

ISSN Online: 2616-8383



Stratford
Peer Reviewed Journals & books

The Effect of Learning Environment in School-Based Mentoring Programs on Students' Social Development in Public Secondary Schools, Nairobi County

Rachel Mbula Muteti

ISSN: 2616-8383

The Effect of Learning Environment in School-Based Mentoring Programs on Students' Social Development in Public Secondary Schools, Nairobi County

Rachel Mbula Muteti

Africa International University

E-mail: rachelmuteti@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Muteti, R., M. (2020). The Effect of Learning Environment in School-Based Mentoring Programs on Students' Social Development in Public Secondary Schools, Nairobi County. *Journal of Education* 3(2), 19-32

Abstract

The primary purpose of this research was to assess the effect of learning environment in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The study adopted a quantitative method and it utilized a cross-sectional correlational design. The population for this study was 44, 686. Besides, the sample size was calculated using Yaro Yamane formulae, which gave 396 respondents. Data was collected using adopted and adapted tools. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential analysis. The correlation results indicated a positive and significant relationship between the learning environment and students' social development aspects: students' building relationships, identity development, self-esteem and sense of belonging. Based on the correlation results, the study concluded that there was a significant relationship between the learning environment and students' social development aspects: students' building relationships, identity development, self-esteem and sense of belonging. Further, from the regression results, the study concluded that the learning environment in school-based mentoring programs had a positive and significant influence on students' social development. Besides, the paper recommended that secondary schools should strengthen the learning environment aspects. These are; the community of peers, teachers' relationship, mentoring climate and meaningful engagement. The parent's involvement enhances the process of mentoring the social development of their children and being in a position to monitor their progress, too, since they will foster it from home once they close the school.

Keywords: *Learning environment, Students' social development, School-based mentoring programs*

1.1 Background of the Study

Mentoring is a relationship with an experienced person who assists another who is less experienced to develop certain competencies skills, and knowledge that can enhance his professional and personal goals (Komosa-Hawkins, 2010; Sanchez & Reyes, 1999). Mentoring is considered as a process whereby individuals who have accumulated a certain amount of experience encourages those who are yet to gain similar or related experience in life. This

process aims at establishing a personal relationship between an experienced and inexperienced person. In this research, the experienced person is termed as the mentor whereas the inexperienced person is the mentee (Mentor, 2009; USC, 2003; Ayton & Hons, 2012; Komsa-Hawkins, 2010).

Mentoring is increasingly beneficial to students' social development. It enhances and promotes a younger person's life and offers a buffer during the transition periods. It supports them to overcome life's challenges and hurdles. In schools, mentoring promotes students' connectedness and interrelations with peers and teachers (Mentor, 2009; Rhodes, Grossman, & Resch, 2000; Thompson & Kelly-Vance, 2001). This enhances how students get acquainted with the school culture and the unspoken rules needed for success (Ayton & Hons, 2012; Mentor, 2009). Specifically, mentoring helps students develop positive relations, sense of belonging, personal identity, and self-worth needed for their adjustment in the school (Wray-Lake & Syvertsen, 2011; Colette, 1997; Spurlock, 2017; DuBois, Holloway, Valentine & Cooper, 2002).

In Canada, just like the USA, have a Big brother and big sister programs, youth mentoring school and school-based programs. In a study done by Kearns (2017), on "School-based Mentoring.", the author argues that little is recorded about community-based mentoring programs, but the school-based mentoring programs are growing very fast as they cut through all school ages, with major emphasis on the adolescents. Some of the benefits of the mentoring program are enhanced students' self-esteem, school connectedness, school retention, and reduction of school absentees, and they become well-adjusted and contributing members of the society (Kearns, 2017).

In Botswana, the government is looking for ways of improving the living standards and well-being of the youths. The government is developing policies that can enhance social development. It has been able to come up with intervention programs notably education and health and special programs such as mentoring that will improve youth's well-being (Diraditsile, 2017).

