

“If They Strike Once, We Will Strike Twice”: Office Door Graffiti As A Double Force Retaliation Against Administrative Policies In Zimbabwean Public Schools

Nyasha Cefas Zimuto

Dean of Studies, Rukara Model School of the University of Rwanda

Corresponding Author: Nyasha Cefas Zimuto. E-mail: nyasha.zimuto.nz@gmail.com, +250792047421,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6915-7397>



Abstract: This paper examines office door graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools as a form of learner dissent against administrative policies. It presents graffiti as a creative outlet for frustration and a critique of authority, reflecting a collective discontent among learners. Often filled with insults aimed at specific administrators, this artwork encapsulates learners' emotional challenges within rigid institutions. The study utilises a mixed-method approach, gathering data from four public schools in the Masvingo district through interviews, focus group discussions, and participant observations. Grounded in Dadaism, the research portrays graffiti as spontaneous rebellion against injustices and a voice for marginalised learner populations. Its strategic placement on office doors symbolises a confrontation with authority, urging administrators to address learner grievances. Ultimately, this study emphasises the importance of graffiti as a visible critique of authority, shedding light on the socio-political contexts affecting learner experiences in Zimbabwe's public schools and highlighting learner agency in systemic challenges.

Keywords: Office door graffiti, retaliation, Zimbabwean public schools, learner dissent, learner experiences

Introduction

Graffiti has its origins rooted in ancient civilisations, where early forms of symbolic expression were etched onto walls, cave surfaces, and monuments (Kutlu, 2009). Initially developed as a means of communication and storytelling, graffiti served to mark territory, convey messages, and record significant events (Mangeya, 2019). Over the centuries, this form of expression evolved, transforming into a powerful medium through which individuals and communities articulate their identities, social issues, and dissent against authority (Zimuto, 2024a). In contemporary society, graffiti transcend its historical origins, often embodying a subversive art form used to challenge political systems, critique societal norms, and express collective frustrations (Israel, Boadu and Johnson, 2023) and today, it stands as a vibrant and often contested aspect of urban culture, reflecting the complexities of human experience in the face of rigid structures and inequalities.

Consequently, graffiti is a powerful and longstanding form of expression for diverse groups (Mangeya, 2019), and in the context of Zimbabwean public schools, office door graffiti emerges as a poignant manifestation of learners' urge to communicate with the authorities. The high prevalence of graffiti on office doors in Zimbabwean public schools indicates an urgent need to analyse the underlying sentiments portrayed through these inscriptions. Rather than mere vandalism, these graffiti constitute a communicative act, often laden with insults and obscenities directed at specific individuals in authority (Israel, Boadu and Johnson, 2023). The paper opines that by targeting office doors, spaces that symbolise power and control, learners leverage graffiti as a means to confront

and critique the administrative policies that govern their academic lives. This dual nature of graffiti as both a personal and collective response (Morady and Murray, 2023) allows learners to assert their agency while challenging the status quo within the education system (Okon, Udoyo, and Nje, 2023; Zimuto, 2024a).

Research has highlighted the functional aspects of graffiti (Morady and Murray, 2023), suggesting that it can serve as a vehicle for protest and as a reflection of societal grievances. The current research aims to show that graffiti found on office doors addresses core issues learners face, from hierarchical structures in schools to broader social inequities. The crux of this research is to unravel the idea that the content of such graffiti indicates a shared sense of discontent, demonstrating how art on walls can document a collective struggle (Kigen, 2019; Mangeya, 2019). Furthermore, the careful placement of graffiti, often positioned within direct sightlines as doors are opened, reveals a strategic intent to confront authority directly, forcing administrators to confront the realities of learner discontent.

The research aims to prove that as learners navigate their educational experiences, the insults and vulgarities inscribed on office doors become a critical commentary on the nature of leadership within their schools. This double-edged sword of graffiti not only serves to retaliate against perceived negligence or malpractice on the part of school authorities but also reflects learners' deeper emotional states (Zimuto, 2024a; Şad and Kutlu, 2009) and the societal pressures they experience. Through this lens, the graffiti can be seen as an act of resistance, fueled by underlying concerns regarding authority, governance, and the quest for recognition within the school environment (Olusoji, 2013; Zimuto, 2024a).

