EMERGING TRENDS OF TEACHERS' RESISTANCE TO CLASSROOM VISITATION, MONITORING AND SUPPORT PRACTICES CARRIED OUT BY DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICIALS

MOHAMMED ISSAH

Faculty of Education, University for Development Studies,
Ghana, Cell: +233 55 500 2049

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2476-1495

ABSTRACT

This study examines the emerging trends of teachers' resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support practices carried out by district education officials in the Elliotdale Circuit secondary schools of the Dutywa Education District, South Africa. A qualitative approach as well as a case study design were adopted. A purposive sampling strategy was used to select a sample size of twenty-two (22) participants which comprised five (5) principals, twelve (12) teachers, two (2) subject advisors from the District Education Office and three (3) teacher union members from the teacher union office in the Elliotdale Circuit. Permission to conduct the study was sought from the provincial and district education offices. Audiotape recording was used to collect data through face-to-face in-depth individual interviews. Data were analysed thematically. Findings were that there were frequent and unannounced district officials' classroom visitation and monitoring in schools, district and provincial officials displayed some bossy behaviours in schools, there were cases of teachers being victimised and harassed by departmental officials, some teachers were lazy to teach and also expressed fear of been called failures, the existence of teacher unions significantly influenced teacher resistance to classroom visitations and there was fear of change and the unknown experienced by some teachers. Recommendations made were that: The District Education Office should work hand in hand with the Elliotdale Circuit to organize change management, curriculum and pedagogical content knowledge workshops for teachers, school heads and provincial and district education officials to equip them with knowledge on sources and nature of resistance to change in schools and how to ensure classroom visitation and school monitoring are solely based on teacher support and development and so should be devoid of victimization, harassment, witch-hunting and fault-finding.

Keywords: Resistance. Visitation, Monitoring, Curriculum, Support

1.0 INTRODUCTION

School monitoring, classroom visitation and support are educational investments aimed at developing teachers as human capital (Abdulai, Mohammed & Bidzakin, 2022; Oketch & Asiachi, 1998). As human capital, teachers need to be supported through the monitoring of their activities and through the development of their skills (Oketch & Asiachi, 1998). The involvement of Provincial and District Education Officials in the visitation of schools to

monitor teaching and learning is justified on the basis that the professional development of teachers has large educational returns when invested in (Abdulai, et al., 2022; Mbatia, 2016).

In the United States of America, Sergiovanni and Robert (2009), Nolan and Hoover (2004) opined that schools and classroom visitations help school heads and education officials to discover teachers' potential that need to be tapped and to help teachers overcome their weaknesses to enhance effective teaching and learning. From the South African perspective, education is deemed to have taken place if teaching, learning and assessment are effectively carried out (Gamlem &Smith, 2013).

To Bush (2011), it is only through constant school visitation and monitoring that effective teaching, learning and assessment are assured. At the same time, Mngomezulu (2015) claims that the involvement of subject advisors in the monitoring of teaching and learning activities is aimed at contributing to school effectiveness and student success. Highlighting the significance of educational officials conducting school visitation and monitoring, Du Plessis (2013) is of the view that visitation and monitoring of teaching and learning by subject advisors are important practices for locating weaknesses in curriculum implementation and the improvement of teaching and learning.

Perspectives from the Kenyan education system are that school visits and monitoring are mandates of the inspectorate of the Ministry of Education to support the development of teachers as human capital and to ensure the realization of effective teaching and learning in classrooms (Mbatia, 2016). Embarking on school visitation, monitoring and support by subject advisors are exercises meant to ensure school programme improvement and sources of support for teacher career growth (Wango, 2009; Mbatia, 2016). Furthermore, Ngware, Oketch, Mutisya and Abuya (2010) are of the view that provincial and district education officials need to observe teachers in class, give feedback and professionally guide them to effectively teach in class. While Olembo, Wanga and Karagu (1992) mentioned that monitoring of schools is a professional service that is carried out by educational officials, administrators and teachers aimed at maintaining or improving teaching and learning activities.

In Ghana, the Ghana Education Service (GES) has mandated heads of schools, circuit supervisors, school management teams and Parent Teacher Associations to monitor, supervise and support teachers in both curriculum and co-curriculum activities and to ensure effective teaching and learning in classrooms (Baidoo, 2010). In the same country, Abdulai, et al., (2022) claimed school monitoring and classroom visitations are practices aimed at guiding and supporting teachers in their classroom practices and in their future professional development.

It is important to highlight that in Nigeria, Suleiman, Nike, Mustapha and Okwara (2020) are of the view that the purposes of school visitation, monitoring and supervision by education officials is the improvement of students learning and the giving of teachers the necessary professional support. In Kenya, Mbatia (2016), Wairimu (2016) mentioned that some aspects of school monitoring include district officials rendering professional advice on management and administrative duties, addressing curriculum and professional development issues and supporting teachers in carrying out their instructional activities effectively.

In spite of the significance of classroom visitation and school monitoring by subject advisors, these practices for a very long time have been resisted by teachers (Mbatia, 2016). Teacher

resistance is the desire by teachers to keep existing educational practices in the face of curriculum changes or changes in general education practices that they consider to be undesirable and threatening (Giles, 2006). Teachers have always resisted school monitoring and classroom visitation by subject advisors as they regard those practices as fault-finding exercises and harshly judgmental activities that are aimed at provoking fears in teachers and students (Mbatia, 2016). In Kenya, school visits, monitoring, and support by education officials are considered by some teachers as practices full of harassment and a threat to teacher professional autonomy (Wango, 2009; Mbatia, 2016).

