The Process Writing Approach in Bhutan: 

A case of cross-national policy borrowing

Dechen Zangmo

Master in Education
The University of New England, 
Australia.

Bachelor of Education
Samtse College of Education
Royal University of Bhutan.

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Education and Arts at the University of Newcastle, Australia.

August, 2013
Declaration

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

Dechen Zangmo

(Signed): ............................................................... (Candidate)
Date: August 2013
Dedication

First of all I would like to dedicate this work to my late father, Sonam Wangchuk and mother, Pema Dechen who were both teachers. My father’s passion on using various modern methods to teach English in contrast to my mother’s keenness for rote learning of prayers in Dzongkha, their differences on the preference of methods inspired me to explore the current Bhutanese teachers view on “Process Writing Approach,” an approach from a different culture.

I would also like to dedicate this work to Werner Christen, my husband. His passion and interest in different cultures and his role more as a father to me with his special undying love and care inspired me to take up this project.

Next, I would like to dedicate this work to my one and only daughter, Sonam Peldon. Sonam’s extremely mature, sensible and hardworking character inspired me continuously. She was always there as a good role model for me.

Finally I dedicate this work to my country and government for making me who I am now.
Acknowledgements

“Thousands of candles can be lit from a single candle, and the life of the candle will not be shortened. Happiness never decreases by being shared”. (Gautama Buddha)

I have learned the above quote from no other people than my two supervisors during the endeavour of my PhD. I deeply feel indebted to my supervisors Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole and Dr. Rachel Burke.

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole with his stable positive outlook on life provided me with the perfect role model of an optimistic, understanding, diligent, compassionate, generous and efficient supervisor. His continuous assurance that “You will get there Dechen!” upheld me to pull through the hardest turmoil of my PhD even at times when my confidence level fell to zero.

Equally, Dr. Rachel Burke also has provided me with the perfect role model of a generous and friendly female academic. I owe my deepest gratitude to both of you, with your guidance, encouragement and support; it was possible for me to reach the destiny of my PhD journey.

A very big thank thank you Mr. Bill Buggie of University of New Brunswick, Canada who generously helped me by providing all the necessary information about the writing of the English curriculum.

Thanks to Dr. Tom Griffith and Dr. Zsuzsa Millei, Dr. Michael Arthur-Kelly for also giving their guidance and support. My gratitude goes to Professor Max Smith for providing me with all the needed motivation and resources and Dr. Heather Sharp for reading my thesis and giving constructive feedback.

Exceptional thanks to my family and friends: my brother in-law Jamba Tobden, without his matured guidance and encouragement; this project would not have been
completed. By the same token I would like to thank my sister, Pema Wangmo, who is also a Doctoral candidate at the University of Newcastle, and of course, to my sister Sonam Lhaden and nephew Tandin Phub.

Special thanks to my friend Selfy Manueke, for all your technical support and Deki Gyamtso for your moral support. Last but not the least my heartfelt thanks to a faraway friend for being always there to support me with a touch of a button on my mobile.
Table of Contents

Declaration.................................................................................................................. ii
Dedication ................................................................................................................... iii
Acknowledgements .................................................................................................... iv
Table of Contents ....................................................................................................... vi
List of Tables ................................................................................................................ x
List of Figures ................................................................................................................. x
List of Appendices ....................................................................................................... x
Definition of Key Terms ........................................................................................... xii
Abstract ....................................................................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER ONE - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH .................. 1

1.1. Introduction .......................................................................................................... 1
1.2. The Research Problem ....................................................................................... 3
1.3. Rationale and Purpose of the Study ................................................................... 5
1.4. Aims of the Study ............................................................................................... 6
1.5. The Research Questions .................................................................................... 7
1.6. Conceptual Framework ...................................................................................... 8
1.7. Significance of the Study ................................................................................... 9
1.8. Structure of the Thesis ....................................................................................... 11

CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW ........................................... 14

