

Induction and Mentoring as Correlates of Senior Management Team's (SMT's) Job Performance at Maluti District, Eastern Cape, South Africa

Paulos D. Leboea¹, Kemi O. Adu² and Emmanuel O. Adu^{3*}

¹*Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare East London Campus, South Africa*

²*Faculty of education, University of Fort Hare East London Campus South Africa*

^{3*}*Faculty of education, University of Fort Hare, P.O. Box 1005, East London 5200, South Africa*

E-mail: ¹<leboeagetsmail@yahoo.com>, ²<201510102@ufh.ac.za>, ³<eadu@ufh.ac.za>

KEYWORDS Policies. Mentoring. Induction. Organization. Participant. Performance

ABSTRACT People need support to help them engrave new skills into their own basic skills. Hence, the role of induction and mentoring cannot be over emphasized. This research investigated the effect of induction and mentoring on the SMT's job performance. The research adopted a Correlational survey research design. Simple random sampling technique was used to select the participants. Self-structured questionnaires were validated and used to elicit information from the respondents. The findings revealed among others that the SMT members did not feel that they could do their job well, even if they had not undergone any induction process, schools did not induct new personnel. This may further mean that many schools did not adhere to the organization policy of induction and the bulk of the SMT participants were not aware that they were suppose to assign mentors to their supervisees. The study recommends that the training of the SMTs in relation to the organizational policies should be structured properly.

INTRODUCTION

Most personnel who have assumed supervisory positions as the School Management Team's (SMTs) invariably do not do their tasks well, either due to the lack of time or the ability to fulfill this obligation (Grobler et al. 2006: 209). This becomes a problem which caused the researchers to be curious as to why some SMTs fail to do their tasks effectively – as observed by Grobler et al. (2006) above. This again becomes worrisome, as the SMTs are expected to play a crucial role in the life of a school. A functional school equals a functional school management team, in that SMTs should control work done by the colleagues in their departments, guide their colleagues in strategies of mediating skills, knowledge, attitudes and values to their learners (Education Labour Relations Council 2003: C66–67). The SMTs can only do the foregoing effectively only if they have been trained accordingly, as pre-service training is generalist in nature, except for subject specialization which the educator would have done in order to forestall having a knowledge gap.

SMTs are further supposed to beef up the schools' policy on management issues that the principal may delegate to them as, and when, that becomes necessary. The management issues contextualized in this paper are not the general management mandates, but they refer specifically to those management issues pertaining to the policies of induction, and mentoring. Again, SMTs need to coach and mentor their colleagues in the junior ranks for effective implementation and management of all the school-based activities. Whereas entry level (post level 1) educators needed to do a short training course before aspiring to assume the supervisory roles in the school, they now need just three, five and seven years respectively in the system to be eligible for applying for a promotion post as HODs, Deputy Principals and Principals respectively (Grobler et al. 2006: 209). Some SMT incumbents end up just teaching and adding no value to the schools' work control policy, whilst they also enjoy having a fewer number of teaching periods than their post level 1 (entry level) colleagues.

Nationally, Heystek (2002: 185) is of the view that people need support to help them engrave new skills into their own basic skills. This is cor-

robored by Education Facilitators (2001: 13) who quip that failure to assist a new incumbent with guidance and communication can lead to a good teacher leaving the profession. This, in effect, means that new incumbents need induction and mentoring to assess in line with the curriculum prescripts as well as being put in the groove to the supervise curriculum or being guided to implement it effectively, lest they should regard themselves as being ineffective and redundant.

Induction and mentoring are crucial for the SMT in that they need to be trained therein, as a way of introducing them to their new work terrain. This helps the SMT to be functional and productive in the institutions where they are employed. They, in turn, need to orientate/induct those under their supervision.

Research Objective

The main objective for this research is to investigate if the SMTs are performing their roles by utilizing the organizational policy that encompasses induction and mentoring for aspirant SMT personnel.

