The Effect of Mentoring Styles in School-based Mentoring Programs on Students' Social Development in Public Secondary Schools, Nairobi County

Rachel Mbula Muteti
Africa International University
E-mail: Rachel.muteti@aiu.ac.ke

Abstract

The primary purpose of this research was to assess the effect of mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. The study adopted a quantitative method and utilized a cross-sectional correlational design. The population for this study was N=44, 686. The sample of this study was calculated using Yaro Yamane formulae, which gave n=396. Data was collected using adopted and adapted tools; The Munich-Evaluation-of-Mentoring-Questionnaire (MEMeQ), MinT Tool, Johns Hopkins Learning Environment scale (JHLES), Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS), and Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential analysis. The correlation results indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles and students' social development aspects: students' building relationships, identity development, self-esteem and a sense of belonging. Based on the findings, the study recommended that secondary schools should strengthen the mentoring styles aspects. These are active listening, advising, prescribing and cooperation. For the continuity and excellence in the school-based mentoring programs the teachers must reflect, interrogate and evaluate themselves against the best practices of school-based mentoring. The government can work at enhancing mentoring styles in all schools by offering initial training and refresher courses for school mentors so as to ensure that standards of the school mentoring programs are enhanced significantly. Parents need to be involved in and understand the school-based mentoring programs by first: attending awareness workshops and trainings on teenage parenting and secondly, attend joint parents-students' mentoring sessions

Keywords: School-based mentoring program, Mentoring styles, Students' social development, High school students.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Mentoring has been an essential tool for nurturing many young people in the world. It is not a new concept, having originated in ancient Greece. According to Nayab (2011), a "mentor" was a friend of King Odysseus, assigned to take care of the lastborn son, Telemachus. The relationship of the mentor was a close parental relationship because of the guidance he offered to Telemachus. Since that time, the word has carried the same meaning today (Nayab 2011). Reports from studies show that in the United States of America, there are over 5,000 mentoring programs which have been started and implemented with over three million students/youths. Their aims have been to create a positive and meaningful relationship between the youths and adults and improve their well-being, giving social and emotional support, and guidance (Lee, Park & Alcazar-Bejerano 2015; Schwartz, Lowe, & Rhodes, 2012).

School-based mentoring programs have increased and intensified their approach in helping students to excel in school, and they have recorded shared purposes and benefits. According to Downs, the school-based mentoring programs have "emerged as a potential method that can enhance youths' pro-social behaviour, as well as their well-being in the following areas: connectedness, attrition, academic success, reduction of at-risk behavior and building of resiliency. (Down, 2011)

In South Africa, marginalization of girls is prevalent; therefore, schools become the central place for mentoring them. A study done by Jefferis and Theron was entitled "Promoting resilience among Lesotho-speaking adolescent girls: Lessons for South African teachers," The teachers were used in a phenomenological study, as mentors in helping the girls develop resilience through draw-and-talk and draw-and-write methods. Findings from the study indicated that "(i) teachers actively listen and provide guidance; (ii) teachers motivate girls towards positive futures; and (iii) teachers initiate teacher-girl partnerships." (Jefferis, & Theron, 2017, 5)

In Kenya, there are many social ills among the youth that seem to thrive in our communities. The same ills have infiltrated the education system. Among them are such things as drug and substance abuse, aggressive behavior, conduct disorder, mob psychology, peer pressure, negative media influences, destructive and harmful traditional practices, social incompetence, and bullying, among others (MOEST 2018; Mbuthia 2013). Increasingly, there is a great concern for how schools can help students overcome some of these developmental and social challenges. One of the national goals of education states that social development is a human right for learners. The goal further stipulates that schools have an obligation to promote national values and aspirations of every learner so that they can have the capacity to play a full part in the nation's social and cultural development (Ministry of Education Science and Technology 2012). One of the methods that has been suggested to promote students' social development is mentoring. 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. In the interest of enhancing this research, the study sought to assess the effect of mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The adolescent stage is known to be a very critical period involving many transitions for young people. Literature reveals that adolescents need mentoring during this stage so that they can develop a positive personal identity, positive and meaningful relationships, self-esteem, and a strong sense of belonging. Mentoring relationships and processes are varied, from nurturing academics to youth development (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 (Karanja & Gikungu 2014). 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, Komosa-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 (Komosa-Hawkins 2010). McCoy (2017) reviewed best practices for school-based mentoring program and the findings revealed that mentoring relationships are influential on students' behavior, promoting connectedness, and reducing discipline referrals. Karanja and Gakungu's (2014) findings revealed that mentoring promoted harmonious relationships, improved behavior, enhanced academics and promoted quick settling among students.

