



Research Article

The implication of transformative pedagogy in classroom teaching: A case of Bhutan

Karma Dorji¹, Pema Tshering², Tempa Wangchuk³ and Sherab Jatsho⁴

¹Royal Education Council, Bhutan; ²Rangjung Central School, Bhutan; ³Nangkor Central School, Bhutan; ⁴Yangchen Gatshel Middle Secondary School, Bhutan.

Correspondences should be addressed to Karma Dorji  karmadorji@rec.gov.bt

Received 29 June 2020; Revised 6 August 2020; Accepted 15 August 2020

Bhutanese teachers received training on transformative pedagogy to heighten the quality of teaching methods. However, given the paucity of the study, little is known about the implication of transformative pedagogy. Therefore, exploratory study was carried out to ascertain the implication of transformative pedagogy in Bhutanese classroom teaching. Twenty teachers (N=20) took part in face to face interviews. The data was analysed based on the framework of manifest content analysis advocated by Bengtsson (2016). Findings suggest that transformative pedagogy has the positive implication to Bhutanese classroom teaching. Findings also show that the practice of transformative pedagogy is limited by curricular design, classroom structure, and the notion of teacher being the source of all knowledge. The suitability issue of transformative pedagogy in the context of curricular design, classroom structures, and the affinity towards traditional teaching methods are discussed.

Keywords: Bhutanese education, transformative pedagogy, adult learning, transformative learning, exploratory study

I. Introduction

Quality of education was one of the issues echoed in the Bhutanese society. Many Bhutanese banded that there is no competency in Bhutanese high school going children to meet the needs of the 21st century (Pedey, 2008; Sherab & Dorji, 2013, Tamang, 2008). On this score, Bhutanese in the circle of education argued that the quality of education is a complex domain that cannot be inferred based on reading, writing, and speaking competency (Johnson, Childs, Ramchandran & Tenzin, 2008; Tamang, 2008). The general populace, however, speculated that there is a need to transform teachers' classroom pedagogical practices (Johnson, Childs, Ramchandran & Tenzin, 2011; Namgyel, 2013; Sherab & Dorji, 2013). Since then, the quest to update teachers with new teaching methods was the top priority of Ministry of Education [MoE] (MoE, 2012a, 2012b, 2014; Thinley, 2013; Thinley & Maxwell, 2013).

In the past few years, MoE took forward several initiatives to reform the education systems aimed at improving the quality of education. The effort to transform the pedagogy was one of the many bold ventures pursued by MoE. Correspondingly, His Excellency, the Honorable Prime Minister of Bhutan declared 2016 as the "Teacher Development Year" and subsequently launched the teacher development programme titled "transformative pedagogy". Thus, transformative pedagogy became one of the highlights of education fraternity. In 2016, MoE embarked on providing a week-long training on transformative pedagogy to nearly all the Bhutanese teachers (Jurmey, 2018; MoE, 2016; "Not Vessel", 2016; Samdrup, 2016). The training was founded upon the premise to help teachers critically reflect on their current practices and update methods to better engage the students (MoE, 2016; "Not Vessel", 2016; Royal Education Council [REC], 2016a; Samdrup, 2016). To a greater extent, the experiences and skills obtained by teachers through training was intended in heralding an interactive and robust classroom climate to help students to adapt or adopt any situations (MoE, 2016).

Transformative pedagogy is the art of teaching that fosters collaborative learning and strengthen students to think creatively and critically (Donnell, 2007; Levy & Kerpelman, 2010). It believes on the principle that learning requires concerted effort of learners to critically examine their beliefs, values, and assumptions (Meyers, 2008) or placing learners at the heart of the learning process (Vijayachandran, 2018). Ideally, the central to transformative pedagogy is the reciprocal collaboration between teachers and students with

particular emphasis on students' role in the construction of knowledge (Levy & Kerpelman, 2010). Therefore, the classroom practices that make use of transformative pedagogy apply the philosophy that considers clear investment in "student engagement, participation, ownership and making learning processes fun and exciting" (Wangdi, 2016, para. 8).