According to Muchiri (2013) the government has initiated and implemented programs that enhance youth employability through the creation of vocational and youth polytechnics, and relevant curriculums are used in equipping the youth with work place skills (Muchiri, 2013). Some corporate institutions have mentoring programs that work at achieving the same goals of preparing youth for employability. Some of these organizations work with relevant government ministries and they have recorded success in their engagements. On the role of the community; parents/guardians and religious organizations, the study revealed that the parents appreciated the mentoring programs and they pointed out that it had brought positive impact on the youths. Parents said that they observed some positive attributes such as "career identification, self-awareness, time management, job-search skills, and leadership skills (v)." Above all the findings revealed that there was a positive effect and impact on developing productive youths in Kenya (Muchiri, 2013). Although, mentoring has been considered as an effective way to help students overcome personal and social challenges (MOEST, 2018), the Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012, on reforming education and training sectors in Kenya, reported that good practice mentoring services in schools do not exist in sufficient depth. Based on these back grounds, the study sought assess the effect of learning environment in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Adolescent stage is known to be a very critical period of many transitions for the young people. Literature reveals that the adolescents need mentoring during this stage so that they can develop positive personal identity, positive and meaningful relationships, and self-esteem and have a sense of belonging. Ayton and Hons (2012) outline a range of mentoring relationships that nurture them towards the above; youth mentoring programs, and academic mentoring programs (Ayton & Hons, 2012). Based on these, the goal of mentoring is to foster positive social development for young people by offering support, being role models to them and providing chances to grow new skills and competencies, as well as advocacy (DuBois, 2005). Traditionally, mentoring is offered by experienced adults who guide them through this stage. Engaging in a mentoring relationship broadens adolescents' skills and competences, providing new dimensions for life, increasing their relationship networks as well as learning from others' experience ("Guidance for Mentors" 2010). At the same time, it helps the young person develop holistically as they remain engrossed on achieving their academic goals (Dubois, Holloway, Valentine & Cooper, 2002).

In a school setting, mentoring programs promote psychosocial, spiritual, professional and educational goals (Maloner, 2011). In the US and other developed countries, there are several studies that have been done on the effect of school-based mentoring programs among adolescents/students, and the results are varied. For example, Komsa-Hawkins (2010) focused on the development, implementation, and evaluation of a mentoring program where one-to-one mentoring was provided by a mentor to a mentee in a school setting, the findings revealed that school-based mentoring programs have significant results to social development (Komsa-Hawkins, 2010). McCoy (2017), reviewed best practices for school-based mentoring program and the findings revealed that mentoring relationships are influential on students' behaviour and promotes connectedness, improves behaviour and reduced discipline referrals (McCoy, 2017). Karanja and Gakungu (2014), findings revealed that mentoring promotes harmonious relationships, improved behaviour, enhanced academics and promoted quick settling among students.

In Kenya, after a series of school unrest, the government formed several commissions of enquiry to investigate and come up with recommendations that are applicable to the situation. Macharia report of 2000, came up with its 3 sets of findings that were categorized as; administrative factors, students' factors and geographical factors. In the students' factors, it pointed out issues such as; peer pressure and emotional instability during the adolescent stage. The Wangai report of 2001 identified a number of causes that led to unrest, among other factors, there was moral decay, rejection, bad role models, external influences, drug abuse, and mass media glorifying violence (Government of Kenya). Later a special commission was formed; Koech Commission which came up with the Koech Report of 2008, it identified the causes of school unrest as lack of effective school guidance and counselling services among others (Sifuna & Otiende, 2006). These are just a few of the task forces that were formed to investigate the unrest in the education sector, but despite their efforts, the school unrest continued in a number of secondary schools. In 2008, 300 school were closed due to the unrest; between July and September, while in 2016; between May and August; over 130 schools experienced school burning. The disruptive behaviour threatens the peaceful co-existence of the students and those in authority (National Crime Research Center, 2016; Sifuna & Otiende, 2006; Muteti, 2018).

It is worth noting that in 2012, a Sessional Paper No. 14 was published, with a number of recommendations to the education sector. One of the key things for implementation of was mentoring programs and related intervention programs that can deal with pro-social behaviour,

behaviour problem and social development (MOEST, 2012). Based on researcher's knowledge, the government has not rolled-out a framework for school mentoring programs. Several schools have come up with activities to support students' social development, although they are not referred to as mentoring activities.