In Kenya, after a series of incidents of school unrest, the government formed several commissions of enquiry to investigate and come up with recommendations that are applicable to the situation. The Macharia Report of 2000 came up with its three sets of findings that were categorized as administrational 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 which identified the causes of school unrest as a 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 schools were closed due to the unrest between July and September, while in 2016 (May through August) over 130 schools experienced school burning. The disruptive behavior threatens the peaceful co-existence of the students and those in authority (National Crime Research Center 2017; 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 was mentoring programs and related intervention programs that can deal with prosocial behaviour, behavioral problems and social development (MOEST 2012). Based on the 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 that has been systematically documented on how mentoring programs are run or organized. Since mentoring has incredible benefits to students' social development, there is a need to research its effectiveness on students' social development. These observations informed this study which sought to assess the effect of mentoring styles 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 mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs on students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County.

2.0 Literature Review

According to Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory that was developed in 1979, he explains the interactions between organisms and the external world, the social interactions between the systems and the forces behind each of these systems in the ecology. The social relationships and interactions in the systems and among the systems is a continuous and complex process. Adolescent's development is majorly influenced by immediate relations; siblings, parents, peers, teachers, and neighbors, while it is true that the large ecological system also influences them. This theory explains how social interactions can be divided into four distinct and unique systems: microsystem, mesosystem, ecosystem, and macrosystem. (Berk 2009; McDevitt, Ormrod & McDevitt 2004; Kail & Cavanaugh 2013; Kostelnik 2015).

Each of these settings and contexts affects an adolescent's social development, learning process and ability to function effectively in life. These systems affect the adolescent directly or indirectly, thus influencing his wellbeing, values, social competences, communication skills, interests and life choices, relationships, and creativity. Concurrently, they are learning and being equipped with other several skills that are relevant to their development and growth. This enhances a student's social competences and offers opportunities to practice and receive feedback. This also affects the adolescent's personal development and how he relates to his peers; he learns to regulate his emotions, boost his ego, control and moderate his attitude, and to respect and value his peers and their opinions. (Muzi 2000; Kostelnik 2015; Berk 2009)

Ecological theory is crucial to this study since social relations are very paramount in mentoring. They happen within set controls and boundaries, which have their guiding norms, assumptions and values. The relationship with the school mentors is particularly important to mentees who have a weaker relationship with their families. Since the school environment is central to students' development and well-being, the interrelationships with peers, teachers and mentors have a diverse effect on enhancing, strengthening and sustaining students' social development, which include boosting their self-esteem, promoting their sense of belonging and personal identity, and building positive relationships (Price & McCallum 2015).

2.2 Empirical Review

A school mentoring program is a model that is based in a school rather than in an organization or community. Schwartz, Lowe, and Rhodes (2012) point out that school-based mentoring is integrated into schools, where mentors meet with mentees during and after-school time in the school campus. Additionally, Jucovy (2007) points out that school-based mentoring as the program that is found in school locales as school-based mentoring programs (SBMPs). A school-based mentoring program has several major features: 1) students are referred for mentoring to school staff; 2) a mentor schedules time during the school calendar year to meet a student; 3) meetings between mentors and mentees are on school premises during school days (Ibid.). These features reflect a pattern of an effective secondary school mentoring program.