In Ghana, in spite of the significant contributions of school monitoring, classroom visitation and support by subject advisors, teachers in the Hohoe Municipality resisted and reacted to it differently (Ambrose, 2020). Because of the ill feelings of Ghanian teachers about school monitoring and classroom visitation, Baffour-Awuah (2011) makes a special appeal to education authorities to pre-inform teachers about the purpose and significance of school monitoring and classroom visitation and to psychologically support all teachers welcome such professional practices and to stop thinking that such practices are kinds of witch-hunting and fault-finding practices (Baffour-Awuah, 2011).

In Nairobi, Adikinyi (2007), Gachoya (2008) are of the view that teachers have always resisted classroom visitation and monitoring and are likely not to take any advice or guidance from subject advisors. For instance, in Albania, Kosovo and Turkey, Sultana (2008) through a comparative analysis claimed changes to teacher practices in the education system imposed by outside actors and donors are met with strong teachers' demonstration of outright resistance since the beliefs of teachers are that such changes and reforms in the teaching profession are forms of cultural imperialisms and are also irrelevant to the needs, priorities and concerns of the school community.

There are studies on teachers' resistance, school supervision in the international world, Africa and some provincial education institutions in South Africa but there have never been such studies in the Elliotdale Circuit and there has never been a study on emerging trends of teachers' resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support practices in the Elliotdale Circuit. This paper examined the emerging trends of teachers' resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support practices carried out by District Education Officials at the Elliotdale Circuit. In spite of the significance of classroom visitation and school monitoring, secondary school teachers at the Elliotdal Circuit resist such visitations and monitoring as a result of unprofessional treatment, bureaucracy and the witch-hunting agenda of the monitoring team. Therefore, this study was designed to examine the emerging trends of teachers' resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support practices carried out by District Education Officials at the Elliotdale Circuit in the Dutywa Education District. This paper is organized as follows: Section one deals with the theoretical framework. Section two discusses the reasons and causes of teacher resistance. The research method and design employed are presented in section three while the results of the study and discussions of the findings are presented in section four. The last section comprises conclusions and recommendations.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theory that guided this study is Kubler-Ross's change management theory. This theory was created by the Swiss- American Psychiatrist Elisabeth Kubler-Rose in 1969 to explain the mind-expanding views teachers go through in the process of any reform or change to be implemented in any education system (Malik, 2022; Reiling, 2022). Changes in schools disrupt the status quo of teachers and trigger different emotional responses from them, with internal resistance to change surfacing as a result (Malik, 2022; Aktas, 2021). The theory helps in understanding teachers' emotional turmoil as a result of changes in how teaching and learning should be. Kubler-Ross change management theory depicts the following five (5) stages:

- **Shock, Grief and Denial:** The first stage is shock, grief, or denial where an individual teacher shows his/her defense mechanisms to stop the occurrence of change. Teachers will resist implementing change or accept it, as such hold it at arm's length as they debate whether it is real or it is an imagination (Reiling, 2022; Aktas, 2021). At this stage, teachers become less committed to teaching and learning as they do not want anything that disrupts the status quo and, as such, sticks to the old ways of teaching and learning (Malik, 2022).
- **Anger:** This is the stage where the reality of change surfaces and manifests in the form of fear or anger in teachers (Malik, 2022; Aktas, 2021). Here, teachers will show some kind of acceptance when they realise the battle of denial is going nowhere; they will turn their attention to someone or something to blame and express anger and frustration as well as a decline in morale and confidence (Reiling, 2022).
- **Bargaining:** The third stage is bargaining; this is where teachers who managed to pass through the anger stage of the change process or curve attempt to recover from shock, grief, denial and anger by exploring the path to least objection and by negotiating and finding a compromise deal (Malik, 2022). Teachers will begin to engage with the reform or change, they will shift from being emotional to being rational and realistic and they will begin to bargain to experiment with the change which in turn will lead to the growth of their morale and confidence again (Reiling, 2022; Aktas, 2021).
- **Depression:** In this fourth stage, teachers lose hope entirely, feel demotivated, sad, regret, and think their professional autonomy is been threatened (Malik, 2022; Aktas, 2021). Though these teachers may be going through some kinds of frustration, they may hold onto a false hope that change may not take place but finally, they lose hope and have lower morale and confidence when change has finally taken place (Reiling, 2022; Aktas, 2021).
- **Acceptance:** The last stage of Kubler-Ross's change management theory is acceptance. Here, teachers gradually come to terms with change because their inhibitors to change have been lowered, they accept change and start to look for new opportunities that change will bring to them (Aktas, 2021; Malik, 2022). Reiling (2022), and Aktas (2021) explained that in the final stage, teachers will arrive at a decision on how to move forward, and they will shift into action mode by accepting and working with reform or change in the education system, as such, their moral and confidence grow at an accelerated pace.

3.0 REASONS AND CAUSES OF TEACHER RESISTANCE

Teachers' resistance occurs when they do not see the need for change in the education system or when classroom visitations and general school monitoring infringe on their professional

autonomy as they are more interested in maintaining the status quo (Robert, 2023; Altinyelken, 2013). It has also been mentioned by Huberman (1989) that teachers in their later years of the teaching profession are resistant to educational changes and are also less committed to changes and new practices in the profession. This is why in New York, Fullan and Hargreaves (1996) opined that teachers in their later years of practice have the tendency to protect their self-interests and the status and autonomy of colleague teachers whenever proposed educational changes are seen as threatening to the general teacher profession. Any classroom visitation or the monitoring of teaching and learning activities by school principals or Education Officials have the potential to reduce or eliminate teacher status and professional autonomy (Robert, 2023).