The content of week-long training on transformative pedagogy was devised with the aim to inform teachers about the philosophical foundations of engaging students through discourse, group work and partners (REC, 2016a). The training provided first-hand experience of teaching through Kagan's cooperative learning structure, team and class building, brain-based learning, multiple intelligences, emotional intelligence, and professional learning community (MoE, 2016; REC, 2016a). By and large, the content of the week-long training was different from the training modules offered in pre-service training programmes. The pre-service training modules make the mixture of both the professional development modules and subject-based modules (REC, 2009). Therefore, the pre-service training modules largely pivot on providing theoretical lenses and experiences in educational psychology, teaching pedagogy, assessment modality, etc. (vanBalkom & Sherman, 2010).

On the eve of MoE's 2016 week-long training programme, Bhutanese teachers lauded the prospect of transformative pedagogy in Bhutanese classroom teaching. They expressed that the training not only provided them the skills and the tools needed for an interactive class to foster engaged learning but also gave the energy of inspiration and motivation (Samdrup, 2016). Perhaps, many teachers posited that skills acquired through training would help to induce dramatic pedagogical shift from traditional didactic methods to the setup that is learner centered and student engaging (Jurmey, 2018; MoE, 2016; Wangdi, 2016). Conversely, majority of the Bhutanese questioned the way the transformative pedagogy was introduced into the Bhutanese education system. Many raised skepticism over the suitability of transformative pedagogy amidst thick curricular design, overcrowded classroom, and the heavy workload of teachers (Johnson, Childs, Ramchandran & Tenzin, 2011; Namgyel, 2013; MoE, 2012b; Sherab & Dorji, 2013; Sinchuri, 2013).

However, given the paucity of the study, little was known about the implication of transformative pedagogy in Bhutanese classroom teaching. Therefore, this study was carried to answer the following research questions:

1. What effect does the transformative pedagogy have in terms of its strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat in the Bhutanese classroom setting?
2. What is the implication of practicing transformative pedagogy in the Bhutanese classroom?
3. What intervention programme may be derived from the results of the study?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

In this study, the case study approach was used as a part of the exploratory design. The case study approach was used as there was a need to explore the in-depth implication of transformative pedagogy in the Bhutanese classroom setting. Given the nature of the case study, the participants were investigated in the natural setting through holistic approach in one of the western districts in Bhutan (Bicak, 2019).

2.2. Participants

Cresswell and Clark (2011) posit that the study that aims to construct complete understanding of the phenomena require to select the cases that are information-rich. Correspondingly, teachers were recruited in this study based on the three-step inclusion criteria. First, teachers who have received training on transformative pedagogy in 2016 were identified either through telephonic conversation or e-mail correspondence. Second, teachers possessing the experience of teaching through transformative pedagogy and the ability to share experiences or opinions were identified through telephonic conversation with school principals. Lastly, twenty (N=20) teachers were recruited in the study based on their availability and willingness to take part in the study. There were thirteen male (n=13) and seven female (n=7) teachers. Seven were from three higher secondary schools, eight from two middle secondary schools, and five from two lower secondary

schools. Four teachers were specialised in teaching science disciplines, three in mathematics, seven in arts, two in commerce, and four in economics. All the participants had more than five years of teaching experience.

2.3. Data Collection Tool

Data was collected through an unstructured interview protocol that contained three open-ended questions. The face to face interviews were carried out either after the school hours or on weekends depending on the choice of the interviewees. The interview sessions lasted for about 25 minutes with each interviewee. Two senior research officers from Research Division, REC, Paro, Bhutan validated the interview protocol. The first question "How is transformative pedagogy in education?" elicited generic perspectives, while the second question "How is transformative pedagogy in teaching and learning?" unveiled perceptions in terms of teaching and learning. The third question "Do you have any other comment?" ascertained additional views.

2.4. Data Analysis

The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed into verbatim. The data were analysed based on the approaches of manifest content analysis advocated by Bengtsson (2016). During the analysis, transcripts were read to find out the codes (in vivo codes) that make sense of the research question (decontextualisation) and re-read (recontextualisation) to trace out any meaningful, evocative, or repeated patterns left untraced. The codes were then condensed into sub-categories or sub-headings which were consolidated further into overarching categories (categorisation) and the themes respectively. To understand better, the codes were tabulated in terms of frequency (f) in respective themes. The data in the tables were supported by participants' verbatim. Each participant was coded as T1, T2, T3... T20.