According to Erickson's theory of 1968, he posited that secondary school students are in the developmental stage of the adolescents; aged 13-18 years. Different developmental psychologists have stated that adolescents are social explorers, experimentalists and learners

(Kail & Cavanaugh 2013; McDevitt & Ormrod 2004; Myers 2005; Berk 2009; Kostelnik 2015). The adolescents make their life more meaningful through social relations. This is well stipulated by theories developed by Erickson's, Piaget's and Bronfenbrenner's that provide developmental framework for adolescent development issues on the psychosocial, cognitive and ecological system respectively. This is a period where many transitions take place. Scheer, Gavazzi, and Blumenkrantz cite Hall (2007) who describes it as a period of "breaking away from one's childhood to prepare for adulthood." During this period, an "adolescent goes through varied struggles that have to deal with issues of responsibility versus irresponsibility, and their own ambitions in the social world (Scheer, Gavazzi & Blumenkrantz. 2007). These struggles have been the basis of guiding adolescents as they go through this stage.

While amid all these major changes, behaviour management becomes a major issue as they question every authority and guidance from home to school. As noted by Kail and Cavanaugh (2013), they engage in risky behaviour and they try to experiment with almost everything. On the same note, this is also a time in life when they make major decisions about life, family, and academics. The choices that they make will either motivate or demotivate them about schools and academic performance. Mentoring and guidance are important as a means of empowering, nurturing and guiding the adolescent in making rational and informed decisions.

In a school-based mentoring program, there are various mentoring styles, which differ due to personality types and learning styles. These mentoring styles enhance unique skills that mentees want to acquire, and thus bring out the best in mentees, while on the other hand, mentors are provided with different ways of reaching out to others and really making an impact. The four types of mentoring styles are:

Active listening styles

Active listening involves a technique in a mentoring relationship where the mentor is expected to be a keen and attentive listener as he/she interacts with the mentee. This skill causes the mentor and mentee to foster a strong and close relationship of mutual understanding and respect. On the same note, the mentee feels motivated to achieve his/her mentoring objectives (Hidayushafie et al. 2017). In active listening, the mentor possesses some counselling skill; he asks guiding questions during the conversation, then summarizes the conversation while explaining the progress and way forward. In this style, the mentor builds an influence base, thus mentees are more likely to listen to him or her (Turner 2009).

Advisory Style

The advisory style is the second mentoring style, which is means a mentor has the authority to make recommendations to the mentee. This is where the mentor and mentee get into a mentoring relationship and the mentor provides the mentee with approaches that assist him in dealing with situations that he might be struggling with. In so doing, the mentor "provides the mentee suggestions for problem-solving and alternatives to improve [in life] (Hidayushafie et al. 2017)." Additionally, Griffiths (2013) points out that when the mentor is using the advisory style, in some cases he will identify the mentee's weaknesses and suggest some plan of actions for improvement.

The mentor might have possessed an educational background, which is a key element for this type of mentoring style. This causes him or her to nurture the mentee by giving expert advice (Hidayushafie et al. 2017). The advisory mentor takes time to evaluate a situation thus helping a mentee and guiding him/her to acquire relevant knowledge and skills. This style is positive but still pushes a mentee to excel and gives him/her suggestions for good problem-solving skills. The mentor takes time to learn about the mentee, understand which skills they

are lacking, and empowers him/her on how to use different strategies for fixing those deficiencies. As a mentor who uses this style, personalized support, assistance, guidance, and the challenge are offered to the mentee to see him excel (Goodman et al. 2008).

Prescribing Style

The next mentoring style is a prescribing style. In the prescribing style, Qureshi and Maxwell (2014) state that this is where the mentor takes the responsibility of providing precise instructions to the mentee on how to handle a particular problem or situation that has occurred and needs improvement or attention in the mentee's life. The prescribing mentoring style plays a key role of laying out hands-on steps in assessing, investigating and managing a mentee, with a main focus of "what" and "how" to prescribe it (Hidayushafie et al. 2017).

Cooperative Style

A cooperative mentoring style involves a joint effort between the mentor and mentee; they work together to ensure they solve current problems. In this scenario, mentees are allowed to share their opinions freely, as they purpose in working together (Ibid.). A mentor who uses the cooperative method does not put his own interest first, of having to push his agenda first and win, but rather have a win-win situation, based on mutual interests (Morak 2009).