2.1. Introduction ......................................................................................................... 14
2.2. Approaches to Writing in English as Second Language (ESL) .................. 14
2.2.1. The Product approach. ................................................................................. 15
2.2.2. The Process Writing Approach (PWA). ...................................................... 17
2.2.3. Reduced Importance of PWA in Australia. ............................................. 18
2.2.4. PWA still on the go. ................................................................................... 19
2.2.4.1. PWA did not disappear. ....................................................................... 21
2.3. Definition of Curriculum .................................................................................. 24
2.3.1. The explicit curriculum. ............................................................................. 24
2.3.2. Curriculum defined as experience. ........................................................... 25
2.3.3. Curriculum defined as enactment or implementation ......................... 26
2.4. Approaches to curriculum in Bhutan ............................................................... 27
2.4.1. Who is Responsible? ............................................................................... 27
2.4.2. Introduction of PWA in English Curriculum .......................................... 28
2.4.2.1. Various groups of people involved. ..................................................... 28
2.4.2.2. Innovation and training. .................................................................... 30
2.4.3. Shaping the curriculum to fit the new context. ..................................... 33
2.4.4. Four stages of policy borrowing ............................................................... 33
2.4.4.1. Cross National Attraction: impulses and externalising potential ....... 34
2.4.4.2. Decision. ............................................................................................. 35
2.4.4.3. Implementation ................................................................................... 35
2.4.4.4. Internalization/indigenization .............................................................. 36
2.4.5. Cultural differences: Native English Speakers and Nonnative English Speakers. ......................................................... 38
2.4.6. Constructive alignment. ......................................................... 41
2.4.7. The curriculum documents. ......................................................... 43

CHAPTER THREE - BACKGROUND OF BHUTAN ........................................ 45
3.1. Introduction .................................................................................. 45
3.2. Brief background of Bhutan ......................................................... 45
3.3. Early literacy and its effect on Bhutanese lives ................................ 45
3.3.1. Bhutanese culture and traditions ............................................. 46
3.4. Secular form of education: Hindi and Choke .................................. 48
3.4.1. Modernisation and language switch: English and Choke .......... 50
3.4.2. Problems with borrowed practices ......................................... 51
3.4.3. Problems with locally initiated curriculum development .......... 53
3.5. Implications of local background for the present investigation .......... 54

CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY ....................................................... 55
4.1. Introduction .................................................................................. 55
4.2. Rationale for Qualitative Research Design .................................... 56
4.3. Research Questions and Data Collection methods .......................... 58
4.4. Curriculum Documentary Analysis (Phase 1) ................................. 58
4.4.1. Curriculum documents ............................................................ 58
4.5. The Initial semi-structured interview (Phase 2) ............................... 59
4.5.1. Research site and participants ............................................... 59
4.5.2. Data collection method .......................................................... 64
4.6. Video-recording Lessons (phase 3) ............................................... 65
4.6.1. Schools and teachers .............................................................. 65
4.6.2. Parents from diverse backgrounds ......................................... 68
4.6.3. Feeder schools and other schools ......................................... 69
4.6.4. Data collection: Method ......................................................... 69
4.6.4.1. Video-recording and editing ............................................. 70
4.6.4.2. Running commentary ........................................................ 70
4.7. The Issue of Typicality .................................................................. 71
4.7.1. School and cultural informants .............................................. 71
4.7.2. Comments on typicality .......................................................... 71
4.8. Research Procedure ...................................................................... 72
4.9. Data Analysis ............................................................................... 74
4.9.1. Curriculum documentary analysis ........................................ 74
4.9.2. Initial semi-structured interview analysis ................................. 76
4.9.3. Video-recording lessons analysis .......................................... 77
4.9.4. The typicality analysis ............................................................ 78
4.10. Conclusion ................................................................................... 78

CHAPTER FIVE - FINDINGS FROM THE DATA ANALYSIS ....................... 79
5.1. Introduction ................................................................................... 79
5.2. The Guide ..................................................................................... 79
5.3. The Key Principles of PWA .......................................................... 81
5.3.1. Recursive versus linear .......................................................... 82
5.3.2. Role of the teacher ................................................................. 83
5.3.3. Conferencing ........................................................................... 83
5.3.4. Writers’ Workshop ................................................................. 83
5.3.5. Use PWA for all genres ....................................................... 84
5.3.6. Evaluation .................................................................... 84
5.4. Alignment and Coverage of PWA ........................................ 84
5.4.1. Alignment of standards/objectives and the set activities .......... 84
5.4.2. PWA Alignment in the evaluation and assessment .................... 87
5.4.3. PWA in The Reading and Literature book and Reading and Literature section of The Guide .............................................. 88
5.5. Findings of the Initial Interview ............................................. 90
5.5.1. Principals’ reflection on the training ...................................... 91
5.5.2. Principals’ understanding of the concept .............................. 93
5.5.3. Summary of the principals’ reflection on training ...................... 93
5.5.4. Use of The Guide .............................................................. 94
5.5.5. Positive attitudes/initiatives ................................................ 95
  5.5.5.1. Positive attitudes .......................................................... 95
  5.5.5.2. Initiatives .................................................................. 97
5.6. Challenges with PWA ............................................................ 97
5.6.1. Challenges faced by the teachers in general ........................... 98
  5.6.1.1. Time issues/large class size ............................................ 98
  5.6.1.2. Vast syllabus ................................................................ 99
5.6.2. Challenges specific to location of schools ......................... 100
  5.6.2.1. School location & family background ............................. 100
  5.6.2.2. Peer conference issues: schools in the rural ...................... 101
5.7. Effective Aspects of PWA ...................................................... 103
5.7.1. Prewriting .......................................................... 103
5.8. Conclusion ........................................................................ 105