Research Questions

- What is the relationship between induction and the SMTs' job performance?
- What is the effect of mentoring on the SMTs' job performance?

Literature Review

Concept of Induction

The National Department of Education (NDOE 2000: 30) defines induction simply as the process of introducing new staff members into a school, and further quips them. A good school should have a carefully planned induction programme which runs at the beginning of each academic year. The formal part of the induction process should be similar for all the new incumbents at the beginning of each year; the formal induction part should actually be very intensive for the first week while it actually has to stretch over not only over the first term but indeed over the whole of the first year (NDOE 2000: 30). The informal part of the induction process is better realized in the social occasions

at which new the incumbents meet the existing staff at the school as well as the other newcomers – regardless of the positions they will be holding (NDOE 2000: 30).

Heystek (2002: 125) defines induction as a systematic organizational effort to assist personnel to adjust readily and effectively to the new assignments, so that they will be able to contribute maximally to the work of the system while not forgetting to realize personal and position satisfaction. He further indicates that a school may recruit personnel, select them, place them, replace them and transfer them but of cardinal importance is for the personnel to adapt fully to the job that they have to perform within a certain environment and to the colleagues with whom they have to co-operate (Heystek 2002: 126).

In defining induction, Grobler et al. (2006: 207) opined that it is precisely the process of introducing the new employees to the goals of the organization, its policies and procedures, its values and the co-workers, as well as the activities related to the tasks to be performed and the equipment to be used. These scholars further noted that as the pool of potential employees in South Africa is increasingly becoming more diverse with regard to the age, language and cultural background, it is mandatory that proper attention be paid to induction. The above definition actually encompasses a whole lot of activities associated with induction which we seldom see in South African schools if at all it is ever practiced. It is also very true that in South Africa, especially in the education field, there is an influx of potential educator employees. These will need to be properly inducted on being employed. Again, being a newcomer in an organization cannot be confined only to the educators who come to teach for the first time, but must also refer to the seasoned educators who join a school either on a transfer or promotion. This, in effect, means that even educators who join the the SMT must undergo induction so as to be put in the groove regarding how the new school operates.

Bush and Middleton (2006: 142-143) define induction by categorizing it into three elements, namely socialization, achieving competent performance and understanding organizational culture.

Under induction as socialization they quip as follows:

- Accepting the reality of the organization; this means knowing the do's and don'ts regarding individual behavior in an organization;
- Dealing with resistance to change;
- Learning how to work realistically in a new job, in terms of having to cope with too much or too little organization and too much or too little job definition;
- Dealing with the boss and understanding the reward system, which encompass knowing the amount of autonomy given and what the organization defines as high performance; and
- Locating one's place in the organization and developing an identity, which is, understanding how an individual fits into the organization (Bush and Middleton 2006: 142).

In defining induction as achieving competent performance, Bush and Middleton (2006: 143) succinctly described induction sub-elements as follows:

- Getting used to the place, that is, overcoming the initial shock and immobilization of the new organization and job demands;
- Relearning, which presupposes recognizing that new skills have to be learned, or, how learned skills have to be reapplied;
- Becoming effective, which means consolidating one's position in the organization by applying new behaviors and skills, or integrating newly formed attitudes with ones held from the past.

Lastly, in defining induction as understanding organizational culture, Bush and Middleton (2006: 143) posited that this is the transfer of loyalties to the new organization and they further stressed that until this happens, the new incumbent will never become committed to the success of the new place of employment and this may hamper optimum level of performance. Guthrie (2003: 1619) opined that induction programs 'are blossoming throughout the country as one strategy' of helping teachers to transit from being student teachers to being professional teachers. Put in context, this means that induction is a process that involves operationalizing programmes that are geared towards welcoming novice teachers in the teaching profession. This opinion transcends the mere definition of induction in that it also presupposes the rationale thereof.