3.0 Methodology

The study adopted a quantitative method and utilized a cross-sectional correlational design. The population for this study was N=44, 686. The researcher employed multistage sampling in this study so as to get the exact respondents from the schools. Random sampling was used in selecting the participants to ensure that every student has an equal and independent chance of being included in the study. The sample of this study was calculated using Yaro Yamane formulae, which gave n=396. This study employed primary data collection using structured questionnaires and focus group discussions. To collect data, the study used questionnaires. The questionnaires were self-administered by the researcher through the drop and pick. Data was collected using adopted and adapted tools: The Munich-Evaluation-of-Mentoring-Questionnaire (MEMeQ), MinT Tool, Johns Hopkins Learning Environment scale (JHLES), Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS), and Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale. The data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential analysis.

4.0 Findings and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of Mentoring Styles

In this section, the study sought to answer the question on the extent to which mentoring styles 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 mentoring styles. 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 mentoring style construct was categorized into four scales: Active listening, Advising, Prescribing and Cooperation.

Active Listening

Table 1 below provides descriptive results on active listening scale.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics: Active Listening

Active Listening	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M*	S.D*
My mentor gives me space to talk about my problems; he does not give his opinion in principle.	32, 8.2%	58, 14.9%	77, 19.8%	127, 32.6%	95, 24.4%	3.5	1.2
My mentor is open minded to solutions coming from me, even if on first sight he does not think much about them.	34, 8.7%	47, 12.1%	87, 22.4%	148, 38%	72, 18.5%	3.6	2.4
When I am worried about something my mentor takes time to listen and understand	29, 7.4%	24, 6.1%	51, 13%	127, 32.5%	160, 40.9%	3.9	1.2
My mentor listens, confirms what he has heard, then offers his opinions only if I'm to go off the discussion	30, 7.7%	49, 12.5%	79, 20.2%	135, 34.4%	99, 25.3%	3.6	1.2
Average						**3.6**	**1.5**

M – mean; S.D – Standard Deviation

The findings in Table 1 indicates that majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that *my mentor gives me space to talk about my problems; he does not give his opinion* in principle had a mean response of 3.5 and a standard deviation of 1.2. The statement *my mentor is open minded to solutions coming from me, even if on first sight he does not think much about them* had a mean response of 3.6 and a standard deviation of 2.4. The statement *when I am worried about something my mentor takes time to listen and understand* had a mean response of 3.9 and standard deviation of 1.2, and *my mentor listens, confirms what he has heard, then offers his opinions only if I'm to go off the discussion* had a mean response of 3.6 and a standard deviation of 1.2. The overall mean of 3.6 implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on active listening. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.5.

Advising

Table 2 below provides descriptive results on advising scale.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics: Advising

M – mean; S.D – Standard Deviation

Advising	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M*	S.D*
My mentor looks at situations and gives suggestions then I can make my own choices	20, 5.1%	26, 6.7%	58, 14.9%	133, 34.2%	152, 39.1%	4	1.1
When I am I trouble, good thinking might be impossible, so in these occasions, my mentor does the work problem-solving.	45, 11.6%	53, 13.7%	81, 20.9%	108, 27.9%	100, 25.8%	3.4	1.3
My mentor is a good adviser who stimulates me to think and	15, 3.8%	16, 4.1%	49, 12.5%	116, 29.6%	196, 50%	4.2	1.1

reflect after he suggests all kinds of solutions.							
My mentor gives me ideas that lead to problem-solving.	12, 3%	15, 3.8%	38, 9.6%	145, 36.8%	184, 46.7%	4.2	1
Average						**3.9**	**1.1**

The findings in Table 2 indicate that a majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that *my mentor looks at situations and gives suggestions then I can make my own choices* had a mean response of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 1.1, *my mentor is a good adviser who stimulates me to think and reflect after he suggests all kinds of solutions* had a mean response of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 1.1, and *my mentor gives me ideas that lead to problem-solving* had a mean response of 4.2 and standard deviation of 1.0. However, the respondents were neutral on the statement that *when I am I trouble, good thinking might be impossible, so in these occasions, my mentor does the work problem-solving* had a mean response of 3.4 and a standard deviation of 1.3. The overall mean of 3.9 implies that majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on advising. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.1.

