop romantic relationships	☐	☐
37.	☐	☐	Some students have a hard time laughing at the ridiculous or silly things they do	BUT	Other students find it easy to laugh at themselves	☐	☐
38.	☐	☐	Some students do not feel that they are very inventive	BUT	Other students feel that they are very inventive	☐	☐
39.	☐	☐	Some students feel that they are better than others at sports	BUT	Other students don't feel they can play as well	☐	☐
40.	☐	☐	Some students really like the way they are leading their lives	BUT	Other students often don't like the way they are leading their lives	☐	☐
41.	☐	☐	Some students are not satisfied with the way they do their job	BUT	Other students are quite satisfied with the way they do their job	☐	☐
42.	☐	☐	Some students sometimes do not feel intellectually competent at their studies	BUT	Other students usually do feel intellectually competent at their studies	☐	☐

	Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
43.	☐	☐	Some students feel that they are socially accepted by many people	BUT	Other students wish more people accepted them	☐	☐
44.	☐	☐	Some students like their physical appearance the way it is	BUT	Other students do not like their physical appearance	☐	☐
45.	☐	☐	Some students find they are unable to get along with their parents	BUT	Other students get along with their parents quite well	☐	☐
46.	☐	☐	Some students are able to make really close friends	BUT	Other students find it hard to make really close friends	☐	☐
47.	☐	☐	Some students would really rather be different	BUT	Other students are very happy being the way they are	☐	☐
48.	☐	☐	Some students question whether they are very intelligent	BUT	Other students feel they are intelligent	☐	☐
49.	☐	☐	Some students live up to their own moral standards	BUT	Other students have trouble living up to their moral standards	☐	☐
50.	☐	☐	Some students worry that when they like someone romantically, that person won't like them back	BUT	Other students feel that when they are romantically interested in someone, that person will like them back	☐	☐
51.	☐	☐	Some students can really laugh at certain things they do	BUT	Other students have a hard time laughing at themselves	☐	☐
52.	☐	☐	Some students feel they have a lot of original ideas	BUT	Other students question whether their ideas are very original	☐	☐
53.	☐	☐	Some students don't do well at activities requiring physical skill	BUT	Other students are good at activities requiring physical skill	☐	☐
54.	☐	☐	Some students are often dissatisfied with themselves	BUT	Other students are usually satisfied with themselves	☐	☐

VITA

Alexa Claire Nelson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE USE OF SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY AND A PEER MENTORING PROGRAM TO INCREASE SELF-PERCEPTION IN INTRAMURAL EMPLOYEES

Major Field: Leisure Studies

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Leisure Studies at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May 2020.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana in May 2017.

Experience:

- Competitive Sports Graduate Assistant, Department of Wellness, Oklahoma State University, August 2018 – Present
- Intramural Sports Intern, Butler Recreations, Butler University, July 2017 – June 2018

Professional Memberships:

- NIRSA