CHAPTER SIX - FINDINGS OF THE VIDEO-RECORDED LESSONS
AND THE INTERVIEWS ................................................................. 106

6.1. Introduction .......................................................... 106
6.2. Video-recording Observation .............................................. 106
  6.2.1. Location of the schools .................................................... 106
  6.2.2. Bhutanese classroom factors ............................................. 107
    6.2.2.1. Number of students and classroom setting .................. 107
      6.2.2.1.1. Video-recording 1 in school 1 (T 1) ......................... 107
      6.2.2.1.2. Video-recording 2 in school 2 (T 2) ......................... 108
      6.2.2.1.3. Video-recording 3 in school 3 (T 3) ......................... 108
  6.2.3. Culture related factors ............................................... 109
    6.2.3.1. Teacher-Student Relationship .................................. 109
    6.2.3.2. Introducing PWA (similarities) ................................... 110
  6.2.4. Teacher differences on teaching PWA ............................... 111
    6.2.4.1. T1 introduced PWA within 45 minutes ....................... 111
    6.2.4.2. T2 Focus on one aspect ............................................ 112
  6.2.5. Reasons for differences .............................................. 113
6.2.6. PWA applied in writing lesson.................................................................114
6.2.7. The parts of PWA adapted.....................................................................116
6.2.8. Teachers’ attitudes..................................................................................117
6.3. Typicality of observed practices.................................................................118
6.3.1. School location and family background.................................................118
6.3.2. Bhutanese classroom factors.................................................................119
6.3.2.1. Steps involved for introducing PWA......................................................119
6.3.2.2. The ineffective parts of PWA altered to adapt.....................................120
6.4. Cultural Difference....................................................................................120
6.4.1. Individualism-collectivism.......................................................................120
6.4.2. Power distance........................................................................................121
6.4.3. Uncertainty avoidance.............................................................................122
6.4.4. Masculinity and femininity......................................................................123
6.4.5. Long-term orientation versus short term orientation to time.................124
6.5. Conclusion..................................................................................................125

CHAPTER SEVEN - DISCUSSION ......................................................................126
7.1 Introduction..................................................................................................126
7.2. Misalignment of the core curriculum documents.......................................129
7.3. Issues with various forms of training.........................................................132
7.4. Educational/cultural tension between PWA and the Bhutanese context....132
7.4.1. Multiple drafting and cultural tensions....................................................133
7.4.2. Peer conferencing and cultural tension...................................................133
7.4.3. The local educational tension..................................................................133
7.4.4. Partial implementation of PWA..............................................................134
7.4.5. Adaptation...............................................................................................134
7.4.6. Positive attitudes.....................................................................................135
7.5. Summary of the combined findings..........................................................136

CHAPTER EIGHT – CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.................................138
8.1. Introduction..................................................................................................138
8.2. Research Context.......................................................................................138
8.3. Through the Lenses of the Three Frameworks...........................................139
8.3.1. The misalignment of curriculum documents.........................................139
8.3.2. Different approaches to inservice training..............................................140
8.3.3. Local educational and cultural context..................................................141
8.4. Implication of the Study............................................................................145
8.4.1. Implication for curriculum planners......................................................145
8.4.2. Implications for teacher trainers and curriculum writers......................146
8.4.3. Implications educational and cross cultural differences.......................146
8.4.4. Teachers’ compliance for future change...............................................147
8.5. Contribution of the Study to the Existing Knowledge...............................148
8.6. The Limitation of the Study.......................................................................149
8.7. Recommendations for future study..........................................................150
8.8. Conclusion..................................................................................................150

REFERENCES..................................................................................................152

APPENDICES ..................................................................................................165
List of Tables