Teachers will always resist changes that are imposed on them by management. Teacher resistance can come from a failure in the implementation of new curriculum, reforms and organizational changes when such reform or change is noted to have been imposed on teachers (Robert, 2023). This is why Acheson and Gail (2003) in New York claimed there is bound to be resistance from teachers when subject advisors and education officials on monitoring and support missions in schools are strict and autocratic. While Koranteng (2013) in Ghana claimed teachers will resist any school monitoring or classroom visitation if they see it as an intrusion in their daily teaching and learning plans.

It has also been mentioned that poor leadership in the forms of leadership role confusion, lack of leadership skills and lack of people skills by school managers and Education Officials can all contribute to teacher resistance in schools (Robert, 2023; Mngomezulu, 2015). As categorically stated by Reepen and Barr (2010), and Bryk and Schneider (2003) that lack of supervisory skills and lack of school monitoring and classroom visitation skills by monitoring teams or subject advisors in explaining to teachers the significance of school monitoring, support and classroom visitation can all lead to teachers' resistance and negative thinking.

Any monitoring activities and changes in the education system that will not bring rewards and reinforcement to teachers will be met with resistance (Robert, 2023). It has also been reported by Robert (2023) that one of the contributive factors to teacher resistance is the influence of peer pressure from teachers in other to protect colleagues, group interests and workplace social bonds. As highlighted by Abraham Maslow belonging to a group is a powerful need by teachers in schools (Mohammed, Coetser & Molepo, 2015). Organisational politics do play a role in influencing teachers to resist decisions made by management with the perception that they may lose some of their powers (Robert, 2023).

Surprises and fear of the unknown by teachers with regards to changes to educational practices can be a source of their resistance because, the fewer teachers know about a visit or monitoring to be conducted in a school or changes to be introduced in the education system, the more fearful they become (Robert, 2023). In Boston, Beach and Reinhartz (2000) highlighted that there is always fear and panic among teachers when school monitoring, support and classroom visitation are mentioned. While in Kenya, Ndegwa (2001) expressed that teachers have always regarded the visit to the school by subject advisors as a stressful experience due to their fear of the unknown. In New Jersey, Greenberg and Baron (2000) claimed teachers have the feeling that they are secured and protected when practices surrounding teaching and learning are familiar to them. They resist actions that negatively affect their comforts, well established and

familiar professional practices and they always feel uneasy about the unknown (Altinyelken, 2013).

There is bound to be teacher resistance to changes, school visits and monitoring by Education Officials where there are signs of mistrust (Robert, 2023). Implementation of change efforts in a school environment where there is mistrust is also likely to suffer from resistance and will also have little success. Glanz (2010) is of the opinion that teachers do resist classroom visitation and the monitoring of how instructional activities have been carried out because of mistrust, unstable and unfriendly relationships that exist between them and the subject advisors. Kulsyurubar (2003), Zepeda (2007) opined that teachers would resist any school monitoring and classroom visitation where there is a lack of trust, harmonious teacher-subject advisor relationship and respect. The absence of trust and cordial relationships also creates fear and dissatisfaction among monitoring and advisory teams (Kulsyurubar, 2003).

Teachers may resist school visitations and monitoring because of the belief that it provokes fear and failure (Mbatia, 2016). Changes in schools including curriculum reforms can make teachers doubt their pedagogical competency and capabilities to perform their duties (Robert, 2023). According to Acheson and Gail (2003), most teachers are not convinced of the significant contribution of school monitoring and classroom visitation by officials from education district offices and so do not want to be visited and supported because they see those practices as system executioners and practices badly applied to discard the ineffective and uncommitted teachers from the good ones.

It has also been revealed by Robert (2023), Holland and Adams (2002) that faulty implementation, lack of tact and poor timing in teacher monitoring and visitation can all contribute to teacher resistance. Teacher resistance may occur as a result of the wrong manner a monitoring exercise has been conducted or because the time for such exercise is awkward (Robert, 2023; Holland & Adams, 2002). Contemporary school monitoring and classroom visitation have been met with resistance from teachers and have been labeled as practices full of harassment, the settling of personal scores, intimidation, and fault findings by some monitoring teams from district education offices (Glanz, 2010).

4.0 METHODOLOGY

A qualitative research approach was adopted in this study to assist in the understanding of the opinions and experiences of participants with regard to teachers' resistance and school monitoring, visitation and support ((Bhandari, 2023; Busetto, et al., 2020). The design used was a case study to identify the emerging trends of teacher resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support and to establish how the identified emerging trend could be addressed to improve the quality of school monitoring, teaching and learning in secondary schools of the Elliotdale Circuit. The design was chosen because of its ability to see relationships between teacher resistance and school monitoring, classroom visitation and support and because of its ability to explore deeper causes of teacher resistance in secondary schools (Lohman, 2021; Crowe, et al., 2011).

A purposive sampling strategy was used to select a sample size of twenty-two (22) participants which comprised five (5) principals, twelve (12) teachers, two (2) subject advisors from the District Education Office and three (3) teacher union members from the teacher union office

in the Elliotdale Circuit. These participants were selected because of their in-depth understanding and having rich information on issues surrounding teacher classroom visitation, monitoring and support in the circuit (Mohammed, Cishe & Lukman, 2023; Patton, 2014).

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the provincial and district education offices in order to enhance scientific integrity, participants' rights and dignity (Bhandari, 2023). Face-to-face in-depth individual interviews were conducted through the use of audiotape. As a qualitative study, the study employed a thematic analytical method in order to aid in reading through the set of data collected, to look for patterns in the meaning of the data and to find themes throughout the analytical process (Villegas, 2023).