The Concept of Mentoring

Leboea et al. (2015) opined that there were different definitions relating to mentoring and that definitions depended on the different model of mentoring that used. He further noted that mentoring, in essence:

- exists in an organizational context;
- is an adult relationship;
- invariably involves an element of power dependency;
- is concerned with on the job practice;
- is a means of promoting the new educator's involvement in professional learning; and
- Emphasizes progression from a guided to independent practice.

Naidu et al. (2008: 97) define mentoring as a general process in which an experienced person assists and guides a less experienced person. These scholars further regard mentoring as a relationship between two persons. Leboea et al. (2015) further posited that this relationship could be effective in the education arena if it was dynamic and reciprocal, in which case 'a more advanced and wise career incumbent (mentor) helped a less experienced person – who has development potential (mentee) in some specified capacity' (Naidu et al. 2008: 97). Taking the relationship definition of mentoring forward, the following key elements come to the fore:

- The mentoring relationship is dynamic and not static;
- It is reciprocal – the impetus comes from the both sides;
- The relationship takes place in the work environment;
- The mentor is a wise career incumbent;
- The mentor helps the mentee to develop; the mentee is less experienced but has the potential to develop; and
- The mentee is developed in some specified capacity (Naidu et al. 2008: 98).

The foregoing points to the SMTs at school in that they will have been educators for a number of years before applying to assume supervisory positions in the school and therefore form the core of mentoring personnel to their less experienced colleagues. The researcher's view is that the SMTs should therefore have been suitably and relevantly trained in order for them to effectively guide and supervise others. The merit of this assertion is that the mentees will

reap the benefits of being guided by the mentors who know the ins and outs of what they are doing.

Corroborating Naidu et al. as mentioned earlier, Education Facilitators (2001: 11) quip that mentoring is one approach that seeks to improve the transfer of experience and skills from the master and experienced educators to the novices. They further suggest that 'mentor-beginner educator relationship should focus on the first year of new employees' work in the organization, which – in the current study – is the school. Moreover, Education Facilitators continue to refine their definition of mentoring by actually defining the mentor, who they say, is a person who perceives himself as being co-responsible for the professional development of another person.

In defining mentoring, English (2006: 660-661) posited that it is a work policy that was often used interchangeably with assisting, guiding, teaching, learning, readiness, compensation, support and socialization. He further opined that can be divided into traditional and alternative conceptions. On the traditional conception he quips that mentorship involves training in skills building and knowledge acquisition, both inside and outside education. He calls traditional mentorship a relationship which is guided by experienced persons in the schools, universities or other professional domains. These mentioned personnel transfer understanding and knowledge to apprentices. This is a unidirectional process wherein the most experienced person teaches while the neophyte or novice learns.

English (2006), however, criticizes the traditional mentorship conception by saying that because of its uni-directionalness it is a transmission model that does not focus on sustaining professional development, lifelong learning or relationship building. It further stifles critical reflection and feedback as authoritative knowledge is mediated, and satisfaction and recognition is derived from the protégé's (mentee) accomplishments (this compares fairly well with the definition sponsored by Naidu et al. (2008: 98), regarding mentoring as a relationship – this was cited previously under the definition of mentoring).

The difference in the foregoing definitions of mentorship seeks to say nowadays mentorship should be bi-directional (as in co-mentoring), instead of being uni-directional (as in the

traditional or transmission conception of mentorship). This difference becomes even more important in that neophytes join the teaching fraternity with a new, fresh outlook in the education dialectic, which may be opposed or even more diversified than that of their seniors who may have studied a long time ago and may have therefore forgotten or may not have come across that kind of knowledge during their tenure as students. The researchers' view is, therefore, that a learning relationship between the mentor and mentee may stand both in a good stead and may assure a successful productivity rate on the part of the mentor, which, for the purpose of our study, refers to an the SMT member.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The current study involved the correlational research design but adopted the survey type in order to collect data on how induction and mentoring as relates to the SMTs' job performance at Maluti District in Eastern Cape, South Africa.