Thus, this paper seeks to unravel the idea that graffiti on office doors in Zimbabwean public schools represents a complex interplay of learner voices challenging the administrative forces that shape their educational experiences. The point is to bring to the fore the fact that graffiti serves as a powerful tool for confrontation, offering a visible and audacious critique of authority (Olusoji, 2013). By delving into the nuances of these expressions, one can gain deeper insights into the broader socio-political context within which they are situated, furthering our understanding of how learners articulate their frustrations and aspirations in an educational landscape marked by rigid policies and governance.

Literature Review: A Brief Overview of Dissent Graffiti

The phenomenon of graffiti as an expression of dissent has been widely explored across various contexts, highlighting its role as a communicative act in settings of social unrest. Scholars such as Kigen (2019) and Mangeya (2019) argue that graffiti is a powerful vehicle for voicing societal grievances, particularly within oppressive systems. The emotional resonance of graffiti resonates through the lenses of cultural resistance and identity formation, positioning it as a vital aspect of social commentary in contexts where traditional forms of dialogue may be stifled. This foundation sets the stage for examining how graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools not only articulates frustrations with administrative policies but also reflects broader socio-political dynamics.

In light of this, understanding the specific context of Zimbabwean public schools reveals a distinct interplay between authority and learner agency. Research by Zimuto, Mojapelo, and Mutasa (2023) underscores that graffiti on office doors encapsulates a collective dissatisfaction among learners, who leverage this medium to challenge hierarchical structures and assert their presence within the educational environment. The strategic choice of office doors as a canvas serves to confront administrators directly, as highlighted by Morady and Murray (2023), who argue that this placement transforms graffiti into a potent form of resistance that demands acknowledgement from those in power. This dual role of graffiti as both personal and collective resistance paves the way for deeper inquiry into the emotional landscapes of learners navigating rigid institutional frameworks.

Moreover, the theoretical underpinnings of Dadaism provide an insightful lens for analysing the motivations behind learners' graffiti-related expressions. As noted by Okon, Udoyo, and Nje (2023), Dadaism represents a form of spontaneous rebellion against authority, echoing the sentiments expressed through graffiti in schools. This artistic freedom reflects not only dissent but also a desire for recognition and legitimacy within the educational system. By synthesising these perspectives, the current study emphasises the critical importance of graffiti as an outspoken critique of authority, ultimately illuminating the transformative potential of learner dissent in addressing systemic challenges faced within Zimbabwe's public schools.

Office Door Graffiti: Theoretical Underpinnings

This work is guided by Elger's (2004) major tenets of Dadaism. According to him, Dadaism is an avant-garde movement that emerged in the early 20th century, was characterised by its rejection of traditional artistic conventions and societal norms (Elger, 2004). Central to Dadaism is the notion of anti-art, which challenges the established aesthetic values of society. This movement sought to provoke thought and question the status quo by embracing absurdity and irrationality. In the context of retaliation graffiti, the principles of Dadaism resonate deeply, as graffiti functions as a spontaneous act of rebellion against perceived injustices and a critique of social structures. Just as Dada artists employed shock tactics to jolt audiences out of complacency, learners use graffiti to express their frustrations with authority and to confront the rigid administrative policies in their educational environment.

Another key tenet of Dadaism is its emphasis on the collective voice of disenfranchised groups, which aligns closely with the motivations behind retaliation graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools. Dadaists believed in the power of communal expression to highlight societal issues, often incorporating elements of chance and spontaneity into their work (Button, 2010; Şad and Kutlu, 2009). Similarly, the graffiti found on office doors serves as a communal response to the grievances learners face, reflecting shared feelings of discontent and frustration. The nature of this graffiti, marked by insults and vulgarities directed at authority figures, evokes the Dadaist spirit of collective defiance, where individuals come together to voice their dissent against the governing powers that control their educational experience.