5.0 RESULTS

Based on the objectives of the study, the results are: (i) frequent district officials' visitation (ii) the bossy nature of departmental officials (iii) departmental officials' victimization and harassment (iv) laziness and fear of failure (vi) teacher unions influence and (vii) fear of change.

6.0 DISCUSSIONS

6.1 Frequent District Officials' Visitation

The study found frequent visits in the secondary schools by the officials from the District Education Office as actions teachers resisted and labeled some of such visits as unofficial, too frequent and too distractive to their daily teaching and learning plans. Some comments from a teacher were: Actually, our officials do visit us too frequently for monitoring which we always resist because we need space to work in our schools. In response to the findings of the unofficial and frequent manner teachers have been visited and monitored in the schools, Baffour-Awuah (2011) argues that there will not be any resistance from teachers once school and classroom visitation and monitoring are part and parcel of school lives and where teachers are informed in advance about its purpose and when such visits will take place.

Lamentation from a Principal was: The Department sometimes visits us to waste our time and do not also have the time to listen to the challenges faced by my teachers. In support of this finding, in Ghana, Abdulai, et al., (2022) state that though there are benefits related to the monitoring and support of teachers in schools, in some cases, such monitoring becomes too frequent and a waste of teachers' instructional time. In Trinidad and Tobago, James and Massiah (2019) also lament that frequent teacher visitation and monitoring are time-consuming and have elements of distrust between teachers and Monitoring Teams.

A subject Advisor was heard saying: You see, some of these teachers resist and also do not like a subject advisor who frequently visits them for monitoring and support. To support this finding, U-Sayee and Adomako (2021) alluded that poor teacher attitudes and their tendency to resist Subject Advisor's visits do affect the quality of monitoring and support in schools. Another teacher laments that: Teachers actually panic saying they do not want subject advisors to be visiting them frequently. With this lamentation, Abdulai, et al., (2022) claimed there are teachers who are too hostile and too resistant to Subject Advisors' visitation and monitoring of teaching and learning.

It was further revealed that there is a tendency of teachers to develop a culture of resistance to any visit by the officials to monitor or support teaching and learning activities because most of the officials do go into the schools unannounced and with no formal letters informing schools about their visits. A teacher said the following: Yes, there is resistance not because we the teachers do not have what the Department is looking for, but mostly because the Department does not make appointments or inform us, we the teachers that they will be visiting us for monitoring and support and end up disturbing the contact sessions we want to have with our learners.

6.2 Bossy Nature of Departmental Officials

Another emerging trend of teacher resistance to monitoring and support is the bossy nature of the Departmental Officials who visit schools. The study found that Subject Advisors and other Education Officials when in schools for monitoring and support show signs of arrogance, they are too strict and behave like bosses who know it all. A Principal mentioned that: My teachers are of the view that Departmental Officials visit schools as the bosses to rule and to dictate to teachers what to teach and how to teach, as such, teachers always resist such behaviours and bossy nature. To corroborate this finding, in Kenya, Jonyo and Jonyo (2019) opined that teachers do show signs of resistance to any visitation or monitoring because some monitoring in schools is so rigid and suppressive to teachers' autonomy and professionalism.

A Union Representative also said the following: They are not the same; some departmental officials are bureaucratic, strict and arrogant while others are good to us. To support this finding, Smith and Cronje (1995), Acheson and Gail (2003) opined that teacher resistance can emanate from bureaucratic procedures District Officials or Monitoring Teams subject teachers to. Those officials who are arrogant are made to be so by some of the teachers who do not want to work at all. This is why in Ghana, Osei, Mensah and Agbofa (2020) claimed effective monitoring and support of teachers' work in school by Education Officials are affected by resistance and uncooperative attitudes of some teachers who do not prepare adequately to teach.

It was also revealed that the Departmental Officials on their missions in the schools try to rule and to dictate to teachers what needs to be done without paying attention to what teachers have to say, the nature of the school environment, the kinds of learners and situations regarding teaching and learning in rural schools. A teacher's views were that: I think some of them are bossy; they feel that they are the bosses and can dictate what should be happening. They do not give room for the circumstances in which we find ourselves. A learner in the city and a learner in the Elliotdale circuit are far different from each other, so when I have not covered my syllabus to the expected point or level the officials should be able to understand and make room for such shortcoming, but they feel that everything must be done according to the norm. To confirm these findings, Abdulai, et al., (2022), Glanz and Heinmann (2018) are of the view that some school visitation and monitoring are authoritative, unfriendly and domineering as such, teachers ought to resist such bossy behaviours.

A Subject Advisor's claim was: Principals do not want the subject advisors to be interfering in their administration matters; an example could be poor management of the school time books where teachers do not log in properly. Principals think we look down upon them when a suggestion comes from us; some principals are also not always in schools whenever we visit

them; hardly have you seen some principals in their schools. According to Jonyo and Jonyo (2019), some reasons why resistance does come from teachers whenever there is the monitoring of their work are that some Education Monitoring Teams do dominate the whole process of monitoring and support in schools, there is a lack of collegiality in the whole process and subsequently, they impose solutions to management and instructional lapses.

6.3 Departmental Officials' Victimization and Harassment

It was found in the study that teachers do resist Departmental Officials' victimization and harassment whenever they visit schools for monitoring and support. It was uncovered that most of the Departmental Officials visit schools with negative attitudes toward victimization, they demand a lot of paperwork from teachers and they visit schools with fault-finding missions. A Teacher said the following: Our problem is that the Departmental Officials visit schools with negative attitudes of victimization and fault findings. In Ghana, Abdulai, et al., (2022) were of the view that there are teachers who dislike being reprimanded and harassed by officials on monitoring and visit, as such, they see such visits and monitoring as witch-hunting. Kassahun (2014), Baffour-Awuah (2011) state that there is bound to be teacher resistance where school visit and monitoring is characterized by picking holes from here and there and where there is witch hunting and fault finding.