Population/Sample and Sample Selection

The population of this study comprised all the Senior Management Team members in Maluti District. Simple random sampling technique was used to select fifty-four SMT members from the total number of eighty-four in all the Maluti District.

Research Instruments

Self-structured questionnaire was used to collect information from the respondents on the effect of induction and mentoring on the Senior Management Team's job performance. The instrument consisted of the closed-form (structured) questionnaire of the modified Likert scale responses from SA to SD that is, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) to be the best instrument for the current study because it would be easy to subject it to statistical analysis. This foregoing questionnaire was used to collect data relating to the current study's independent variables, namely, induction and mentoring.

Another structured questionnaire was used to collect data relating to the SMTs' job perfor-

mance or job satisfaction, which constituted the dependent variable. The rating scale used in this case was still of the Likert scale format, although numbers ranging from 1 to 5 were used, with the numbers representing POOR, FAIR, GOOD, VERY GOOD and EXCELLENT respectively.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments

The instruments were validated by giving the instruments (structured questionnaires) to experts in the Faculty of Education of the university under whose auspices the study was conceived. This led the researchers looking into how the reliability of the current data collecting instrument (the structured questionnaire) was ensured. Hence, the instrument reliability was measured using Cronbach alpha in which its coefficient was above 0.80 then the instrument (structured questionnaire) was deemed to be reliable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between induction and the SMTs’ job performance?

This section had 6 sub-questions, which were coded as C1, C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6. These sub-questions sought to answer question 2 of the study

C1: *You do believe that there is a relationship between induction and your job performance.*

Table 1: Relationship between induction and SMT job performance

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Disagree	30	55.6	55.6	55.6
Strongly disagree	24	44.4	44.4	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

In Table 1, 24 out of 54 participants (44.4%) strongly disagreed with the notion that there was a relationship between induction and the SMTs’ job performance, while 30 out of 54 (55.6%) disagreed. This meant that no response carried the view that there was a relationship between induction and the SMTs’ job performance.

The interpretation hereof is that SMT members did not feel that they could do their job well

even if they have not undergone any induction process. This perception was not in sync with the policy in that the latter ordained that the personnel must undergo induction when they assume duties at a new workplace, or at a workplace other than their previous work-station. In this regard Harley et al. point out that sometimes some tensions exist between policy and practice (Education Facilitators 2001: 186).

C2: *You were given training on inducting teachers under your supervision.*

Table 2: Educator induction by supervisor

	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Strongly agree	6	11.1	11.1	11.1
Agree	15	27.8	27.8	38.9
Disagree	29	53.7	53.7	92.6
Strongly disagree	4	7.4	7.4	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

Asked as to whether they were given training on inducting educators under their supervision, participants responded as follows: 4 (7.4%) participants strongly disagreed, 29 (53.7%) disagreed, while 6 (11.1%) and 15 (27.8%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively (see Table 2).

The interpretation that is attached hereto is that more participants disagreed that they were trained to induct their supervisees. The disagreement is aggregated as 4 plus 29 (33 participants), which cumulatively gives 61.1 percent, as against 6 plus 15 (21 participants), which cumulatively gives 38.9 percent; of the participants who agreed that they were trained to conduct induction on their supervisees. Further interpretation of the above may not be that in most schools the SMT members are not trained to run induction workshops, nor do such schools induct new incumbents. They leave supervisees to their own devices. The finding is negated by Bush and Middleton (2006: 141), Guthrie (2003) and Grobler et al. (2006: 209).

C3: *Your school inducts all new personnel irrespective of post or position.*

Asked if their schools do induct all new personnel regardless of post or position, participants responded as follows: 4 (7.4%) and 13 (24.1%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 28 (51.9%) and 9 (16.7%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 3).

The simple interpretation hereof is that more participants' schools did not induct the new personnel. This may further mean that many schools did not adhere to the organization policy of induction. The finding is not supported by Bush and Middleton (2006: 141), Guthrie (2003: 1619) and Grobler et al. (2006: 209).