Although the practice is gaining momentum in secondary schools, there is scanty literature or studies that have been done on the effect of school-based mentoring programs in the region. Additionally, there seems to be insufficient information on a systematic way that is documented on how mentoring programs are run or organised. Since mentoring has incredible benefits to students' social development, there is a need to research on its effectiveness on students' social development. These observations informed this study which sought to assess the effect of learning environment in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary school in Nairobi County.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The primary purpose of this research was to assess the effect of learning environment in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Review

Environmental learning theory gives one the idea that a child's learning and behaviour is shaped by his environment. This study will concentrate on one environmental learning theory; Social learning theory, Albert Bandura (1977). Bandura developed this theory with the knowledge and principles of classical conditioning and operant conditioning theory. He brought in a new perspective of observational learning in a social context. Bandura theorized that people learn through one another; that is by, observing, imitating, and modelling. He believed that the environment influences one's behaviour and learning in a social context, and that the produced behavior and learning is as a result of the reaction to their environment (Berk, 2013; Baker, 2011; Kostelnik, 2015; Mcleod, 2016). He argued that learning occurs through observing people's behaviour, attitudes and the outcomes of their behaviour, and thus reflects on the things that he likes, forms an idea of how they want to behave and later it is evident in actions. Bandura theorized that a person has to be motivated to perform and imitate the observed behaviour (Woolfork, 2007; Berk, 2013).

A number of critiques, argues that this theory gives major emphasis to the external factors of learning unlike the internal one. Mcleod (2016) argued that, though the theory may be effective tool to critique the practice in educational circles, it provides no approaches to solving educational problems. Additionally, in case of misunderstanding during the mentoring program between the mentee and mentor, it does not stipulate the procedures on how to deal with the issue (Walker, 1997; Mcleod, 2016; Kostelnik, 2015).

The implication of Bandura's Social Learning theory to mentoring of students; a mentee can learn from the mentor through role modelling; observing their behaviour and replicating the same. Even when a student has behaviour management issues, by being paired to a mentor; through socialization and observing the mentor behave, he can change. Thus, development of social competences and skills. The behaviour can be reinforced by rewarding and give positive encouragement to desired behaviour. This promotes the students' social development and thus influencing change of behaviour among other peers, and it makes it easier for students and school administration to develop positive mutual relationships and connectedness. This acts as

a catalyst to students recording increased self-image, sense of belonging is enhanced, achieving their competences, skills and personal goals. The Bandura's theory has often been termed as a connection between behaviourist and cognitive learning theories due to its components: attention, memory, and motivation (Bridgeman, 1977; Baker, 2011).

2.2 Empirical Review

School-based mentoring programs are designed to develop students' social development; lessen cases of indiscipline and support students' self-confidence, and skills such as; personal identity, sense-esteem, sense of belonging and building a positive relationship. This leads to commitment in academics, school attendance and to help in fostering students' understanding of their connectedness to the world across time (Karcher, Holcomb & Zambrano 2008). The adolescents are learning to cope with several social and emotional challenges in school. The adolescent stage is described more by the social and emotional development. It is a time when there is a lot of hormonal imbalance that is taking place, formation of their self-identity, though they psychologically try to distance themselves from the parents, they identify more with their peers. Peer groupings are formed based on social acceptance and conformity to the group values, self-revelation, loyalty to peers, and allegiance to the group leader (Berk, 2009; Myers, 2005; Kail & Cavanaugh, 2013; McDevitt, Ormrod, & McDevitt, 2004; Handel, Cahill & Elkin, 2007).

A learning environment is very crucial for the life and learning of a student. According to Nursing Times (2013) learning environment "facilitates learning by encouraging and supporting and making them feel they are part of the team." In the case where the learning environment is not well structured and lacks mentors, the students feel overwhelmed, anxious and threatened. It is the responsibility of mentors and teachers to create a conducive environment for all students. A favourable mentoring learning environment should have the following characteristics: a community of peers, teachers' relationship, favourable mentoring climate with meaningful engagement.