Prescribing

Table 3 below provides descriptive results on prescribing scale

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics: Prescribing

Prescribing	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	Agree	strongly agree	M*	S.D*
For complicated problems, my mentor gives me solutions	12, 3.1%	25, 6.4%	74, 18.9%	128, 32.7%	153, 39%	4	1.1
My mentor indicates how problems can be solved in the most efficient way.	11, 2.8%	17, 4.3%	68, 17.3%	148, 37.8%	148, 37.8%	4	1
My mentor insist that I have to follow his advice	86, 21.9%	100, 25.5%	95, 24.2%	54, 13.8%	57, 14.5%	2.7	1.3
My mentor mostly tells me how to handle problems in an effective way	14, 3.6%	18, 4.6%	79, 20.3%	159, 40.9%	119, 30.6%	3.9	1
Average						**3.7**	**1.1**

M – mean; S.D – Standard Deviation

The findings in Table 3 indicate that a majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that for complicated problems*, my mentor gives me solutions* had a mean response of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 1.1. *My mentor indicates how problems can be solved in the most efficient way* had a mean response of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 1.0, and *my mentor mostly tells me how to handle problems in an effective way* had a mean response of 3.9 and a standard deviation of 1.0. On the other hand, a majority of the respondents were neutral on the statement that *my mentor insist that I have to follow his advice* had a mean response of 2.7 and a standard deviation 1.3. The overall mean of 3.7 implies that a majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on prescribing. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.1.

Cooperation

Table 4 below provides descriptive results on cooperation

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics: Cooperation

Cooperation	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree	M*	S.D*
We solve my problems together with my mentor on the basis of equality	38, 9.7%	54, 13.8%	87, 22.2%	109, 27.8%	104, 26.5%	3.5	1.3
In the mentoring process, my mentor is constantly searching for solutions that can be acceptable to me and him.	24, 6.1%	51, 13%	75, 19.2%	126, 32.2%	115, 29.4%	3.7	1.2
My mentor is open and clear on his points of view and expect the same from me.	29, 7.4%	29, 7.4%	79, 20.2%	126, 32.2%	128, 32.7%	3.8	1.2
The best solutions come from two directions.	27, 6.9%	32, 8.1%	78, 19.8%	103, 26.2%	153, 38.9%	3.8	1.2
Average						**3.7**	**1.2**

M – mean; S.D – Standard Deviation

The findings in Table 4 indicate that a majority of the respondents agreed with the statements that *we solve my problems together with my mentor on the basis of equality* had a mean response 3.5 and a standard deviation 1.3 and *in the mentoring process, my mentor is constantly searching for solutions that can be acceptable to me and him* had a mean response of 3.7 and a standard deviation of 1.2. *My mentor is open and clear on his points of view and expects the same from me* had a mean response of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 1.2, and that *the best solutions come from two directions* had a mean response of 3.8 and a standard deviation 1.2. The overall mean of 3.7 implies that a majority of the respondents agreed with most of the statements on cooperation. However, the responses were varied as shown by a standard deviation of 1.2.

4.2 Correlation

4.2.1 Relationship between Mentoring Styles and Students' Social Development

In response to RQ 2 which states: "To what extent does the mentoring styles 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 if there is a significant relationship between the variables mentoring style 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-value ≤ 0.05, H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a relationship between mentoring style and students' social development. But if p-value ≥ 0.05, H_0 is not rejected, which concludes that there is no significant relationship between mentoring style and students' social development.

H_{O1}: There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building. Results in Table 5 show the correlation findings on the relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building.

Table 5: Correlation Results: Mentoring Style and Building Relationships

		Building Relationships	Mentoring Style
Building Relationships	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Mentoring Style	Pearson Correlation	.271**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

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

The findings in Table 5 indicate a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.271 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 (r=0.271, p=0.000). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building.

H_{O2}: There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development. Results in Table 6 shows the correlations findings on the relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development.

Table 6: Correlation Results: Mentoring Style and Identity Development

		Identity Development	Mentoring Style
Identity Development	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Mentoring Style	Pearson Correlation	.268**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	

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

The findings in Table 6 reveal a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.268 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 (r=0.268, p=0.000). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development.