Moreover, the playful yet confrontational nature of Dadaism offers a framework for understanding retaliation graffiti as a form of meaningful protest. Dada artists often employed humour and absurdity as a means to disrupt social norms and provoke critical engagement (Button, 2010; Hopkins, 2004). This mirrors the role graffiti plays in learners' lives, as it subverts traditional channels of communication and creates a confrontation with authority. By inscribing their feelings and thoughts on office doors, learners transform these mundane spaces into sites of resistance, amplifying their voices in a landscape that often silences them. Thus, Dadaism provides a powerful lens through which to view retaliation graffiti, highlighting the intersection of artistic rebellion and social critique in the quest for agency and recognition within a rigid educational framework.

Research Methodology

This research aims to explore the phenomenon of office door graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools, particularly in the Masvingo District. It examines how this form of expression serves as a double force retaliation against administrative policies perceived as unjust by learners. To gain a comprehensive understanding of this issue, a mixed-methods approach will be employed, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of office door graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools in four selected schools in the Masvingo District of Zimbabwe and the schools were labelled schools A, B, C and D for anonymity. A case study of the Masvingo District will act as the research design (Davidavičienė, 2018; Kumar and Praveenakumar, 2025) which is a research design. The primary aim of this research is to investigate the experiences of 20 teachers and 400 learners within these institutions. The teachers were chosen purposively because of the administrative roles they play in schools, and the four hundred learners were selected using the systematic random method from the population to avoid bias. The researchers chose the first learner they met randomly in each school, and after chose the twentieth learner they met within the population. However, the learner population was divided into female and male categories to circumvent gender bias. The teacher category respondents were labelled Teacher Respondent One up to Twenty. Learners were also labelled Learner Responded One up to Four Hundred to hide the identity of participants. The quantitative aspect will involve numerical data related to various factors such as retaliation number of respondents in agreement with a certain postulation. This data will facilitate statistical analysis, allowing for the identification of trends and correlations (Davidavičienė, 2018) that may exist between graffiti strategies and learner retaliation intentions.

In addition to the quantitative approaches, qualitative methods will also be employed to enrich the findings. Focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews will be conducted with a select group of teachers and learners to gather in-depth insights into their experiences and perceptions (Kumar and Praveenakumar, 2025; Gupta and Gupta, 2022) regarding office graffiti in the secondary school environments. This qualitative data will help in understanding the contextual factors that influence graffiti production and

purpose, such as classroom dynamics and administrative policies. By capturing the voices of both teachers and learners, the research aims to provide a nuanced perspective that numbers alone cannot convey.

Data from both the quantitative and qualitative components will be analysed and subsequently triangulated to form a cohesive understanding of the research problem. Statistical analysis will be conducted using appropriate methods for the quantitative data, while thematic analysis will be utilised for the qualitative data to identify recurring themes and patterns (Kumar and Praveenakumar, 2025). This approach enables a holistic understanding of the prevalence and implications of graffiti, as well as the narratives behind the expressions of dissent. This mixed-method approach aims to provide a comprehensive analysis (Gupta and Gupta, 2022). of office door graffiti as a form of double force retaliation against administrative policies in Zimbabwean public schools. By integrating quantitative and qualitative data, the research seeks to uncover the complexities of learner dissent and contribute to a deeper understanding of the socio-political dynamics within the educational landscape.

Findings: Office Door Graffiti as a Double Force Retaliation

This section elucidates on the findings of the research, laying them thematically for easy comprehension.

Office Door Graffiti: The Targets

The research has found that graffiti on office doors carries with it messages to the authorities. One inscription found in School A on the door of the deputy head teacher reads. 'If you want to fight, we are prepared, ' asked about the meaning of such inscriptions. Learner Responded 200 said, 'If they strike once, we will strike twice'. When probed to give more information, the respondent explained that if the administration tries to do something detrimental to the well-being of the learners, they will use any means necessary to retaliate using a force which is two times stronger than the administration's. Learner Responded 30 added, 'We cannot fight them directly, but we just retaliate using what we have at hand, and they cannot control us.' This finding points to the idea that graffiti on administration offices is targeted at the office bearers and is there to act as a contrary force against the dictates of the authorities. Thus, graffiti stands as a reply message to the actions of the administrators. This is in tandem with Zimuto, Mojapelo and Mutasa's (2023) finding that graffiti, in general, carries with it resistance messages, and the graffiti producer intends to deliver the message in subtle ways.