Community of Peers-A community-centered learning and mentoring environment promotes community values, norms and lifelong learning. It contributes to the aligning of mentees' and mentors' expectations. Students in secondary school are described by Erickson in his psychosocial theory as social-beings who thrive better in community of peers, and therefore community of learning can enhance their well-being and development. Mullen (2009) points out that when a mentor is employing learning communities as mentoring strategy, it is important for him to consider the "multifaceted strengths and challenges of generational outlooks" and diverse levels that facilitate the success of learning communities centered on mentoring.

Teachers' Relationship-A mentoring and learning environment is made conducive by teachers' rapport and support that is offered to the students. When the students understand that their teacher cares about them it makes their life in school easy and adaptable. To build these kinds of relationships, it calls for the teachers and mentors have extra interest in every mentee's interests and abilities, and at the same time their challenges, struggles and frustrations. Reeves, Kanan and Plog (2011) point out that a teacher needs to be a role model in life, learning and be able to celebrate students' achievements. Be human and even accept when he makes mistakes. When the students see that he has a sense of humor: make mistakes and laugh even in times when he feels frustrated, the student feels more comfortable to do the same. This helps in breaking the barriers between mentors/teachers and students, hence making it easy for students to confide in their mentors.

Mentoring Climate-The main purpose of a mentoring program is to ensure that students are nurtured, supported and guided in making the right decisions as they strive to achieve their personal and career goals. For the realization of this goal, a conducive mentoring climate ought to be learner-centered; the interest of the students put first. The learning abilities and interests of each learning ought to be considered, and if possible have individualized learning, then enhances their interests. Ever students have abilities, strengths, interests, needs, abilities and learning styles (Armstrong, 2009). Therefore, how they perceive, interpret and demonstrate the acquired knowledge and skills is also different (Gardner, 2016). With this in mind, it helps the mentor understand the interest and abilities of the mentee, have proper matching since they are able to understand diversity, assess the mentees fairly against his abilities, and work at fulfilling their needs of the mentee classroom (Murdoch & Wilson, 2008).

Meaningfully Engagement-A mentoring relationship is perfected by having meaningful engagement if only both participants understand each other very well. The mentor and mentee ought to align their expectations, have a clear perspective of the mentoring relationship and communicate it effectively, thus creating a conducive mentoring learning environment for mentoring. A mentoring program ought to make the mentees responsive, flexible and teachable. This can only be possible if the mentees are engaged meaningful, having their interest at heart and being mindful of their needs throughout the process and in case of any adjustments, to be made they are legitimate that still align to the mentoring goals. This will, therefore, make the mentees have a sense of ownership and thus meaningful participation.

3.1 Methodology

The study adopted Quantitative method and it utilized a cross-sectional correlational design. The population for this study was 44, 686. The researcher employed multistage sampling technique. The sample of this study was calculated using Yaro Yamane formulae, which gave 396. Data was collected using adopted and adapted tools. The data was analysed using descriptive and inferential analysis.

4.0 Findings and Discussions

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

In this section, the study sought to answer the question on the extent to which the learning environment in school-based mentoring programs relate to students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi county. The respondents were required to rate several statements relating to learning environment. The statements were based on a Likert type scale using the following rating scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. The respondents were required to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement. The learning environment construct was categorized into four scales: community of peers, teachers' relationship, mentoring climate and meaningful engagement.

Community of Peers

Table 1 portrays the descriptive results on community of peers' scale.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics-Community of Peers

Community of Peers	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M	S.D
I am connected with other students in my school	21, 5.4%	23, 5.9%	69, 17.6%	134, 34.2%	145, 37%	3.9	1.1
I feel supported in my personal and career goals by other students	24, 6.1%	52, 13.2%	107, 27.2%	104, 26.4%	106, 26.9%	3.7	2.3
I am able to make friends in school easily	27, 6.9%	33, 8.4%	69, 17.5%	106, 26.9%	159, 40.4%	3.9	1.2
I feel a sense of community in school	24, 6.1%	37, 9.4%	69, 17.6%	145, 37%	117, 29.8%	3.8	1.2
I feel a sense of belonging during my time at school	12, 3.1%	30, 7.6%	79, 20.1%	133, 33.8%	139, 35.4%	3.9	1.1
Average						3.8	1.4

The findings in Table 1 reveal that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that they are connected with other students in the school with a mean score of 3.9 and a standard deviation of 1.1. The survey question of whether they feel supported in their personal and career goals by other students had a mean response of 3.7 and a standard deviation 2.3 Moreover, the statement of whether they are able to make friends in school easily had a mean response of mean 3.9 and a standard deviation of 1.2, Further the statement that they feel a sense of community in school had a mean response of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 1.2. Similarly, the survey question of whether they feel a sense of belonging during their time at school had a mean response of 3.9 standard deviation of 1.1. The overall mean of 3.8 implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on community of peers. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.4.