The study further revealed that teachers become resistant, aggressive, and defensive when being harassed, victimised and not treated like professionals by the officials. A Principal laments that: Teachers are also aggressive and defensive because it is assumed that our officials are in schools to victimize them. In reaction to this finding, Manuel (2007) states that when teachers are harassed, coerced and victimised, their performance is reduced, leading them to react with resistance and resentment. A Union Representative was also heard saying the following: Our officials from the district level sometimes harass teachers and demand unnecessary paperwork from them. In support of the above findings and to highlight why teachers resist visitations and monitoring in schools, James and Massiah (2019) mentioned a lack of trust between District Officials and teachers, victimization and poor relationships while Jonyo and Jonyo (2019) claimed harassment of teachers by Subject Advisors, the authoritative and routine nature of monitoring and support practices in schools are some reasons why teachers find it fit to resist all forms of monitoring.

6.4 Laziness and Fear of Failure

The study again found laziness and fear of failure on the part of teachers to be emerging trends in teacher resistance to officials' visits to schools for monitoring and support. The study revealed that some of the teachers resist Departmental Officials' visits to schools because of the fear of being labeled as failures and lazy for not being able to prepare well to teach in class, because of their lack of content knowledge in what they teach and because of their inability to meet deadlines for assessing students' homework, class work, class test, case studies and control test for moderations. A Subject Advisor states that: I think, it all boils down to doing your work; if your work is well done and you have done what you are supposed to do, I do not think there will be any resistance or chaos., Because most teachers do not do their work, they fear they would be exposed for their failure to live up to expectations. Abdulai et al., (2022) concur with these findings when they explain that teachers resist and dislike being monitored

and visited by their Subject Advisors because of the fear that their weaknesses will be unveiled. While Van Veen et, al., (2005) claimed teachers who resist any classroom visitation and monitoring are stubborn and lack content knowledge to teach.

A statement from a Principal was that: Any teacher who resists the officials' visits is the very teacher who does not teach in the school. Yes, it is true. Their behaviour shows that they do not want to teach at all. They claim the subject advisors expose weaknesses by not doing the right thing in the classrooms. This is why in Zimbabwe, Tshabalala (2013) reiterates the need for teachers to be visited, monitored and supported in schools by subject advisors because some teachers have the tendency not to initiate professional activities to develop their teaching skills when no one checks on them. It was also revealed that teachers who develop a culture of resistance do not want their weaknesses to be exposed for not completing their expected syllabus. A Teacher's opinion was that: Colleague teachers who resist official visits and supervision do have fear of their own failure, are those who are lazy to work and not also ready to be accountable. Also, some of us want freedom in schools in such a way that we want to go to school and sit without teaching.

As a result of teachers' tendency not to conduct classes when not being monitored, Mbatia (2016), Ngware et al. (2010) are of the view that teachers may be professionally trained but nothing may be done in class, as such, they must be visited in class and they must be monitored to see their executions of professional duties and should not be left not visited or monitored. A union Representative highlights that: Some teachers resist because they do not teach the learners as expected of them. I will believe that if teachers do not want the Department to visit their schools it is because they are not doing their work well in the schools. In reiterating the need for teacher monitoring and support in schools, Mbatia (2016) points out that teachers as humans do display different professional attitudes towards teaching and learning and, as such, should be visited in class and monitored.

6.5 Teacher Unions Influence

The study uncovered the existence of teacher unionism as an emerging trend in teacher resistance to Departmental Officials' visits to schools. It was revealed that teacher unions do influence their members or teachers to resist any subject advisors' class visit for observation because teachers are trained professionals and so must not be treated like unskilled workers in schools. A principal had these to say: there are some teachers in the circuit who resist management decisions and also have attitudes towards the subject advisors and the head of departments simply because the unions have them at their back if there should be any reprimanding. What a teacher said was that: As I have mentioned, some of us resist being visited in class for observation by the Officials because of the belief by our unions that we are professionals and not unskilled labour to be monitored anyhow. To confirm these findings, Grindle (2004) is of the view that teacher resistance to monitoring and classroom visitation by education officials can be a result of negative influences and interference from organised teacher unions.

It was found that some teachers are reluctant to teach or meet the deadline for moderation because of the belief that the unions would protect them if there should be warning letters served or disciplinary actions against them for their unprofessional conducts A subject Advisor

also laments that: Teacher unions do influence teachers to develop a culture of resistance to subject advisors' visits in the classrooms. Also, the unions do ask their members not to allow the subject advisors to dictate to them or tell them how to teach. So with this in mind, the teachers do not even want to see the subject advisors coming to visit them.

6.6 Fear of Change

The study found fear of change as a reason why teachers in the Elliotdale Circuit develop a culture of resistance. It was revealed that frequent curriculum changes, the inadequate training teachers receive on implementing new curricula and the general changes in how things are done in the education system are the predominant causes of teacher resistance in secondary schools. A principal mentioned that: One of these is the change of curriculum from time to time. These teachers are resisting that and always complaining. To concur with these findings, Achinstein and Ogawa (2006) claimed there is an unwillingness in teachers to accept curriculum reforms, as such, they have been noted to have contributed to curriculum reform failure (Zimmerman, 2006; Altinyelken, 2013). They complain they do not have time to teach because of workshops organised by the Department. Teachers are so de-motivated when it comes to curriculum issues. To support these findings, Van der Westhuizen (2008) highlights that resistance is usually a reaction from teachers who wish to protect themselves from the effects of curriculum changes and reforms.