H_{O3}: There is no significant relation between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem. Results in Table 7 shows the correlation results on the relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem.

Table 7: Correlation Results: Mentoring Style and Self Esteem

		Self Esteem	Mentoring Style
Self Esteem	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Mentoring Style	Pearson Correlation	.190**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	

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

The findings in Table 7 reveal a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem. This is supported

by a correlation coefficient of 0.190 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 (r=0.190, p=0.000). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem.

H_{O4}: There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging. Results in Table 8 shows the correlation results on the relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging.

Table 8: Correlation Results: Mentoring Style and Students' Sense of Belonging

		Sense of Belonging	Mentoring Style
Sense of Belonging	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Mentoring Style	Pearson Correlation	.248**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	

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

The findings in Table 8 reveal a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging. This is supported by a correlation coefficient of 0.248 and p value of 0.000, which is less than conventional p value of 0.05 (r=0.248, p=0.000). Based on this, the H_0 is rejected, which concludes that there is a significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging.

4.3 Regression Analysis

The regression of coefficients results is presented in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Regression Coefficient

Model		B	Std. Error	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.948	0.228	8.529	0
	Mentoring Style	0.120	0.052	2.33	0.02

a Dependent Variable: Social Development

As revealed by the results above, the estimated was as indicated below:

$Y = 1.948 + 0.12X$

Where:

Y = Students' Social development

X = Mentoring Styles

Regression of coefficient results in Table 9 indicate that there is a positive and significant relationship between mentoring style and students' social development (β=0.12, p = 0.02). This is supported by a beta coefficient of 0.12 and p value of 0.02<0.05. This implies that an improvement in mentoring style by 1 unit would lead to an improvement in the students' social development by 0.12 units.

Further, the study sought to establish the effect of mentoring style aspects on students' social development. The bivariate regression results are summarized below.

Table 10: Summary of Mentoring Styles and Social Development

Student's Social Development	Beta Coefficient (β)	Sig
Cooperation	0.236	0.000
Prescribing	0.234	0.000
Advising	0.228	0.000
Active Listening	0.119	0.001

Based on the above findings, all aspects of mentoring styles had a positive and significant effect on students' social development. From the results, cooperation had the greatest effect on social development (β=0.236), followed by prescribing (β=0.234), then advising (β=228), and lastly active listening (β=0.119).

5.0 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary

The study sought to establish the extent to which mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs influence students' social development in public secondary schools in Nairobi County. To achieve this, the study tested four hypotheses. The correlation results indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between mentoring styles and students' social development aspects: students building relationships, identity development, self-esteem and sense of belonging.

Based on this findings, the hypotheses: **H$_{O1}$:** There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' relationship building; **H$_{O2}$:** There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' identity development; **H$_{O3}$:** There is no significant relation between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' self-esteem; and **H$_{O4}$:** There is no significant relationship between mentoring styles in the school-based mentoring programs and students' sense of belonging were rejected. Thus, implying that there was a significant relationship between mentoring styles and students' relationship building, identity development, self-esteem and sense of belonging. Further, the regression results revealed that mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs had a positive and significant influence on students' social development.

5.2 Conclusions

The study concluded that secondary school students were in agreement with most of the statements relating to mentoring styles. This implied that the students found mentoring style elements which included active listening, advising, prescribing and cooperation as essential in enhancing their social development. Based on the correlation results, the study concluded that there was a significant relationship between mentoring styles 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 mentoring styles in school-based mentoring programs had a positive and significant influence on students' social development.

5.3 Recommendations

From the findings, the study recommended that secondary schools should strengthen the mentoring styles aspects. These are active listening, advising, prescribing and cooperation.

This is expected to further enhance social development of the students through mentoring styles. For the continuity and excellence in the school-based mentoring programs the teachers must reflect, interrogate and evaluate themselves against the best practices of school-based mentoring. The government can work at enhancing mentoring styles in all schools by offering initial training and refresher courses for school mentors so as to ensure that standards of the school mentoring programs are enhanced significantly. Parents need to be involved in and understand the school-based mentoring programs by first: attending awareness workshops and trainings on teenage parenting and secondly, attend joint parents-students' mentoring sessions.