Teachers' Relationships

Table 2 provides descriptive results on teachers' relationships scale.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics-Teachers Relationships

Teachers Relationships	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M	S.D
The teachers are very supportive of my career goals	31, 7.9%	30, 7.6%	75, 19.1%	92, 23.4%	165, 42%	3.8	1.3
The teachers take time to know me	56, 14.3%	58, 14.8%	104, 26.5%	95, 24.2%	79, 20.2%	3.2	1.3
The teachers I encounter genuinely care about me my well-being	31, 7.9%	35, 8.9%	97, 24.6%	120, 30.5%	111, 28.2%	3.6	1.2
I am encountering an abundance of positive, inspiring role models in school	20, 5.1%	44, 11.3%	88, 22.6%	119, 30.6%	118, 30.3%	3.7	1.2
I feel comfortable confiding in teachers on important issues	48, 12.2%	60, 15.3%	89, 22.7%	92, 23.5%	103, 26.3%	3.4	1.3
Average						3.5	1.3

The findings in Table 2 reveal that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that the teachers are very supportive of their career goals with a mean response of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 1.3. Besides, the mean score of whether the teachers they encounter genuinely care about their well-being was 3.6 with a standard deviation of 1.2. Likewise, the survey question of whether they are encountering an abundance of positive, inspiring role models in school had a mean response of 3.7 and a standard deviation of 1.2. Further, majority of the respondents were neutral on the statement that the teachers take time to know them with a mean response of 3.2 and a standard deviation of 1.3. Moreover, the statement of whether they feel comfortable confiding in teachers on important issues had a mean response of 3.4 and standard deviation of 1.3.

The overall mean was 3.5 which implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on teachers' relationships. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.3.

Mentoring Climate

Table 3 provides descriptive results on mentoring climate scale.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics-Mentoring Climate

Mentoring Climate	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M	S.D
I feel I am in an environment that nurtures my abilities	16, 4.1%	25, 6.4%	85, 21.9%	137, 35.2%	126, 32.4%	3.9	1.1
I feel safe and secure as I meet my mentor	12, 3.1%	24, 6.1%	66, 16.8%	120, 30.6%	169, 43.1%	4.2	2.3
I understand the objective of the mentoring curriculum	18, 4.6%	27, 6.9%	69, 17.6%	126, 32.2%	150, 38.4%	4.1	2.8
Average						4	2

The findings in Table 3 indicate that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that they feel they are in an environment that nurtures their abilities with a mean response of 3.9 and a standard deviation of 1.1. The survey question of if they feel safe and secure as they meet their mentor had a mean response of 4.2 and standard deviation of 2.3. Also, the statement of whether they understand the objective of the mentoring curriculum had a mean response of 4.1 and standard deviation of 2.8. The overall mean was 4 which implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on mentoring climate. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 2.

Meaningful Engagement

Table 4 provides descriptive results on meaningful engagement scale.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics: Meaningful Engagement

Meaningful Engagement	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M	S.D
The school mentoring program is flexible and responsive to my needs as a student	33, 8.4%	34, 8.7%	96, 24.6%	106, 27.1%	122, 31.2%	3.6	1.2
My mentor and I are managing our boundaries very well	15, 3.8%	23, 5.8%	79, 20.1%	134, 34%	143, 36.3%	3.9	1.1
I feel that I have a say in the decision in the school mentoring program	38, 9.7%	59, 15%	80, 20.4%	112, 28.5%	104, 26.5%	3.5	1.3
The school mentoring program encourages scholarship and creativity	43, 10.9%	34, 8.7%	58, 14.8%	110, 28%	148, 37.7%	3.7	1.3
Average						3.7	1.2