3. Results

The study ascertained the implication of transformative pedagogy in Bhutanese classroom teaching under four themes: Strength, weakness, opportunity and threat.

3.1. Strength

Table I illustrates the strength of transformative pedagogy in classroom teaching. At least 17 participants proffered that transformative pedagogy promotes interaction amongst the students, while 16 each had the view that it create spaces for students to participate equally and build their knowledge. Approximately one-half of the participants posited that learning becomes interactive and participatory. On the other hand, nearly one-third of the participants maintained that transformative pedagogy makes the classroom teaching both hands-on and minds-on which fosters investigative and engaging teaching-learning experiences.

Table I
Strength Associated with the Practice of Transformative Pedagogy

Theme	Codes	f
Strength	Makes learning hands-on and minds-on	7
	Makes teaching investigative and engaging	6
	Learning becomes interactive and participatory	8
	Creates interaction amongst students	17
	Gives the chance to build their concept	16
	Meet the needs of diverse learners	5
	Equal participation of students is possible	16

On this score, at least five participants remarked that the practice of transformative pedagogy enables teaching to cater the needs of diverse learners. Given below is an excerpt taken out from the verbatim of T3:

T3. "Transformative pedagogy makes our classroom teaching vibrant and hands-on... it makes learning engaging... and creates interaction amongst students when applying Kagan's cooperative learning structures. Teachers find comfortable to teach to every student who has different learning abilities... and let students make their knowledge".

3.2. Weakness

Table 2 illustrates the downside of the transformative pedagogy in classroom teaching-learning. All the participants expressed that the coverage of the syllabus on or before time is the central issue associated with the transformative pedagogy. For this, 18 participants reiterated that the pace of classroom teaching becomes slow and standstill. More than one-half of the participants believed that the classroom atmosphere becomes burdened with menace and nuisance. This was further consolidated when nearly one-half of the participants had the view that students take the liberty, talk too much, or simply do not take classroom activities seriously. Notwithstanding, nearly one-quarter of the participants expressed resentment against transformative pedagogy.

Table 2

Weakness Associated with the Practice of Transformative Pedagogy

Theme	Codes	f
Weakness	Creates nuisance in the class	11
	Students take liberty	7
	Students talk too much	8
	Students do not take things seriously	9
	Treat teachers as jerks	4
	Low achievers depend on high achievers	5
	The slow pace of teaching	18

Their disposition was on the ground that it provides room for low achievers to rely on high achievers or leads to the extent where students resort to calling teachers as jerks. Given below is an interview excerpt of T7:

T7. "Transformative pedagogy is good in general. But, there are many issues that we need to tackle in the process. Our curriculum is large and thick and teaching through transformative pedagogy makes the pace of the teaching very slow. It becomes difficult for one to cover the syllabus on time. More so, transformative pedagogy slow learners dependent on the high achievers. Many students tend to take advantage and talk too much in the class. Some even call teachers as jerks"

3.3. Opportunity

Table 3 shows the merits of transformative pedagogy in classroom teaching. Eighteen participants maintained that students develop a sense of individual accountability, while 16 of them explicated that students get motivated and develop confidence. Moreover, they (11 participants) had the view that transformative pedagogy also makes the learners feel secured and respected. Concordantly, more than one-half of the participants had the view that transformative pedagogy helps the learners build social skills or relationships between student to student or student to teacher. At the same time, at least nine of them also expressed their contentment that the practice of transformative pedagogy augments learners' communication skills. In the other domain, it appeared legible when participants posited that the practice of transformative pedagogy enables the teachers to understand the learners.