It was again found that teachers have fears of the unknown, they do not want to learn new things or new ways of teaching and they do not also want to change from their old ways of teaching to modern ways of teaching. A teacher lamented that: change is a problem, we the teachers are always facing changes in our schools; it is difficult for us to accept that because we do not know what the change is bringing to us. How could we be trained for only a week in a new curriculum that we are expected to teach for years? All these can bring about resistance from us the teachers. To corroborate these findings, Bean, Human, et al., (2006) note that changes in school refer to changes in teachers which in general teachers do not like because they are reluctant to change their old ways of teaching. Again, Van der Westhuizen (2008) mentioned that there is resistance because teachers do not want to change their existing behaviors, actions and habits in the teaching profession.

7.0 CONCLUSION

Teachers' resistance to classroom visitations and the overall monitoring of school activities are as a result of the impromptu manner these practices are carried out in schools and the frequent manner subject advisors and monitoring teams visit schools. The bossy nature of subject advisors, their behaviours to victimise and harass teachers and their tendencies to hold on to the bureaucratic style of monitoring teachers' activities in schools have all contributed to secondary school teachers' resistance and have also contributed to defeating the purpose upon which classroom visitations and school monitoring practices are established. Teachers have also in one way or another failed to live up to professional expectations in schools as it can be seen from their fear of change, their inability to prepare well to teach, to assess students based on the required number of tasks and to be well prepared for moderations, as such, they resist any kind of classroom visitations and school monitoring. The influences of teacher unionism on teacher resistance to classroom visitation and school motoring cannot be underestimated

because teachers know very well that they are been influenced by the unions to resist any attempt by the employer to inspect and police their activities in schools and they know very well that the unions will protect them from been reprimanded.

Last but not least, the use of only secondary school teachers in the circuit is the limitations, there is the need, therefore, to conduct a similar study using all teachers of the Elliotdale Circuit to establish the emerging trends of teacher resistance to classroom visitation, monitoring and support practices carried out by district education officials.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The District Education Office should work hand in hand with the Elliotdale Circuit to organize change management workshops twice a year for all teachers. In such workshops, experts in change management should be contacted to train all teachers and all school heads on efficient strategies for managing teacher resistance, participants should also be equipped with knowledge of sources and nature of resistance to change in schools. Also, curriculum and subject experts should be contacted by the Department of Education to support, train and retrain all teachers on Pedagogical Content Knowledge in all subject areas so as to remove from them the fear of change, the fear of the unknown and the fear of being labeled failures for poor content knowledge acquisition and for poor classroom delivery.

The same workshop should be organized for all Provincial and District Education Officials whose duties are to monitor and support teachers in schools. In such workshops, officials should be trained and equipped on: how to be sensitive to the influences past educational systems have on teachers, how to pre-inform teachers and their school heads on intended visits and monitoring, how to consider the views and perceptions of teachers on change when monitoring schools, how to consider individual teacher differences, how to ensure a culture of mutual trust and respect, how to allow for teacher participation in the initial stages of idea generation with regards to reforms and changes and how to accommodate the views of teachers who oppose reforms and changes.

The Departmental Officials should work efficiently and effectively with all school heads either through face-to-face discussions or formal group presentations to communicate to teachers the need for classroom visits and school monitoring in the era of curriculum reform. The Department of Education should again organise in-service training for all their officials on school monitoring to educate them that classroom visitation and school monitoring should solely be based on teacher support and development towards effective curriculum implementation, as such, their visits and monitoring should be devoid of victimization, harassment, witch-hunting and fault-finding.

Educational leaders and departmental officials should manifest supportive and facilitative leadership behaviours when change is to be implemented. The Department of Education should give concessions in the form of salary increases and bonuses to teachers in exchange for support of workload and extension of teaching and learning time as a result of curriculum reform and general changes in the education system. The Department of Education should also give teacher unions more representation in change management decision-making.

The District Education in conjunction with Circuit Education should work with all teachers to convince them that any reform in the education system is geared towards having a positive impact on learners' and teachers' lives. Teachers should also be given the freedom to adopt curriculum reform practices to fit their unique pedagogical approach and the particular needs of their students. Monitoring teams from both Provincial and District Education should not be bullies or critics but be advisors, inspirers, and helpers to all teachers. In the same way, all teachers should accept subject advisors and all other officials on monitoring missions as partners for instructional improvement rather than as bureaucrats and intruders in how teachers teach.

REFERENCES

Abdulai, R., Mohammed, I., & Bidzakin, V. K. (2022). Supervisory Practices in Schools: Antidotes to Deficiency in Teacher Professional Development and Pedagogical Competence at Junior High Schools in the Kumbungu District, Ghana. Journal of Educational Review, 14 (1), 52-62. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363915227_SUPERVISORY_PRACTICES

Acheson, K., & Gall, M. (2003). Clinical Supervision and Teacher Development: Pre-service and In-service Applications. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED476151

Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R.T. (2006). Infidelity: What the Resistance of New Teachers Reveals about Professional Principles and Prescriptive Educational Policies. Harvard Educational Review, 76(1), 30-63. DOI:10.17763/haer.76.1.e14543458r811864 https://www.researchgate.net

Adikinyi, J. W. (2007). Teachers' Perceptions on the Role of Quality Assurance and Standards Officers on Quality of Education in Nairobi Public Secondary Schools, Kenya. Thesis: University of Nairobi, Nairobi. http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke

Aktas, M. (2021). Kübler-Ross' Five Stage Change Curve Model – All you Need to Know. Retrieve July 10, 2023, from https://userguiding.com/blog/kubler-ross-change-curve-model/