The majority of teachers who were interviewed said they held leadership positions by the time they were interviewed. Nineteen out of the twenty participants answered yes to the question, "Do you hold any leadership position at your station?" Thus, ninety-five per cent of the interviewees are administrators in different schools. All twenty participants agreed to have seen graffiti in every part of the school. However, female participants seem to be reluctant when it comes to reacting to graffiti when it is found on office doors. One female respondent, amounting to five per cent of the total sample, said she asked the learners to delete and punish the perpetrators. Ten of the male participants (one hundred per cent of the male sample) said they made sure graffiti was deleted and then punished those accused of writing on walls. On consulting learners about graffiti writing, one hundred per cent of the teachers' category participants unanimously said that they did not consult learners on why they write graffiti. This is the same as what was found by Okon, Udoyo, and Nje's (2023) finding that the administrators just punish the learners who produce graffiti without consulting them on why they write on the walls.

Administrators from the four schools were also asked for their views on what they thought could be done to graffiti writers. Teacher Participant 20 has this to say, 'Those who are caught doing it must be punished or even expelled for a certain period so that others see the gravity of the offence and desist from following suit'. Teacher Participant 14 said, 'Learners should learn that graffiti is a sign of cowardice. They should be bold enough to present their issues since some information can go unnoticed by the intended recipients (admin), but some learners might take them seriously, which might affect the tone of the school.' The finding points to the fact that teachers feel obliged to punish those whom they catch writing graffiti. It depicts the fact that authorities feel challenged by dissent messages in graffiti and, in a way, feel obliged to punish their 'enemies'. All twenty participants see punishment as the only possible solution to graffiti writing. When asked if they have ever realised which classes normally write on walls, all twenty teachers, which translates to one hundred per cent of the sample, highlighted the fact that graffiti is prevalent during the third term, and accordingly, they attributed graffiti writing to external examination writing classes. This, they said, is because the classes feel

empowered to attack the administrators because they will be about to leave the school after national examinations. The findings point to the fact that there is mainly one section in every school that is thought to be the main participants in graffiti writing: the external examination writing classes.

On the events which normally trigger learners to write, eleven of the teachers who make up fifty-five per cent of the total sample, argued that learners normally write during sports galas. The nine remaining (forty-five per cent) said graffiti was mainly visible after a certain encounter involving the writer and the school authorities or the writer and other learners. Teacher Participant 12 said, 'These learners think that after a misunderstanding with the teacher, scratching his or her doorframe is the right way of fighting back, which is wrong.' The participants, as a result, agree that learners do not just write, but they write after something has happened, and the graffiti will be a retaliatory message aimed at inflicting more pain than what they would have endured in the hands of the administrator. The findings are in tandem with what Okon, Udoyo, and Nje (2023) found about learners' graffiti. They found out that graffiti is triggered in most cases by the activities in school vicinities.

There is rife evidence, as presented in the preceding findings section, of the fact that graffiti is a common feature on teachers' office doors. The first finding was that office door graffiti has targets, and these targets are the administrators. The interviews held proved that office doors are chosen as the graffiti locations for easy recognition by the targeted audience, who, in most cases, are teachers with administrative posts. It was found out that in junior teachers' offices, graffiti is minimal (Kigen, 2019; Zimuto, 2024a). This is not accidental. The research has found that this is because learners see junior teachers as part of them. It is interesting to note that teachers who do not hold any leadership positions are not attacked in graffiti because they are seen as victims of the same system that oppresses learners. Learners view leaders as oppressing to both junior teachers and learners, and thus, there is an almost insignificant number of graffiti articles printed on junior teachers' offices. Location of graffiti points to the fact that the 'enemy', according to the learners, is not the teacher in general but the teacher who holds a position that enables him/her to make administrative decisions (Zimuto, Mojapelo and Mutasa, 2023). These decisions are the ones that are perceived as adversely affecting learners in their day-to-day learning lives (Zimuto, Mojapelo, Mutasa, 2025).