Table 3

Opportunity Associated with the Practice Transformative Pedagogy

Theme	Codes	f
Opportunity	Develops social skills in the class	10
	Improves student to student or student to teacher relationship	12
	Improves students' communication skills	9
	Develops a sense of individual accountability	18
	Learners feel motivated and confident	16
	Learners feel secured and respected	11
	Teachers understand the learners	16
	Teachers sense the psychological needs of the learners	6
	Teachers feel the emotional patterns of the learners	17

On this score, at least 17 and six participants opined on the teachers' ability to understand the emotional patterns and the psychological needs of the learners respectively. Given below is the verbatim of T13:

T13. "The transformative pedagogy has lots of benefits. It helps the learners develop good relationships amongst themselves and with the teachers. You know... transformative pedagogy builds students' confidence and makes them motivated... Teachers also get the chance to know the learners better. We come to understand the emotional and psychological needs of the learners. Students also feel secured ... they feel respected. We have seen many students becoming responsible and accountable for the task".

3.4. Threat

Table 4 shows the variables that impede the practice of transformative pedagogy in the Bhutanese contextual setting. Of all, the curricular design appears to be the most glaring threat that challenges the feasibility of transformative pedagogy. Nineteen participants had the consensus that with large syllabi in place, they find difficult to cover the syllabi on time. Concordantly, more than one-half of them also maintained that the standing curricular materials are thick and voluminous. Not surprisingly, more than one-half participants mentioned that the classrooms are customarily packed, not much space in the classroom, or classrooms are overcrowded. More so, seven participants also proffered about the inadequacy of the learning materials as hindrance to the practice of transformative pedagogy. Not surprisingly, it came out explicitly that there are some members of the teaching fraternity who do not buy the idea of transformative pedagogy.

Table 4
Threat Associated with the Practice of Transformative Pedagogy

Theme	Codes	f
Threat	Some school leaders prefer the lecture method	5
	Some teachers prefer the lecture method	6
	Some students like spoon-feeding	8
	Some students like the lecture method	9
	Some feel easy with the lecture method	7
	Syllabi are large and difficult to cover on time	19
	Curricula are thick and voluminous	13
	Classrooms are packed and crowded	12
	Not much space in the classroom to practice transformative pedagogy	11
	The learning materials are not adequate	7

Nearly one-fourth of the participants posited that some school leaders and teachers still prefer lecture method over transformative pedagogy. At the same time, approximately one-third of them indicated a student's affinity towards the lecture method. They said that students still prefer spoon-feeding, feel easy with lectures, or like when everything is taught by the teacher. The excerpt given below is the verbatim of T9:

T9. "At times, we find difficult to apply transformative pedagogy in the classroom setting... some school leaders and teachers still prefer lecture method. Most of the students still like it when taught through the lecture method... you know they feel easy... like spoon-feeding. This may be true as our syllabi are thick and vast. Kagan's cooperative learning structures do not seem to work well because the classrooms are always packed and crowded".

4. Discussion

4.1. Strength

This study revealed that transformative pedagogy makes the classroom lesson hands-on and minds-on or investigative. These findings imply that the use of transformative pedagogy makes the classroom learning

scenario reflective, critical, or inquiry-based. In their assertion, Lopez and Olan (2018) maintain that “transformative pedagogy empowers students to critically examine beliefs, values, and knowledge to develop new epistemologies, center multiple ways of knowing, and develop a sense of critical consciousness and agency” (p. 8). Concordantly, Levy and Kelperman (2010, p. 80) posit that the use of transformative pedagogy “helps students to critically examine how they think about information and encourages them to constructively challenge one another’s perspectives”. Similarly, Wangdi (2016) also posits that transformative pedagogy entails the students to critically think and engage in thoughtful discourse.

Findings also reported that transformative pedagogy makes the classroom learning interactive and collaborative in nature. Theoretically, this means that transformative pedagogy promotes the culture of learning as a team. Harrel-levy and Kelperman (2010) have posited that learning in the transformative class is “furthered by the community that is developed within the class” (p. 80). They also maintain that learning via transformative pedagogy is facilitated by collaborative relations between the students with particular emphasis on the students’ role in constructing knowledge. More so, central to the transformative pedagogy is the relationships between students that reinforce and reflect the voice of the student body—a voice formed from the students’ critical analysis of the subject, given their unique individual experiences and their unique collective experiences as a class community (Greene, 2005). Therefore, transformative pedagogy can, presumably, be referred to as the teaching method that emphasises the mutual or collaborative learning between students (Donnell, 2007).