References

Ayton, Darshini, (2012). "The Impact of the COACH Community Mentoring Program on Health and Wellbeing."

Berk, Laura E. (2009). *Child Development*. 8th ed. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Downs, J. (2011). Assessing the Value of a High School Mentoring Program. Boise State University Theses and Dissertations. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/td/191

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.

DuBois, L., Holloway, B. E., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs: A meta-analytical review. American Journal of Community Psychology, 30, 157– 197. doi:10.1023/A:1014628810714.

Goodman, R. L., Flexner, P. A., & Bloomberg, L. D. (2008). What We Now Know about Jewish Education: Perspectives on Research for Practice. Los Angeles: Torah Aura Productions.

Griffiths, O. V. (2013). Understanding the CDM Regulations. London: Routledge.

Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., & McMaken, J. (2007). Making a difference in schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring impact study. *Public/Private Ventures*.

Hidayushafie, Nurul, Syed Sakhi Ahmad Sultani, Siti Sarah Roselan, and Abdullah Noori. (2017). "Different Mentoring Styles of the Supervisors for Final Year M. Ed Students: Students' Perspectives." *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications 7 (9): 299–304.*

Jefferis, T. C., & Theron, L. C. (2017). Promoting resilience among Sesotho-speaking adolescent girls: Lessons for South African teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, *37*(3).

Jucovy, Linda. (2007). The ABCs of School-Based Mentoring. *Program Management Resources.* Education Northwest (formerly NWREL), in collaboration with the Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence. Retrieved from http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/resources/ABCs of Mentoring.pdf.

Kail, Robert V., and. Cavanaugh John C. (2013). *Human Development: A Life-Span View*. 6th ed. Australia; Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Karanja, B. W. & Gikungu, J. M. (2014). Effect of mentorship programmes on the performance of students in secondary schools in Mbooni East District, Makueni County-Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(5), 167.

Komosa-Hawkins, K. (2010). Best Practices in School - based Mentoring Programs for Adolescents. Child & Youth Services, 31(3–4), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/0145935X.2009.524477.

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.

Kostelnik, M. J. (2015). Guiding children's social development and learning: theory and skills (8e [editio).

Lee, K., Kim, M. J., Park, T. H. & Alcazar-Bejerano, I. L. (2015). Effects of a ubiquitous mentoring program on self-esteem, school adaptation, and perceived parental attitude. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *43*(7), 1193-1208.

Luyckx, K., Schwartz, S. J., Berzonsky, M. D., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Smits, I., & Goossens, L. (2008). Capturing ruminative exploration: Extending the four-dimensional model of identity formation in late adolescence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(1), 58-82.

Mbuthia, W. W. (2013). Perceived Factors Influencing Deviant Behaviour Among the Youth in Njathaini Community, Nairobi Kenya (Thesis). Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.

McCoy, R. (2017). Best Practices for School-Based Mentoring Programs: A Systematic Review.

McDevitt, Teresa M. & Ormrod, Jeanne Ellis (2004). *Child Development: Educating and Working with Children and Adolescents*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, N. J: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Ministry of Education Science and Technology. (2012). Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012 on reforming education and training sectors in Kenya. (14).

MOEST. (2018). National Education Sector plan: Sessional Paper No. 14 of 2012.

Morak, D. (2009). *Cooperative Negotiation*. GRIN Verlag.

Muteti, Rachel Mbula. (2018). 'Behavior Management among Early Adolescent and Its Implication to the Church in Africa'. *The International Journal of Humaniities and Social Studies* 6 (3): 113–18.

Muzi, M. J. (2000). *Child development: Through time and transition*. Prentice Hall.

Myers, D. G. (2005). Exploring psychology (6th ed., i). New York, N.Y: Worth Publishers.

National Crime Research Centre. (2017). *Rapid Assessment of Arsons in Secondary Schools in Kenya—July-August, 2016* (pp. 1–68). National Crime Research Centre.