In consequence, the graffiti on office doors is targeted at administrators, and they act as retaliation against the administration's policies. The graffiti artist will be aiming at using graffiti to disrupt the norm, thereby deriding the norm by choosing the art without rules to act as their weapon to attack the authorities that be. The authorities set rules that have to be disrupted through graffiti, which has no one to sanction its form or content. The findings on the target audience of office graffiti have also revealed that the graffiti is, in most cases, insults and vulgarities. This form of retaliation aims to instil pain in the administrators the same way the policies and punishment instil pain in the learners. By insulting the authorities through graffiti, the learners feel vindicated and soothed because, according to them, they would have avenged in a way that is painful and always traumatising to the administrators who would always see the graffiti whenever they enter their offices. Learner Responded 345 has this to say, 'The use of office doors is a way of making the office user see and read the message as soon as they reach their office.' This noticeably shows that office door graffiti is made to pass a retaliatory message, at the same time showing that learners are not happy with the way the office bearer is administering his/her duties.

Office Door Graffiti: Insults and Vulgarities

Zimuto (2025) found that graffiti by learners was found in many places, including restrooms and classrooms. In addition, this research has also found that in the Masvingo District, graffiti is also rife on the administrators' office doors. Thus, office graffiti was mainly found to be located on walls above the door, doorframes and doors. The researcher found meaningful words that seem to be directed at certain individuals in the positions mentioned above. The nature of words found on office doors is the same in all four schools. The words were, in most cases, insults and obscenities. The pictures collected for analysis contained words that were mainly insults directed at teachers who use the offices. The researchers used participant observations and managed to gather one hundred and fifty pictures from different office doors, and out of the one hundred and fifty, only ten pictures did not have insults or obscenities as their content. This entails ninety-three per cent of the pictures contain insults and obscenities, while the remaining seven per cent were labels and derogatory names that are given to teachers by learners. One of the pictures that was captured from the office of the head teacher in School D reads, '*mukuru ziguma*', 'Our leader, you have a big forehead'. The graffiti contains an

insult targeted at the head teacher. When asked about the meaning of such during a focus group discussion, Learner Responded 202 said, 'They have to know that we cannot beat them as they do to us, but we can also inflict pain on them through insults'. Teacher Responded 17 articulated the same sentiments about pain being inflicted on the leaders through insults when he said, 'What pains me a lot is that they use body shaming to insult us when in fact we are their parents when they are here at school.' The graffiti from offices shows that graffiti with insults is dominant, and it is aimed at inflicting pain on the leaders, the same way the leaders inflict pain on learners through corporal punishments. Graffiti is thus being used as a double force retaliation, used to inflict pain on the leaders. It is also vital to note that office graffiti is, in most cases, directed at administrators who use these offices. The researcher found out that the offices of junior members at all the schools are free from graffiti.

On a door in School C, the researcher found an inscription which reads, '*Chikoro chiri kutongwa navaroyi*' (The school is being run by witches and wizards.) The author is arguing that the school is being run by witches and wizards. These words were being directed at the authorities. The researcher established that graffiti in all the schools was similar to the above insult directed towards the authorities. The writers do not employ tacit methods that evade detection of insults by authorities (Mangeya, 2019), but they use direct retaliation. The graffiti artist directly attacked the authorities, labelling them witches and wizards. There is no element of trying to raise the grievances politely. Direct attacks are a characteristic that was found in all four schools. Writers use insults and words that are more direct, and the intention is to cause harm. Learner Participant 99 has this to say, 'If they do not hide their attacks and punishments, why should we. We have to attack them back through a method (graffiti insults) that they understand.' Insults are clear and direct. They categorically state the recipients, making it easy for the reader to match the words with the person being referred to. The artist who produced the graffiti above made it clear that he/she was referring to the authorities. The word *navaroyi* (by witches and wizards) clearly shows that the writer is not apologetic about his/her view on the authorities.