It was touted that the use of transformative pedagogy enables students to build their learning. This finding infers that with transformative pedagogy, the leaning becomes either constructive or promotes the culture of taking ownership in learning. Presumably, this finding by nature appears to mirror the envisage of the nationwide transformative pedagogy training that “attempted to sow the seed of learning by doing” (REC, 2016a, p. 36). In its stand, MoE had the clear vision to “facilitate in heralding an interactive and robust class culture that will help groom students to be confident and competent” (MoE, 2014, p. 1) or to ensue horizontal in terms of information flow rather than a lecture-based top-down approach (“Not Vessel”, 2016; Wangdi, 2016).

On the other hand, it was touted that learning becomes mutually inclusive: meet the needs of the diverse learners. This only means to say that learning becomes the reach of every type of learner when the lessons are couched upon the principles of transformative pedagogy. This finding appears to support Wangdi (2016) that:

In transformative pedagogy, a clear role is set out for every student so a student who is doing well cannot dominate nor can a shy one shy away from participation. The training has also incorporated eight multiple intelligences while planning the lesson plans to suit the learning abilities of different students. For instance, while there are students who learn through writing and reading, some learn through visuals. “The training thus emphasizes on considering the needs of individual learners. (paras. 9–11).

Overall, the findings show Bhutanese teachers’ effort to keep the students focused on classroom teaching. In the bigger loop, the findings conjecture Bhutanese teachers’ pedagogical shift from sage at the centre stage to guide by the side.

4.2. Weakness

Given the setting in Bhutan education system, the practice of transformative pedagogy appears easier said than done. This study pointed out that teaching becomes standstill or steadily slow with transformative pedagogy. By and large, one cannot surmise this finding as the downside of transformative pedagogy. Instead, it can be elucidated from the front of curricular and policy design. Bhutanese teachers are currently challenged from two forefronts. First, teachers are tasked to teach thick and voluminous curricula. Many reported that Bhutanese curricula are vast and hefty in design (MoE, 2014; REC, 2016b). Second, teachers are mandated complete the syllabi on or before the stipulated time. As a result, teachers must be kept on toes to drive the pace of teaching congruent to the flow of stipulated time. Therefore, on the eve of MoE’s week-long training, Bhutanese from various social strata debated much about the suitability of transformative pedagogy. In the

report of Wangdi (2016), many cautioned the way the transformative pedagogy was adopted in hasty manner. "Not Vessel" (2016) maintains that "curriculum or syllabus be reviewed to fit the new pedagogy. These are urgent issues that need to be sorted out. Teachers need to be comfortable and convinced that everything is moving in the same direction" (para. 10).

Much was pointed out about learners' disruptive behavior in terms of taking the liberty, talking much, or not taking the classroom activities seriously. As posited in the preceding section, students' disruptive behavior may not be necessarily due to transformative pedagogy per se. More so, there is no Bhutanese literature that substantiates the correlation between transformative pedagogy and students' disruptive behavior. However, from other point of view, it looks seemingly plausible. With the mindset preoccupied by the dominant lecture method, Bhutanese students must have been taken aback with the sudden advent of transformative pedagogy. Students' reluctance to accept or difficulty in coping with transformative pedagogy was very observed in many schools (Tshering, 2016). That is why, on the eve of MoE's 2016 training programme, it was reported that the "... new pedagogy is introduced at a pace that the students can understand. It mustn't be sudden" ("Not Vessel", 2016, para. 7). Therefore, the need to review the "curriculum, which was prepared based on the conventional method" was felt more than ever (Wangdi, 2016, para. 20).

This study, though sparsely, reported that slow learners become either dependent on high achievers or do not take things seriously. Conversely, this finding contradicts with the tenet that transformative pedagogy meets the needs of diverse learners or empowers the students to take ownership. It also appears as opposed to the report of Wangdi (2016) that "in transformative pedagogy, a clear role is set out for every student so a student who is doing well cannot dominate nor can a coy one shy away from participation" (para. 12). MoE's 2016 training programme was founded on the principle to instill the spirit of equal participation and individual accountability.