The findings in Table 4 indicate that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that the school mentoring program is flexible and responsive to their needs as a student with a mean response of 3.6 and standard deviation of 1.2. Further, the mean score of the statement of whether they were managing boundaries with their mentors had a mean response of 3.9 and standard deviation of 1.1. Moreover, the mean score of the statement regarding whether they feel that they have a say in the decision in the school mentoring program was 3.5 with a standard deviation of 1.3. Also, the statement of whether the school mentoring program encourages scholarship and creativity had a mean response of 3.7 and a standard deviation of 1.3. The overall mean of the survey question was 3.7 which implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on meaningful engagement. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.2.

4.2 Correlation Analysis Results

In response to RQ which states: To what extent does the learning environment in school-based mentoring programs influence students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County? Four hypotheses were tested. A correlation test was done to test of there is a significant relationship between the variables learning environment and students' social development. The test was done at a significant level of 0.05.

The statistical significance was used to determine whether the null hypothesis should be rejected or fail to reject. If $p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$, H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a relationship between learning environment and students' social development. But if $p\text{-value} \geq 0.05$, H_0 is not rejected, which concludes that there is no significant relationship between learning environment and students' social development.

H₀₁: There is no significant relation between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building. Results in Table 5 indicate the correlation findings on the relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building.

Table 5: Correlation Results: Learning Environment and Building Relationships

		Building Relationships	Learning Environment
Building Relationships	Pearson Correlation	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Learning Environment	Pearson Correlation	.517**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings in Table 5 indicate a positive and significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.517 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 ($r=0.517$, $p=0.000$). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building.

H₀₂: There is no significant relation between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' personal identity. Results in Table 6 indicate the correlation

findings on the relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development.

Table 6: Correlation Results: Learning Environment and Identity Development

		Identity Development	Learning Environment
Identity Development	Pearson Correlation	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Learning Environment	Pearson Correlation	.365**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings in Table 6 reveal a positive and significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.365 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 ($r=0.365$, $p=0.000$). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development.

H₀₃: There is no significant relation between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem. Results in Table 7 reveal the correlation results on the relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem.

Table 7: Correlation Results: Learning Environment and Self Esteem

		Self Esteem	Learning Environment
Self Esteem	Pearson Correlation	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Learning Environment	Pearson Correlation	.287**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings in Table 7 reveal a positive and significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.287 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 ($r=0.287$, $p=0.000$). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem.

H₀₄: There is no significant relation between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging. Results in Table 8 reveal the correlation results on the relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging.

Table 8: Correlation Results: Learning Environment and Students' Sense of Belonging

		Sense of Belonging	Learning Environment
Sense of Belonging	Pearson Correlation	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Learning Environment	Pearson Correlation	.521**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings in Table 8 reveal a positive and significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.521 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 ($r=0.521$, $p=0.000$). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between learning environment in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging

4.3 Regression Analysis Results

The regression of coefficients results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Regression Coefficient

Model		B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.948	0.228	8.529	0
	Learning Environment	0.398	0.046	8.74	0.000

a Dependent Variable: Social Development

As revealed by the results presented in Table 9, the estimated was as indicated below:

$$Y = 1.948 + 0.398X$$

Where:

Y = students' Social development

X = Learning Environment

The findings indicate that there is a positive and significant relationship between learning environment and students' social development ($\beta = 0.398$ $p = 0.000$) as revealed in Table 9 above. This is supported by a beta coefficient of 0.398 and p value of $0.000 < 0.05$. This implies that an improvement in learning environment by 1 unit would lead to an improvement in the students' social development by 0.398 units.

Further, the study sought to establish the effect of learning environment aspects on students' social development. The bivariate regression results are summarized in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Summary; Learning Environment and Social Development

Student's Social Development	Beta Coefficient (β)	Sig
Meaningful Engagement	0.397	0.000
Community of peers	0.328	0.000
Teachers Relationship	0.310	0.000
Mentoring climate	0.085	0.001

Based on the findings presented in Table 10, all aspects of learning environment had a positive and significant effect on students' social development. From the results, meaningful engagement had the greatest effect on social development ($\beta=0.397$), followed by community of peers ($\beta=0.328$), then teachers relationship ($\beta=0.310$) and lastly mentoring climate ($\beta=0.085$).