Table 3: Inducting all new personnel

	<i>Frequ- ency</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Valid per- cent</i>	<i>Cumula- tive per- cent</i>
Strongly agree	4	7.4	7.4	7.4
Agree	13	24.1	24.1	31.5
Disagree	28	51.9	51.9	83.3
Strongly disagree	9	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

C4: *You are adequately equipped to conduct induction.*

Table 4 shows that when participants were asked whether they were adequately equipped to conduct induction they responded as follows: 2 (3.7%) and 18 (33.3%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 25 (46.3%) and 9 (16.7%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Table 4: Conducting induction adequately

	<i>Frequ- ency</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Valid per- cent</i>	<i>Cumula- tive per- cent</i>
Strongly agree	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
Agree	18	33.3	33.3	37.0
Disagree	25	46.3	46.3	83.3
Strongly disagree	9	16.7	16.7	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be interpreted to mean that only 20 (2 plus 18) participants thought they were adequately equipped to conduct induction, as against 34 (25 and 9) who did not think they were adequately equipped to conduct induction. Of the few who thought they were adequately equipped only 2 were confident enough, hence they strongly agreed. This finding is negated by Heystek (2002: 125) and NDOE (2000: 30).

C5: *You strongly believe that you were supposed to be orientated in induction before you became an SMT member.*

Asked whether they strongly believed that they were supposed to be orientated in induc-

tion before they became SMT members, participants responded as follows: 1 (1.9%) participant strongly agreed, as against 22 (40.7%) and 31 (57.4%) who disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 5).

Table 5: Induction before assuming SMT position

	<i>Frequ- ency</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Valid per- cent</i>	<i>Cumula- tive per- cent</i>
Strongly agree	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Disagree	22	40.7	40.7	42.6
Strongly disagree	31	57.4	57.4	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result means that an overwhelming majority of the participants felt that it was not necessary for them to be given an orientation in induction before they became SMT members. This may, in effect, suggest why most of them attested that they were not adequately empowered to conduct induction. Furthermore, this may explain why most SMTs responded that no induction took place at their schools. This finding negates the notion found in Grobler et al. (2006: 209-210) and Naidu et al. (2008: 97).

C6: *The training you received in the policy of induction has an effect on your job performance.*

Asked whether the training they had received in the policy of induction had an effect on their job performance, participants responded as follows: 3 (5.6%) and 12 (22.2%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 22 (40.7%) and 17 (31.5%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 6).

Table 6: Induction training and effect on SMT job performance

	<i>Frequ- ency</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Valid per- cent</i>	<i>Cumula- tive per- cent</i>
Strongly agree	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
Agree	12	22.2	22.2	27.8
Disagree	22	40.7	40.7	68.5
Strongly disagree	17	31.5	31.5	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be interpreted in two ways, namely, either that the majority of participants had received an induction training that had no effect

on their job; or that the majority of participants did not receive any training in the policy of induction. We must also remember that many participants may have said that the induction training had no effect simply because, by their own admission in the previous question, there had been no induction training at all (compare with results in 4.1.3.5). This finding is not supported by Grobler et al. (2006: 207), Bush and Middleton (2006: 142) and Naidu et al. (2008: 97).

Research Question 2: What is the effect of mentoring on the SMTs' job performance?

This section had 6 sub-questions, which were coded as D1, D2, D3, D4, D5 and D6. These sub-questions were intended to elicit answers for research question 2.

D1: *You do believe that mentoring does have an effect on your job performance.*

Table 7 shows that when participants were asked whether they do believe that mentoring does have an effect on their job performance they answered as follows: 2 (3.7%) and 3 (5.6%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 19 (35.2%) and 30 (55.6%) disagreed and strongly agreed respectively. The above can be interpreted to mean that the majority of the participants, 19 plus 30, felt that mentoring has no effect on their job performance, while fewer personnel, 2 plus 3, felt that mentoring does have an effect on their job performance. The foregoing finding is not supported by Leboea et al. (2015) and Naidu et al. (2008: 98).