Administrators are attacked by the writers because, in most cases, they view learners as problem children, even when learners are trying to make their views known. Data gathered demonstrates that teachers punish learners who are thought to have produced graffiti. All twenty teachers who were interviewed (one hundred per cent of the total sample) reiterated the idea that perpetrators must be punished. Administrators believe that punishing learners will deter would-be offenders. Punishment in most cases is seen as a corrective measure by those in power (Zimuto, 2024b). However, this is done without even consulting learners about the reasons why they write on walls, which makes graffiti resurface again and again on school office doors. Graffiti is also erased without taking into consideration the message that is contained in the graffiti. Thus, office doors are always full of insults and vulgarities because learners fight back by writing more graffiti, attacking teachers/administrators (Mangeya, 2019; Okon, Udoyo, and Nje, 2023 and Kigen, 2019). Teacher Participant 15 said, 'Those who are caught doing it must be punished or even expelled for a certain period so that others see the gravity of the offence and desist from following suit.' The tit for tat bases under which school authorities and learners operate result in insults on doors. In a bid to show dissent, learners will look for words that can impact the administrators, including insults, which are often viewed as equally painful as corporal punishment in the Masvingo district community. Much like the radical movement of Dadaism, the graffiti that adorns office doors is an impulsive act of defiance against perceived injustices and a sharp critique of entrenched social structures. Mirroring the Dada artists who employed jarring tactics to jolt audiences from their complacency, these graffiti artists use their art as a visceral outlet for their frustrations with authority. This bold expression confronts the stifling administrative policies that permeate their educational environment, transforming mundane spaces into vibrant canvases of dissent and dialogue.

Office Graffiti: The Nature

Findings have brought to the fore the idea that insults on office doors are scratched using sharp objects. Sharp objects are mainly used to write on door frames. The paint on door frames is scratched as graffiti writers imprint words and drawings. Scratching using sharp objects brings in the fact that graffiti writers aim to have their work last longer. Teacher Responded 9 said, 'You normally realise that the doorframe was scratched when you see some paint on the door step, maybe they use knives to scratch the doorframes' Learner Participant 145 said, 'We use wire to scratch the doorframes and this is done to make the writing last longer because to erase they have to buy paint which takes some time.' The above findings indicate that doorframe scratching is done using sharp objects, and the aim is to make the graffiti last longer. It is also important to note that graffiti on office doors is found above the door handles. This finding entails that the positioning of office door graffiti is a calculated move. The eyes of the office user will

be directly facing the art when opening the door (Kigen, 2019). No graffiti was found below the handles, and this calls for an in-depth analysis of the reason why graffiti writers make such an effort to make their works visible. The insulting words on office doors are aimed at the person who uses the office. One graffiti writing reads, 'Ticha mune gwembe' (Teacher, you are infected by a disease). The insults also range from those targeting the body parts of authority figures to comments on their social lives, behaviours, and health, like the one identified above, the aim being to retaliate against administrative malpractices that prejudice the smooth running of learners' lives.

The finding that office graffiti scratchings are, in most cases, done using sharp objects is also one of the paramount findings in this study. It is vital to note that in most cases, this form of graffiti is written using sharp objects (Okon, Udoyo, and Nje, 2023; Zimuto, 2024a). The objects are used to scratch deep marks into the door, tap the wall of the door and or doorframes. These markings are very difficult to erase, thus making the insult last longer, giving a sense of satisfaction to the writer that the pain the office bearer is inflicting in his/her life is also being compensated by the pain the office bearer endures by continually reading the insult on the door. Learner Participant 213 said, 'Sharp object scratching is the way to go. You can scratch, and the markings are deep and permanent.' The proposition opines that learners use these deep scratchings permanency. They endeavour their graffiti to fight their battle for longer periods and hence choice of graffiti nature of graffiti, which enables their goal. The playful yet confrontational essence of Dadaism provides a compelling framework for interpreting retaliation office graffiti as a potent form of protest. Dada artists famously wielded humour and absurdity to disrupt societal norms and provoke critical engagement, effectively challenging the status quo (Button, 2010; Hopkins, 2004). This artistic rebellion resonates deeply with the experiences of learners in the Masvingo district, where graffiti emerges as a vivid subversion of conventional communication channels. Through its bold and often provocative imagery, office graffiti in the form of deep, sharp object scratches confronts authority head-on, transforming doors, doorframes and door lintels into a canvas for dissent and dialogue.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the graffiti found on office doors in Zimbabwean public schools serves as a compelling reflection of learner dissent and a profound commentary on the administrative policies governing their educational experience. This phenomenon reveals a complex interplay between artistic expression and political resistance, positioning graffiti as both a personal outlet for individual frustrations and a collective manifestation of shared grievances. Rather than being dismissed as mere vandalism, these inscriptions should be understood as significant markers of protest, highlighting the emotional landscapes that learners navigate within rigid school structures.