Altinyelken, H. K. (2013). Teachers' Principles Resistance to Curriculum Change: A Compelling Case from Turkey. Education International Research Institute. Retrieved July 9, 2023 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311509538

Ambrose, A. (2020). Perception of Teachers on Instructional Supervision at Basic Schools in Hohoe Municipality of Ghana. American Journal of Education and Information Technology, 4(1), 33-40 doi: 10.11648/j.ajeit.20200401.15 https://www.academia.edu/

Baffour-Awuah, P. (2011). Supervision of Instruction in Public Primary Schools in Ghana: Teachers' and Head Teachers' Perspectives. Murdoch: Murdoch University https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au

Baidoo, F. (2010). Assessment of Supervision in Public Basic Schools in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Dissertation: University of Cape Coast, Ghana. Retrieved June 13, 2023, from https://ir.ucc.edu.gh/xmlui/bitstream.

Beach, D. M., & Reinharts, J. (2000). Supervisory Leadership: Focus on Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. http://www.sciepub.com/reference/271839

Bean, P., Eksteen, F. R. L. N., Llewellyn, E. L., Kleyn, M., & Human., J. J. (2006). Business Studies. (2nd ed). Cape Town: Nasou- Via Afrika. https://viaafrika.com/

Bhandari, P. (2023). Ethical Considerations in Research. Retrieved July 16, 2023, from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/research-ethics/

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for School Reform. Educational Leadership,60 (60), 40-45. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles.

Busetto, L., Wick. W., & Gumbinger, C., (2020). How to Use and Assess Qualitative Research Methods. Neurol. Res. Pract. 2 (14), 2-10 https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z https://neurolrespract.biomedcentral.com

Bush, T. (2011). Theories of Educational Leadership and Management (4th ed.). London: Sage. http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/45638/

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Guro, H., Anthony, A., & Aziz, S. (2011). The Case Study Approach. BMC Med Res Methodol 11 (100), 2-9 https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100. https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com.

Du Plessis, P. (2013). The Principal as Instructional Leader: Guiding Schools to Improve Instruction. Education as Change, 17 (1), 79 – 92. doi:10.1080/16823206.2014.865992 https://www.researchgate.net.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). What's Worth Fighting for in Your School? New York: Teachers College Press. https://eric.ed.gov.

Gachoya, E. W. (2008). Impact of Quality Assurance and Standards on Educational Quality in Secondary Schools in Nyeri South District, Kenya. Thesis: University of Nairobi, Nairobi. http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke

Gamlem, S. V., Smith, k. (2013). Student Perceptions of Classroom Feedback. Assessment in Education Principles Policy and Practice, 20(2), 150-169. https://www.researchgate.net

Giles, C. (2006). Sustaining Secondary School Visions Over Time: Resistance, Resilience and Educational Reform. Journal of Educational Change, 7(3),179-208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-005-5727-1 https://link.springer.com/article

Glanz, J., & Heinmann, R. (2018). Encouraging Reflective Practice in Educational Supervision through Action Research and Appreciative Inquiry. New York: Wiley& Son, Inc. https://www.researchgate.net.son

Glanz, J., Behar-Horenstein, L. (2000). Paradigm Debates in Curriculum and Supervision. Modern and Postmodern Perspectives. West port,C. T: Bergin and Carvey. https://www.researchgate.net

Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2000). Behaviour in Organisations. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. https://www.scirp.org/

Grindle, M. S. (2004). Despite the Odds: The Contentious Politics of Education Reform. Princeton University Press. https://scholar.google.com.

Holland, P., & Adams, P. (2002). Through the Horns of a Dilemma between Instructional Supervision and Summative Evaluation of Teaching. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 5(3), 227-247. doi:10.1080/13603120210138603 https://www.researchgate.net.

Huberman, A. M. (1989). The Professional Life Cycle of Teachers. Teachers College Record, 91(1), 31–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818909100107 https://journals.sagepub.com

James, F., & Massiah, A. (2019). Using Clinical Supervision as a Professional Development Mechanism: Capabilities, Concerns and Challenges. A paper Presented in ECER 2019 Organized by European Educational Research Association. Retrieved June 10, 2023, from https://eera-ecer.de/ecer

Jonyo, O. D., & Jonyo, B. O., (2019). Curriculum Supervision and Implementation in Kenya: The Role of Secondary School Heads. European Journal of Educational Sciences, 6 (2), 1857- 6036. doi: 10.19044/ejes.v6no2a4 https://files.eric.ed.gov.

Kassahun, N. (2014). Practices and Challenges of Educational Supervision on Professional Development of Teachers in Government Preparatory Schools of Addis Ababa College of Education. Retrieved March 13th, 2017 from http://etd.aau.edu.et/bitstream.

Koranteng, G. K., (2013). Stakeholders' Perception of Effectiveness of Supervision in Junior High Schools in the Okai Koi Sub-Metropolitan Area, Accra. Retrieved 29th, April 2020, from https://ir.ucc.edu.gh/xmlui/handle/123456789/3827

Kutsyuruba, B. (2003). Instructional Supervision: Perceptions of Canadian and Ukrainian Beginning High-School Teachers. Master's Thesis. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan. Retrieved from http://library2.usask.ca/theses

Lohman, L. (2021). Case Study Design: Advantages and Disadvantages. Retrieved July 16, 2023 from https://study.com/learn/lesson/case-study-design.html#:~:text

Malik, P. (2022). The Kubler-Ross Change Curve in the Workplace. Retrieved July 2023, from https://whatfix.com/blog/kubler-ross-change-curve.