Table 7: Mentoring effect on SMT job performance

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Strongly agree	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
Agree	3	5.6	5.6	9.3
Disagree	19	35.2	35.2	44.4
Strongly disagree	30	55.6	55.6	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

D2: *Your school does practice the policy of mentoring.*

Asked if their schools do practice the policy of mentoring, participants responded as follows: 2 (3.7%) and 11 (20.4%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively, while 31 (57.4%) and 10 (18.5%) disagreed and strongly agreed respectively (see Table 8).

Table 8: School and mentoring practice

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Strongly agree	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
Agree	11	20.4	20.4	24.1
Disagree	31	57.4	57.4	81.5
Strongly disagree	10	18.5	18.5	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

Simply put, the above result fewer schools did practice the policy of mentoring in the Eastern Cape, while the majority of schools simply ignored the policy. This finding is not supported since scholars and policy designers feel that mentoring is necessary. That mentoring is necessary enjoys support by Naidu et al. (2008: 97) and Education Facilitators (2001: 11).

D3: *You are aware that you have to assign mentors for all supervisees.*

Asked if they are aware that they are supposed to assign mentors for all the supervisees, participants responded as follows: 3 (5.6%) agreed against 37 (68.5%) and 14 (25.9%) who disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 9).

Table 9: Awareness of assigning mentors to supervisees

	Frequency	Per cent	Valid per cent	Cumulative per cent
Agree	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
Disagree	37	68.5	68.5	74.1
Strongly disagree	14	25.9	25.9	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

This can be interpreted to mean that the bulk of the SMT participants, 37 and 14 out of 54 were not aware that they were supposed to assign mentors to their supervisees. The question that should arise in this scenario is that how they went about ensuring that their supervisees did their work in congruence with the policy precepts and precepts. The above finding is not supported by Bush and Middleton (2006: 158) and Leboea et al. (2015).

D4: *You know what mentors should be doing in order to support the mentees (those being supported).*

Table 10 shows that when participants were asked whether they know what mentors should be doing in order to support the mentees, they responded as follows: 3 (5.6%) and 4 (7.4%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively. On the other hand, 37 (68.5%) and 10 (18.5%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively (see Table 10).

Table 10: Knowing mentors' support duties

	Fre- quency	Per- cent	Valid per- cent	Cumula- tive per- cent
Strongly agree	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
Agree	4	7.4	7.4	13.0
Disagree	37	68.5	68.5	81.5
Strongly disagree	10	18.5	18.5	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result can simply be interpreted to say that the bulk of SMTs, 37 plus 10 out of 54, had no knowledge of the duties of the mentors, while very few, 3 plus 4 out of 54, claimed to know the mentors' duties. Of those participants who agreed that they knew the mentors' duties, only 3 out of 54 were confident in their knowledge in that they strongly agreed. The notion of not knowing the mentors' duties is not supported by Leboea et al. (2015) and Guthrie (2003: 1618).

D5: *Before becoming a supervisor (SMT member) you were orientated as to how you would conduct mentoring.*

When participants were asked whether they did receive orientation regarding how they would conduct mentoring they responded as follows: 8 (14.8%) and 16 (29.6%) participants were in strong agreement and agreement respectively, leaving 26 (48.1%) and 4 (7.4%) participants respectively in disagreement and strong disagreement (see Table 11).

Table 11: Pre-SMT mentoring orientation

	Fre- quency	Per- cent	Valid per- cent	Cumula- tive per- cent
Strongly agree	8	14.8	14.8	14.8
Agree	16	29.6	29.6	44.4
Disagree	26	48.1	48.1	92.6
Strongly disagree	4	7.4	7.4	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above result simply means that 8 plus 16 (24) participants had received pre-SMT orientation on how to conduct the policy of mentoring. The above number was in the midst of 26 plus 4 (30) participants who had not been afforded such an orientation. The idea of not receiving pre-SMT training is not supported by Bush and Middleton (2006: 162-163) and English (2006: 660-661).