Table 2.1. The key differences between Feminine and Masculine cultures .................................. 41
Table 4.1. Training/Experiences of Principals in the New Curriculum .................................... 63
Table 5.1. The Key principles: what they mean ............................................................................. 82
Table 5.2. Specification of the listed Learning objectives ............................................................ 85
Table 5.3. The objectives that were numbered wrongly ............................................................... 86
Table 5.4. The themes from the semi-structured interviews .......................................................... 98
Table 6.1. Views of collectivism versus individualism ................................................................. 120
Table 6.2. Low versus high power distance .................................................................................. 121
Table 6.3. Low versus high uncertainty avoidance ...................................................................... 123
Table 6.4. The masculinity versus femininity ................................................................................. 123
Table 6.5. Long-term versus short-term orientation ...................................................................... 124
Table 7.1. Key findings and the sources ......................................................................................... 128
Table 7.2. Resolutions of research questions ................................................................................. 137

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Structure of the Thesis .......................................................................................... 11
Figure 2.1. The four stages of policy borrowing in education .................................................. 34
Figure 4.1. The research questions and the process of data collection ....................................... 57
Figure 4.2. The spread of participants across the country ......................................................... 62
Figure 4.3. Research site for classroom observation ................................................................. 66
Figure 5.1. Organizational Chart for the Guide ........................................................................... 80
Figure 5.2. Factors affecting PWA in the rural schools ............................................................... 102

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Human Research Ethics Approval ........................................................................... 165
Appendix B. Information Statement to Workshop Coordinator .................................................. 169
Appendix C. Information Statements to the Participants at the Workshop ............................... 172
Appendix D. Consent Forms for the Workshop Coordinator ....................................................... 175
Appendix E. Consent Forms for the Participants at the Workshop ............................................. 176
Appendix F. Permission Letter to the Director ............................................................................. 177
Appendix G. Approval Letter ......................................................................................................... 180
Appendix H. Information Statement to the Principals in Schools ............................................ 181
Appendix I. Information Statement to the Teachers in the Schools ......................................... 185
Appendix J. Consent Form for Teachers ....................................................................................... 189
Appendix K. Information Statement to the Parents/Warden/Students ...................................... 190
Appendix L. Consent Form for Parents and Students ................................................................. 192
Appendix M. English Teachers Interview Protocol ....................................................................... 193
Appendix N. Record for conference T1 used.................................................................197
Appendix O. Letter from the Co-ordinator of the writing of the English curriculum ..198
Appendix P. Interview Coding..................................................................................200
Appendix Q. Educational Development ...................................................................202
Appendix R. The Four Harmonious Friends (thuenpa puenshi).................................203
Appendix S. The Twenty Districts.............................................................................204
Appendix T. The Twelve Recommendations by Ministry of Education for English
Curriculum Reform .................................................................................................205
Appendix U. The Eight Writing Standards in The Silken Knot .................................207
Appendix V. The Eight Standards and Elaborated Objectives (2006).......................208
Appendix W. The Eight Standards and Elaborated Objectives (Recent Edition) .......209
Appendix X. Working with Words (2006) ................................................................210
Appendix Y. Writing Memoir (Recent Edition) ..........................................................211
Appendix Z. Introducing Writers’ Workshop...............................................................212
Definition of Key Terms

The key terms related to this research have been explained within the context of the study as in the following:

**Borrowing:** Educational borrowing in this research context means transferring educational practices from elsewhere to improve education at home. This transfer of practices can be imposed by one nation on another, agreement between two nations or borrowing out of the borrowing country’s interest.

**Class and grades:** Class is a term used in Bhutan for students’ level in the school. In this study the term grades will be used for the different levels instead of class. And class will be used for a group of students during observation for example “grade seven class”. This means a group of level seven students.

**Grade four and grade seven:** Grade four is equivalent to year four in Australia (10 years old) and grade seven is equivalent to year seven (13 years old).

**Symbols used for reporting Interview with the principals**

- **P.** when reporting on the interview with the principals, upper case P is used with the participant’s number (e.g. “P 3”).
- **p.** The page number of the interview transcription is indicated with a lower case p. and the number (e.g. “p. 3”)

**Symbols used for teachers involved in classroom observation and interviews**

- **T.** when reporting on the teachers whose lessons are observed, upper case T. is used with the participant’s number (e.g. T 1)
- **TO.** The teachers who observed the video recorded lesson, upper case T and O is used with the participant’s number (e.g. TO 1).