5.1 Conclusions

The study concluded that secondary school students were in agreement with most of the statements relating to learning environment. This implied that the students found learning environment elements including community of peers, teachers' relationship, mentoring climate and meaningful engagement as important in enhancing their social development. Based on the correlation results, the study concluded that there was a significant relationship between learning environment and students' social development aspects: students' building relationships, identity development, self-esteem and sense of belonging. Further, from the regression results, the study concluded that learning environment in school-based mentoring programs had a positive and significant influence on students' social development.

6.1 Recommendations

The paper recommended that secondary schools should strengthen the learning environment aspects. These are; community of peers, teachers' relationship, mentoring climate and meaningful engagement. This has the potential to further improve students' social development. Once the mentioned aspects are considered it will help in improving the existing programs in schools, for the benefit of the students. Further, the involvement of the parent enhances the process of mentoring the social development of their children and be in a position to monitor their progress too, since they will foster it from home once they close school. This will lead to improved school learning environment and thus ultimately lead to enhancement of students' social development some of the critical components of the learning environment are community of peers, teachers' relationship with students, mentoring climate and having meaningful engagements. For any change in the education systems to take place, it has to be ingrained in the educational practices and policies. This will foster a mentoring culture in schools and therefore increase the commitment of the schools to the programs. This calls for implementation of appropriate measures and strategies that will enhance students' social development. At the same time it will lead to positive behaviour interventions that are not only in line with the proposed framework but also at the best interest of the students.

REFERENCES

- Baker, J. P. (2011). An analysis of peer leadership competencies and skills.
- Bridgeman, D. L. (1979). The influence of cooperative, interdependent learning on role-taking and moral reasoning: a theoretical and empirical field study with fifth-grade students.
- Diraditsile, K. (2016). Challenges to social policies: A critical analysis of youth intervention programmes in Botswana. *Asian Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 74.
- Dollarhide, C. T. (1997). Mentoring Using Identity Development Theory: Retaining Students of Diversity.
- DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American journal of public health*, 95(3), 518-524.
- Handel, G., Cahill, S., & Elkin, F. (2007). *Children and society: The sociology of children and childhood socialization*. Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Karcher, M. J. (2005). The effects of developmental mentoring and high school mentors' attendance on their younger mentees' self-esteem, social skills, and connectedness. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(1), 65-77.
- Karcher, M. J., Holcomb, M., & Zambrano, E. (2008). Measuring adolescent connectedness: A guide for school-based assessment and program evaluation. *Handbook of school counseling*, 649-669.
- Karcher, M., & Herrera, C. (2007). School-Based Mentoring. Research in Action. Issue 6. *MENTOR*.
- Kearns, J. H. (2017). "School-Based Mentoring" (unpublished paper), Canada: Adler Graduate School.
- Korkmaz, B., Njiokiktjien, C., & Verschoor, C. A. (2013). Children's social relatedness: an embodied brain process. *environment*, 20, 553-7.
- Kostelnik, M., Whiren, A., Soderman, A., Rupiper, M. L., & Gregory, K. (2014). *Guiding children's social development and learning*. Nelson Education.
- McLeod, S. (2015). Skinner-operant conditioning. Retrieved from.
- MOEST. (2012). "Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012 on Reforming Education and Training Sectors in Kenya," no. 14. Available At: <http://uonlibrary.uonbi.ac.ke/content/sessional-paper-no14-2012-reforming-education-and-training-sectors-kenya>
- MOEST. (2018). "National Education Sector Plan: Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012."
- Muchiri, E. W. (2013). *The Role of Mentorship in Enhancing Youth Employability in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Mullen, C. (2009). *The handbook of leadership and professional learning communities*. Springer.
- Myers, D. G. (2009). *Exploring psychology*. Macmillan.
- Walker, K. (1997). Challenging critical theory in environmental education. *Environmental Education Research*, 3(2), 155-162.