Manuel, J. R. (2007). Developing Professional Autonomy: A Balance Between Licenses and Responsibility. Retrieved May 21, 2023, from http:// www.teacherautonomy.org.

Mbatia, J. W. (2016). Teachers' Perception of Classroom Observation and Checking of Pupils' Exercise Books by Head Teachers on Performance of Duty in Primary Schools in Nakuru North District, Kenya. Journal of Education & Social Policy, 3(3), 80-86 http://www.jespnet.com

Mngomezulu, M. N. (2015). Strategies of Monitoring Teaching and Learning: A School Management Team Perspective. Dissertation: University of Kwazulu Natal, South Africa. https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za

Mohammed, I., Coetser, A., & Molepo, J. M. (2015). Factors Impacting on Teachers' Professionalism at Secondary Schools in the Elliotdale Circuit of the Dutywa Education District. Doctoral Thesis: Walter Sisulu University, South Africa. https://www.wsu.ac.za/index.php/university-library

Mohammed, I., Cishe, E. N., & Lukman, Y. (2023). School District and Teacher Related Barriers to Continuous Professional Learning and Development through University Education. PONTE International Journal of Sciences and Research, 79 (5), 2-16 doi: 10.21506/j.ponte.2023.5.1 https://www.researchgate.net.

Ndegwa, E. N. (2001). Framework for Human Settlements Data Analysis. A paper Presented at the Training Workshop on District Planning and Plan Preparation in Kenya Held at Nyahururu Lodge, from February 26 to March 2, 2002. Retrieved March 21, 2023, from http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/

Ngware, M., Oketch, M., Mutisya, M., & Abuya, B. (2010). Classroom Observation Study: A Report on the Quality and Learning in Primary Schools in Kenya. Nairobi: APHRC. https://microdataportal.aphrc.org.

Oketch, G., & Asiachi, J. (1998). Curriculum Development. Nairobi: University of Nairobi. https://www.coursehero.com.

Olembo, J., Wanga, P., & Karagu, N. (1992). Management in Education. AMREF International University (AMIU) Library, Nairobi: Nairobi Educational Research and Publication. https://catalogue.amref.ac.ke

Osei, E., Mensah, D. K. D., & Agbofa, F. J. (2020). Circuit Supervision in Gomoa East District of Ghana: Key Issues to Consider. Int. J. Innov. Res. Educ. Sci., 7 (6), 467-478 https://www.ijires.org.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice. (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. https://us.sagepub.com.

Reepen, N., & Barr, S. (2010). The Attitudes of Teachers Towards Supervision. Journal of Experimental Education. 4(1),237–301. doi:10.1080/00220973.1935.11009987 https://www.researchgate.net

Reiling, J. (2022). Managing Change Using the Kubler-Ross Change Model. Retrieved May 13, 2023 from https://bethestrategicpm.com/managing-change-using-the-kubler-ross-change- model/

Robert, T. (2023). Why People Resist Change. Retrieved January March 20, 2023, from https://managementisajourney.com/organizational-change-8-reasons-why-people-resist- change/

Sergiovanni, T., & Robert, J. (2009). Supervision in Human Perspectives. (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill. https://books.google.com/books.

Smith, P. J., & Cronje, D. J. (1995). Management Principles: A Contemporary South African Edition. South Africa: Juta& Co, Ltd. https://books.google.com/books.

Suleiman, Y., Nike, Y. S. I., Mustapha, A. I., Okwara, U. J. (2020). Issues and Challenges Facing Supervision of Secondary Education in Nigeria in the 21st Century. Journal of Educational Leadership in Action, 7 (1) Article 12. Retrieved May 23, 2023, from https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/ela/vol7/iss1/12

Sultana, R. (2008). The Challenge of Policy Implementation: A Comparative Analysis of Vocational School Reforms in Albania, Kosovo and Turkey. Peer Learning 2007. Torino: European Training Foundation. https://www.etf.europa.eu.

Tshabalala, T. (2013). Teachers' Perceptions Towards Classroom Instructional Supervision: A Case Study of Nkayi District in Zimbabwe. International J. Soc. Sci. & Education, 4(1), 25-32 https://www.ijsse.com.

U-Sayee, C. R., & Adomako, E. B. (2021). Supervisory Practices and Challenges Faced by Senior High School Principals in Greater Monrovia, Liberia: Implications for Quality Education. Heliyon, 7 (4), 2405-8440. https://www.cell.com

Van der Westhuizen, P. C. (2008). Schools as Organisations. (3rd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik publishers. https://www.worldcat.org

Van Veen, K., Sleegers, P., & Van de Ven, P. H., (2005). One Teacher's Identity, Emotions, and Commitment to Change: A Case Study into Cognitive-Affective Processes of a Secondary School Teacher in the Context of Reforms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 21 (1), 917-934. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.004. https://www.scirp.org

Villegas, F. (2023). Thematic Analysis: What it is and How to Do It. Retrieved May 10, 2023, from https://www.questionpro.com/blog/thematic-analysis

Wango, G. (2009). School Administration and Management. Quality Assurance and Standards in Schools. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation. https://www.academia.edu/

Wairimu, J. M., (2016). Teacher's Perception of Classroom Observation and Checking of Pupil's Exercise Books by Head Teachers on Performance of Duty in Primary Schools in Nakuru North District, Kenya. Journal of Education & Social Policy 3(3), 80-87 http://www.jespnet.co

Zimmerman, J. (2006). Why Some Teachers Resist Change and What Principals can do about it. NASSP Bulletin, 90(3), 238-249. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636506291521 https://journals.sagepub.com

Zepeda, S. J. (2007). Instructional Supervision: Applying Tools and Concepts (2nd ed). NY: Eye on Education. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED496568