D6: *Mentoring benefits the mentor, mentee and the organization.*

When the questionnaire put it to participants that mentoring benefits the mentor, the mentee and the organization, they responded as follows: 3 (5.6%) and 3 (5.6%) participants strongly agreed and agreed respectively to the notion, while 20 (37%) and 28 (51.9%) participants disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to the notion (see Table 12).

Table 12: Mentoring benefits

	Fre- quency	Per- cent	Valid per- cent	Cumula- tive per- cent
Strongly agree	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
Agree	3	5.6	5.6	11.1
Disagree	20	37.0	37.0	48.1
Strongly disagree	28	51.9	51.9	100.0
Total	54	100.0	100.0	

The above finding simply means that the majority of the SMT members (48) who participated in the research did not know that the policy of mentoring benefited the mentors, mentees and the organization – the DBE in this case. This may in part explain why most of them did not even know duties that were expected of the mentors during the process of supporting their supervisees. The foregoing finding is not supported by Naidu et al. (2008: 98) and Zachary (2000: 59) who believed that the policy of mentoring did not favor the mentees.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the results regarding induction, it can be concluded that very few SMT members in the Eastern Cape did have the knowledge of the organizational policy of induction; hence the majority neither implemented nor practiced it in the schools where they worked. They therefore, did not relate what they

are supposed to do (practice) with what they are supposed to know (theory) regarding the policy of induction – this scenario points to a disjuncture between practice and theory. Again, based on the findings regarding mentoring, it stands to the reason that the majority of SMT members are not grounded in training and knowledge of the organizational policy of mentoring, as a result of which no necessary support and guidance is afforded to their supervisees or mentees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researchers further recommend that the training of SMTs in relation to the organizational policies should be structured such that the policies of induction and mentoring must be done holistically and not as separate policies. This conclusion is based on the perceived disjuncture expressed by the participants in responding to the research instruments. A cascade model should be adopted so that what transpires at the DBE national level should filter down through Provinces to districts and schools so that the SMTs' understanding of organizational policies is congruous with the basic view of the organization (the DBE) with regards to its policies. This, in essence, also puts the onus upon the DBE to ensure that it synergizes its oversight responsibility with regards to all the organizational policies that the SMTs should be trained on.

REFERENCES

- Bush T, Middleton D 2006. *Leading and Managing People in Education*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Education Facilitators 2001. *Educational Management V: Human Resource Management EMH500A THE READER*. Cresta: Azaliah College, Education Facilitators (PTY) LTD.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2003. *Policy Handbook for Educators*. Pretoria: Universal Print Group.
- English FW (Ed.) 2006. *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Volume 2. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Grobler P, Warnich S, Carrel MR, Elbert NF, Hatfield RD 2006. *Human Resource Management in South Africa*. 3rd Edition. London: Thomson Learning.
- Guthrie WJ (Ed.) 2003. *Encyclopedia of Education*. USA: Macmillan Reference.
- Heystek J 2002. *Human Resource Management in Education: Code HRE 711*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Leboeae PD, Adu EO, Adu KO 2015. Organization policy and school management team's (SMT's) job performance in South Africa: A literature review. *Journal of Social Sciences (JSS)*, 45(2): 103-112.
- Naidu A, Joubert R, Mestry R, Mosoge J, Ngcobo T 2008. *Education Management and Leadership: A South African Perspective*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.
- National Department of Education (NDOE) 2000. *School Management Teams: Employment, Induction and Orientation of School-based Educators*. Pretoria: CPT Book Printers.
- Zachary LJ 2000. *The Mentor's Guide: Facilitating Learning Relationships*. Danvers, MA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Paper received for publication on June 2016
Paper accepted for publication on October 2016