**Acronyms**

- **PWA** Process Writing Approach
- **NES** Native English speaker/speaking
- **NNS** Non-native speaker/speaking
- **ELL** English language learner
- **ESL** English as a second language
Abstract

Borrowing policy from one national context to another by merely copying a practice has been described as largely superficial and unsuccessful. Evidence has shown that countries who carefully studied the appropriateness to and suitability of borrowed policy in the local context have been more successful in implementing it.

Bhutan uses writing in English for assessing students at the secondary level, notwithstanding the country’s strong commitment to maintaining its cultural integrity. Failure in examinations written in this foreign language will result in student retention at the same level or departure from school. Grade seven seems to have the highest rate of failures and school dropouts in Bhutan.

The Process Writing Approach (hereafter referred to as PWA) was proposed as a part of the Bhutanese revised English curriculum in 2006. It was originally developed for native speakers of English but was introduced in Bhutan to address internal dissatisfaction with student writing. PWA involves active participation of the students in writing multiple drafts in contrast to the old practice where students simply wrote answers to questions from textbooks or made notes from teacher presentations.

This sequential qualitative study examined the alignment between stated intentions, suggested activities and, assessment practices in the 2006 English curriculum documents for grade seven. The study involved interviews of school principals and video recording of classroom lessons, which subsequently provided stimulus for interviewing teachers regarding cultural influences on implementation of PWA. The field work took place six years after implementation of the borrowed policy.

The comparative documentary analysis revealed extreme misalignment within the different sections of the English Teachers’ Guide for grade seven and other supporting curriculum documents for teaching PWA. The interviews and observations exposed numerous challenges to implementation. These challenges mainly related to teachers’ training, their understanding of the new practice and Bhutanese cultural and contextual factors. However, the study also revealed positive teacher attitudes towards PWA and on-going commitment to implementation that led Bhutanese teachers to take a variety of initiatives.

The study suggests that curriculum planners should work towards the consistency of objectives, activities and assessment in curriculum development. Use of longer and more appropriate training during the process of curriculum development may anticipate cross cultural mismatches between foreign methodology and existing local context and help teachers to accommodate the cultural shifts involved in cross-national policy borrowing.

This research in Bhutan may benefit educators working in English as Second Language (ESL) cultural contexts similar to Bhutan. The main issues discovered in this particular study may also assist in developing curriculum in either small project or aid-based educational jurisdictions.
CHAPTER ONE - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.1. Introduction

Many contemporary scholars point out that educational practices cannot be directly copied from one nation and transplanted into another, thus, rigorous studies on education in other countries are still carried out to learn and improve language education policy development at home (Careless, 2003; Hu, 2002; Nguyen, Terlouw, & Albert, 2006; Sonaiya, 2002). Phillips & Ochs (2004) state that many significant scholars of the past such as Matthew Arnold, Mark Pattison, Michael Sadler from Britain and Henry Barnard in USA echoed similar thinking that educational practices from elsewhere cannot be directly replicated in another county. Past findings in the United Kingdom showed that there has been both successful and unsuccessful examples of replication of educational practices in different fields such as vocational education, the concept of magnet schools, the reading recovery scheme and various approaches to the teaching of mathematics (Phillips & Ochs, 2003). These findings reveal that borrowing educational practices is not simply a matter of identifying a practice that has been successful elsewhere, introducing it at home and then accommodating it to local practice. Borrowing educational practices seem to involve a series of stages starting from cross-national attraction, decision, implementation and internalization/indigenization (Phillips and Ochs 2003 - see Figure 2.1, section 2.4.4). The stages make a full circle by one stage linking to the next. Trouble with one stage may impact the next stage, “…evidence suggested that ongoing evaluation is critical to the entire process of educational borrowing” (Phillips & Ochs, 2004, p. 612).

Borrowing educational practices from Native English Speaker (NES) contexts to those characterised by Non-native English Speakers (NNES) is common in international English teaching. However, Non-native English speakers (NNES) face difficulties with borrowed teaching methodologies (Carney, 2008; Kirgoz, 2007). One difficulty stems
from inadequate support for teachers as they implement unfamiliar Western-derived classroom practices that require cultural and professional adjustments to the local context (Dushku, 1998; Wedell, 2003). Mal-adjustment, which is used throughout this thesis in its broadest sense, to local contexts can consequently result in a gap between what curriculum designers intend (the intended official curriculum) and what actually happens in classrooms (the enacted curriculum). The way that teachers enact an innovation will depend on how they react to new concepts, new approaches to presenting content and also to new ways of interacting with students (Vandenberghe, 2002). Understanding the culture and the local context are therefore becoming increasingly important in order to support teachers in implementing approaches that may be ‘borrowed’ at considerable cost to both supplier and recipient.