4.3. Opportunity

This study reported that transformative pedagogy augments students' relationship with teachers and their peers; develop communication skills and emotional stability. As such, these findings indicate that transformative pedagogy facilitates students' social and psychological growth. Theoretically, transformative pedagogy is propelled, in part, by the belief that it establishes the connectivity between students either directly or tangentially (Harrel-levy & Kelperman, 2010). In the 21st century global scenario, learners are not only required to have the academic mastery, but also the competency to relate one-self to other people, and the criticalness to reflect on one-self (Soland, Hamilton, & Stretcher, 2013). Wangdi (2016, para. 23) mentioned that "transformative pedagogy promotes social skills, personal organisation, and builds students as an individual and as part of a team". Therefore, MoE in 2016 unfurled week-long training on transformative pedagogy to "help groom students to be confident and competent who can also adapt and adopt to any situations" (MoE, 2016, p. 1; Tshering, 2016, para. 15).

In the other loop, it appeared that transformative pedagogy aids both teacher and students in understanding each other's psychological or emotional patterns. This finding mirrors the argument that "transformative pedagogy optimizes positive human relationships" report of (REC 2016a, p. 22) or "transformative teachers touch on the self-concepts and identities of youth both tangentially and directly" (Harrel-levy & Kelperman, 2010, p. 81). According to Tennant (2005) and Cranton and Carusetta (2004), transformative teachers pitch to promote awareness both at the personal and relational level. One of the aspirations of MoE's 2016 training programme was to let teachers "understand the different learners in their classroom" (MoE, 2016, p. 3). Johnston (2000) in his research on the teaching of chemistry espouses that classroom teaching must meet both the logical sequence and the psychological needs of the learners. Freire and Macedo (as cited in Taylor, 2008) state that "horizontal student-teacher relationship" (p. 8) culminate towards developing progressive psycho-social bond.

4.4. Threat

This study reported that some school leaders, teachers, and students still prefer lecture-based teaching than transformative pedagogy. This may be true given that schools in Bhutan are virtually obliged to complete syllabi

on or before time. As such, one must be forced inadvertently to resort lecture method. The other reason could be the manner of transformative pedagogy adopted in the Bhutanese schools. It was lamented that “current effort to transform the pedagogy is one such activity that is currently being pursued and one that must be carefully introduced. It is important that this new pedagogy is introduced at a pace that the students can understand. It mustn’t be sudden” (“Not Vessels”, 2016, p. 23). That’s why Bhutan’s national newspaper Kuensel stated that “we had difficulty with students following new methods” (Wangdi, 2016, para. 18). Canonically, this means that not everyone was prepared to embrace the taste of a dramatic pedagogical shift.

Much was reported that, there is not much one can do with thick or vast curricular design. This implies the fact that one cannot expect to see dramatic change in classroom practices unless there is change in Bhutanese curricular design. More so, it connotes the misalignment between curricular design and the demands of transformative pedagogy. This mirrors the fact that “we need to suit teaching strategy to the curriculum and needs of the individual differences in schools” (Rinzin, 2016, para. 8) or “with transformation in the pedagogy we think that there should be some alignment of the curriculum” (Wangdi, 2016, para. 19). A similar concern has been raised by the research findings of Gyamtsho and Maxwell (2012), Rabgay (2018), and Scheulka (2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2014). The recent report by Rinzin (2018) states that:

A teacher leaves no stone unturned to complete a vast syllabus on time. We need to use time consciously in teaching and learning. We end up teaching curriculum which is Indian-borrowed and apply transformative pedagogy from western countries. The vast curriculum and transformative pedagogy (as the mode of delivery) are incompatible. (para. 7).

By and large, the principles of transformative pedagogy demands the classroom structure be open and spacious. However, in actuality, Bhutanese classrooms often remain packed with large number of students. Thus, the practice of transformative pedagogy in such classroom context may just remain as a distant dream. This must be the case why Wangdi (2016) reported that “fate of transformative pedagogy remains limbo with Bhutanese classrooms filled over by 35 or more students” (para. 15).

5. Conclusions

This study investigated the implication of transformative pedagogy in Bhutanese classroom teaching. Thirteen male ($n = 13$) and seven female ($n = 7$) teachers took part in the face to face interviews. The data was analysed based on the approaches of manifest content analysis advocated by Bengtsson (2016).