The strategic placement and content of the graffiti underscore its role as a direct challenge to authority, forcing administrators to confront the realities of learner discontent and the inadequacies of their governance. By drawing on the principles of Dadaism, this form of expression embodies a rejection of conventional norms and a communal assemblage aimed at articulating a collective dissent. The use of insults and vulgarities not only conveys anger but also reflects deeper societal issues and the quest for recognition and justice within the educational context.

Ultimately, the study of office door graffiti in Zimbabwean public schools illuminates the urgent need for a reassessment of the dynamics between learners and school authorities. It calls for a more empathetic understanding of learner experiences and a recognition of their voices within academic governance. By embracing these expressions as valid forms of communication, schools can foster a more responsive environment that values learner agency and promotes dialogue, thereby addressing the grievances that fuel such acts of rebellion.

References

- [1]. Button, T. (2010). Dadaism: restrictivism as Militant Quietism. In *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Hardback)* (Vol. 110, No. 3pt3, pp. 387-398). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [2]. Davidavičienė, V. (2018). Research Methodology: An Introduction. In *Modernising the Academic Teaching and Research Environment: Methodologies and Cases in Business Research* (Pp 1-23). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

- [3]. Elger, D. (2004). *Dadaism*. London: Taschen. Pp, 189.
- [4]. Gupta, A., & Gupta, N. (2022). *Research Methodology*. New Deli: SBPD Publications. Pp, 44.
- [5]. Hopkins, D. (2004). *Dada and Surrealism: A Very Short Introduction* (Vol. 105). Oxford University Press.
- [6]. Israel, P. C., Boadu, N., & Johnson, R. (2023). Classroom Graffiti: Investigating Language and Cognition. *Impact Factor(SJIF)*, 6.
- [7]. Kigen, J. (2019). *An Analysis of Graffiti as A Communicative Strategy in Selected Public Boarding Secondary Schools in Baringo Central Sub-County, Kenya* (Doctoral Dissertation, Egerton University).
- [8]. Kumar, A., & Praveenakumar, S. G. (2025). *Research methodology*. London: Authors Click Publishing.
- [9]. Mangeya, H. (2019). Graffiti as a site for cultural literacies in Zimbabwean urban high schools. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 22(3), 334-348.
- [10]. Morady, M. M and Murray, N. (2023). Linguistic Variation in Iranian University Learner Graffiti: Examining The Role of Gender. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 52(3), 721-742.
- [11]. Olusoji, O. A. (2013). Graffiti as a tool of learners' communication. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(2), 1-11.
- [12]. Okon, P. E., Udooyo, O. E and Nje, J. A. (2023). " One Man's Trash Is Another Man's Treasure": Graffiti and Civic Education among Youths in Nigeria. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 18(7), 140-155.
- [13]. Şad, S. N and Kutlu, M. (2009). A Study of Graffiti in Teacher Education. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, (36).
- [14]. Zimuto, N. C. (2024) a. Graffiti-based Counselling Model: Towards the Implementation of Graffiti-based Counselling Programs in African Secondary Schools. *African Journal of Information Science, Fine Arts & Speech Studies (AJISFASS)*, 1(1).
- [15]. Zimuto, N. C. (2024) b. Theorising Graffiti as a Novel Alternative Public Sphere in. *Media, Social Movements, and Protest Cultures in Africa: Hashtags, Humour, and Slogans*, 219.
- [16]. Zimuto, N. C., Mojapelo, M. L., & Mutasa, D. E. (2025). Artist's cognitive level and the style and form trails in graffiti: an analysis of graffiti from selected Bikita-Matsai secondary schools. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 1-12.
- [17]. Zimuto, N. C., Mojapelo, M. L and Mutasa, D. E. (2023). Emotive Art: An Analysis of Graffiti from Selected Secondary Schools In Bikita-Matsai District, Zimbabwe. *Critical Arts*, 37(1), 39-53.