Nayab, N., & Schneid, J. (2011). Tracing the origins of mentoring and its progression through the ages. *The Bright Hub*.

Price, D., & McCallum, F. (2015). Ecological influences on teachers' well-being and "fitness". *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(3), 195-209.

Qureshi, Z., & Maxwell, S. R. J. (2014). The Unofficial Guide to Prescribing. Edinburgh: Elsevier Health Sciences.

Scheer, S. D., Gavazzi, S. M., & Blumenkrantz., D. G. (2007). Rites of passage during adolescence. The Forum for Family and Consumer, 12(2). Retrieved from https://ncsu.edu/ffci/publications/2007/v12-n2-2007-summer-fall/scheer.php

Schwartz, S. E., Lowe, S. R., & Rhodes, J. E. (2012). Mentoring relationships and adolescent self-esteem. *The prevention researcher*, *19*(2), 17.

Sifuna, Daniel N., and Otiende James E.. (2006). *An Introductory History of Education*. Rev. ed. Nairobi: Nairobi U. Press.

Turner, J. S. (2009). Encyclopedia of Relationships Across the Lifespan. Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Wairimu, M. W. (2013). Perceived factors influencing deviant behaviour among the youth in Njathaini Community, Nairobi, Kenya. *Unpublished master's thesis). Kenyatta University, Kenya*.

APPENDIX: RESULTS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED SCHOOLS

National Schools

1.	Moi Forces Academy	0
2.	Starehe Boys	0
3.	Pangani Girls	0
4.	Nairobi School	0
5.	Kenya High	1
6.	Starehe Girls	0
7.	Lenana High School	0

Extra County Schools

8.	Ngara Girls	0
9.	Parklands Arya	0
10.	Statehouse Girls	1
11.	Kangemi High	0
12.	Hospital Hill High	0
13.	St. Georges Girls	0
14.	Nairobi Milimani	0
15.	Lavington Sec	1
16.	Highridge Sec	0
17.	Moi Girls High School	0
18.	Upperhill School	0
19.	Aquinas Boys High	0
20.	Highway High School	1
21.	Ofafa Jericho	0
22.	Buruburu Girls	0
23.	St. Annes	0
24.	Dagoretti High	0
25.	Precious Blood Riruta	1

County Schools

26.	Nembu Girls High School	0
27.	Eastleigh High School	0
28.	St. Teresa's Boys	0
29.	Maina Wanjigi	0
30.	Uhuru Secondary	1
31.	Kamukunji Secondary	0
32.	Our Lady of Mercy	0
33.	Jamhuri High	0
34.	Pumwani Boys	0
35.	Muhuri Muchiri	1
36.	Langata High	0
37.	Karen C Secondary	0
38.	Langata Barracks	0
39.	St.Teresas Girls	0
40.	Huruma Girls	1
41.	Our Lady of Mercy South B	0
42.	Nile Road Sec	0
43.	Makongeni Sec.	0
44.	St. Patricks Sec	0

45.	Mutuini High	1
46.	Ruthimitu Secondary	0
47.	Ruthimitu Girls	0
48.	Dagoretti High	0
49.	Beth Mugo High…..	0
50.	Embakasi Garrison	1
51.	The Komarock	0
52.	Peter Kibukosya	0
53.	Utawala	0
54.	Mwangaza	0
55.	Kayole South	1
56.	Embakasi Girls	0

Subcounty Schools

57.	Zawadi Secondary School	0
58.	County Girls	0
59.	CGHU High	0
60.	Pumwani Girls	1
61.	Dandora Secondary	0
62.	Dr. Mwenje	0
63.	Ruai Girls	0
64.	Dandora Girls	0
65.	Ruai Boys	1
66.	Raila	0
67.	Our Lady of Fatima	0
68.	Kahawa Garrison	0
69.	Ruaraka	0
70.	Kamiti Sec	1
71.	Babadogo	0
72.	Kariobangi North Girls	0
73.	Mwiki Sec	0
74.	Kiwanja Sec	0
75.	Garden Estate	1
76.	Ndururuno Sec	0
77.	Star of Hope	0

Key: 1 = Sampled
      0 = Not Sampled