Nearly all the participants proffered that transformative pedagogy promotes the synchrony of social interaction and sense of individual accountability amongst the students. Sixteen participants also posited that transformative pedagogy enables students to leverage active participation in the class, construct their own knowledge, or feel motivated and develop self-confidence. Therefore, in the overall, it appears that transformative pedagogy has positive implication to Bhutanese classroom teaching. Conversely, 19 participants maintained that practice of transformative pedagogy is relatively difficult with thick curricula in place. For this, 18 participants opined that the practice of transformative pedagogy makes the pace of classroom teaching slow and becomes difficult to cover syllabi on time. Moreover, it was revealed that the overcrowded classroom structure and affinity towards lecture method largely impede the practice of transformative pedagogy.

This study can offer basis to rethink on the curriculum curricular designs from the milieu of transformative pedagogy. It can also provide evidence to navigate daily classroom praxis through the dynamics of transformative pedagogy. More so, the findings can inform the policy makers to formulate decisions regarding the viability of transformative pedagogy from classroom ambience point of view.

5.1. Limitations

This research was carried out in one of the western districts. At the same time, the research was based purely on the aspects of the qualitative study. Therefore, the trends reported by this study do not have the feat to generalise to the larger section of the society. The study collected data from the pool of selected teachers. Therefore, it lacks the voice from students, school leaders, or other relevant stakeholders. Additionally, data was collected using the interview protocol only. The trustworthiness of the report could

have been strengthened had the data been collected from other sources as well. Moreover, the reports of this study are based purely on the verbatim of the key informants. The reports could have been made realistic if field observations were carried out. Therefore, the study reports do not have the ground to posit the actualities prevailing in the real classroom scenario.

5.2. Recommendations

The findings from this study revealed that practice of transformative pedagogy, in a context like Bhutanese classroom setting, is easier said than done. It appeared glaring that there is not much one can do with transformative pedagogy amidst thick curricular designs and crowded classrooms. More so, it came out vividly that there are some school leaders and teachers who are still inclined towards conventional lecture method. Therefore, it looks riveting that agency or stakeholders in concerned take stock of the matters diligently and implement measures. It may include:

1. Chart intervening or awareness programme to keep every members of the teaching fraternity informed about the merits of transformative pedagogy.
2. Design and develop curricular materials that meets the demand of the transformative pedagogy.
3. Formulate a policy that ensures adequate space in the class for students to move around.

References

- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001>
- Bıçak, F. (2019). Investigation of the views of teachers toward the use of smart boards in the teaching and learning process. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 3(1), 15–23.
- Byod, B. L. (2009). Using a case study to develop the transformational teaching theory. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 7(3), 50–59.
- Cranton, P., & Carusetta, E. (2004). Perspectives on authenticity. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 5–22.
- Donnell, K. (2007). Getting to be: Developing a transformative urban teaching practice. *Urban Education*, 42, 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907300541>
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. P. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language, race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 377–402.
- Gyamtsho, D. C., & Maxwell, T. W. (2012). Present practices and background to teaching and learning at the Royal University of Bhutan (RUB): A pilot study. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(1), 65–75. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE1172.pdf>
- Greene, C. (2005). Education as the practice of freedom. *Equity in Education*, 84, 50–53. Retrieved October from <http://www.pilambda.org/horizons/v84-1/greene.pdf>
- Johnson, D., Childs, A., Ramchandran, K., & Tenzin, W. (2008, July 21). A needs assessment of science education in Bhutan. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/geography/en/files/11198/12396892105Final_Report.pdf/Final%2BReport.pdf
- Johnson, D., Childs, A., Ramchandran, K., & Tenzin, W. (2011). Science education in Bhutan: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Science Education*, 34(3), 375–400.
- Levy, M. K. H., & Kerpelman, J. L. (2010). Identity process and transformative pedagogy: Teachers as agents of identity formation. *An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 10(1), 76–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283481003711684>
- Liu, C. H., & Mathews, R. (2005). Vygotsky's philosophy: Constructivism and its criticisms examined. *International Education Journal*, 6(3), 386–399.
- Lop, A. E., & Olan, E. L. (Eds.) (2018). *Transformative pedagogies for higher education: Moving towards the praxis in an era of change*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Meyers, S. A. (2008). Using transformative Pedagogy when teaching online. *College Teaching*, 56(4), 219–224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.56.4.219-224>
- Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult. Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow, & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (pp. 3–33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ministry of Education. (2012a). *National education policy 2011*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Ministry of Education.

- Ministry of Education. (2012b). *Science curriculum framework pp-xii*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2014). *Bhutan education blue print 2014-2024: Rethinking education*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2016). *Transformative pedagogy*. Thimphu, Bhutan: Ministry of Education.
- Namgyel, T. (2013). Teacher-centered instructional delivery affecting students' learning. *Journal of International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(2), 60–69.
- Not Vessel. (2016, July 8). Not vessels to be filled but fires to be kindled. *Kuensel*. Retrieved from <http://www.kuenselonline.com/not-vessels-to-be-filled-but-fires-to-be-kindled/>
- Pedey, K. (2008). Realizing the golden triangle: A preliminary study on teacher-parent bonding towards delivery of quality education. In T. Singh (Ed.), *Quality of Education in Bhutan: Research Papers* (pp. 77–94). Paro, Bhutan: Centre for Educational Research and Development.
- Rabgay, T. (2018). The effect of using cooperative learning method on tenth grade students' learning achievement and attitude towards Biology. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 265–280.
- Royal Education Council. (2016a). *Royal education council annual report 2016*. Paro, Bhutan: Royal Education Council.
- Royal Education Council. (2016b). *National school curriculum conference report*. Paro, Bhutan: Royal Education Council.
- Schelle, P. R. (2015). Transformative learning in higher education: Praxis in the field of leadership change. *Journal of Transformative Learning*, 3(1), 5–12.
- Schuelka, M. J. (2012). Inclusive education in Bhutan: A small state with alternative priorities. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 15(1), 145–156.
- Schuelka, M. J. (2013a). A faith in humanness: Disability, religion and development. *Disability & Society*, 28(4), 500–513.
- Schuelka, M. J. (2013b). Education for children with disabilities in Bhutan: Past, present, and future. *Bhutan Journal of Research & Development*, 2(1), 65–74.
- Schuelka, M. J. (2014). *Constructing disability in Bhutan: Schools, structures, policies, and global discourses* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/162690>
- Sherab, K., & Dorji, P. (2013). Bhutanese teachers' pedagogical orientation in the primary classes: A factor on quality education. *Journal of International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(1), 18–28.
- Sinchuri, K. B. (2013). Management of school resources. *Journal of International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(2), 49–59.
- Tamang, M. (2008). 360° teacher performance appraisal: An opportunity towards quality education. In T. Singh (Ed.), *Quality of Education in Bhutan: Research Papers* (pp. 115–139). Paro, Bhutan: Centre for Educational Research and Development.
- Taylor, E. W. (2008). Transformative learning theory. In S. B. Marriam (Ed.), *Third Update on Adult Learning Theory* (pp. 5–15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tennant, M. (2005). Transforming selves. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(2), 102–116.
- Thinley, P. (2013). How does teaching of process approach help students with their writing? *Journal of International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(2), 70–80.
- Thinley, P., & Maxwell, T. W. (2013). Pedagogies for stimulating students' responses to first language oral literature: An action research project in a secondary school in Bhutan. *Journal of International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(2), 39–48.
- Tshering, L. (2016, August 7). New pedagogy seeks to transform teaching-learning. *Bhutan Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.pressreader.com/bhutan/bhutan-times/20160807/281505045605896>
- Wangdi, T. (2016, July 5). Infusion of transformative pedagogy. *Kuensel*. Retrieved from <http://www.kuenselonline.com/teachers-introduced-to-Transformative-pedagogy/>
- Ukpokodu, O. N. (2009). Pedagogies that foster transformative learning in a multicultural education course: A reflection. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 4(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.9741/2161-2978.100>
- Vijayachandran, P. (2018, July 24). *Transformative pedagogy and learning*. Retrieved from <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/education/transformative-pedagogy-and-learning-education-essay.php>