The degree to which the documents mandating the change are aligned also influences teachers’ reaction. Biggs (2003a) defines constructive alignment as keeping in line “what is intended to be taught, how it will be taught and assessed, the expertise of the teacher, the ‘climate’ or ethos of the classroom and of the institution itself” Biggs (p. 18). Earlier work suggests that such alignment can yield up to four times greater results in student achievement than less organised approaches (Cohen, 1987).

The introduction of the Process Writing Approach into the Bhutanese English curriculum does not seem to have been informed by either of the notions that borrowing educational practices is a complex matter; or that alignment can make or break an innovation, borrowed or not. The last two stages of Phillips and Ochs’ model (see section 2.4.4) are particularly concerned with “implementation”: how the borrowed innovation is being implemented in the context of the borrower country’s and “internalization”: the effect of the borrowed innovation on the existing system of the borrower country (Phillips & Ochs, 2004, p. 781). Application of this model may assist analysis of Bhutanese
borrowing of the Process Writing Approach and inform contemporary attempts to improve students’ writing in that context.

1.2. The Research Problem

Bhutan uses English as the medium of instruction in the general education system and writing in English is the main means of assessing students, particularly at the secondary level. If students do not learn to write well, they are at a great disadvantage. Their school grades are likely to suffer, especially in classes where written tests and reports are the primary means for assessing progress (Graham, 2006). Bhutanese students who do not succeed in such written tests either repeat or leave school prematurely.

In 2003, Bhutan was identified as having one of the highest proportions of secondary school dropouts and repeaters among South East Asian countries (Singh & Pessoa, 2003). Bhutan Annual Education Statistics (2009) reports the highest repetition rates in Bhutan are grades four and seven. “Grade VII [Seven] has, over the years, had one of the highest repetition and drop-out rates” (Bhutan Annual Education Statistics, 2009 p. 48). According to 2011 reports, grade seven produces the highest average proportion of premature school leavers in Bhutan (5.5%: Bhutan Annual Education Statistics, 2011). This level seems to be an area of concern and suitable as the focus for this study.

An earlier local study conducted in 2002 investigated the teaching of writing in Bhutanese classrooms. It revealed that secondary school teachers in Bhutanese English classes emphasised answering questions from texts that they had explained to their students. The students passively listened to the teachers and took down notes for answering the subsequent questions (Centre for Educational Research and Development, 2002). There appeared to be very little direct teaching of writing by the teachers and limited opportunity for the students to practise writing in English. A follow up study by Curriculum and Support Division (CAPSD) examined the standard of the students’
writing in English and confirmed that the standards of students’ writing in English fell far below official expectations (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a).

Consequently, the five-stage Process Writing Approach (hereafter referred to as ‘PWA’) was introduced as part of English curriculum revision (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a). This approach emphasises writing in English as a process of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing to discover what the writer wants to communicate. Students are expected to write many drafts before a final copy is produced. The PWA also encourages English teachers to act as facilitators and encourages students to choose what and how they write, to take ownership of their writing (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a). The impulses for including PWA into the Bhutanese curriculum seem to have come from “internal dissatisfaction” in what Phillips & Ochs refer to as the “early stages of policy borrowing process” (Phillips & Ochs, 2003, p. 451).

The PWA was developed to teach writing to NES therefore it assumes a set of cultural characteristics. Although English is the language of instruction in Bhutan, the PWA may remain foreign to teaching writing in Bhutan because of cultural and classroom factors. Observation of student writing portfolios by Buggie and co-workers (2009) revealed that students had written only a few drafts related to a single topic and then no further evidence of teaching of PWA-informed writing was found following its 2006 implementation. This suggests that teaching in line with PWA did occur after it was first introduced in the English curriculum but stopped after one attempt. This is possibly because PWA was originally developed to teach writing to NES (Dequi, 2005; Matsuda, 2003a) and it is significantly different from contemporary approaches to teaching writing in Bhutan. It could be due to lack of constructive alignment between the planned curriculum and the local context.
What has affected the implementation of PWA in Bhutan? What are the potential problems and factors that would have influenced how teachers in Bhutan experienced the proposed change? Investigating factors affecting curriculum implementation at the classroom level may help to close gaps between intended and implemented curriculum by formulating strategies to tackle the problems appropriately. No such study on the PWA in Bhutan existed and this provided the space for the present investigation.

1.3. Rationale and Purpose of the Study

Developing a shared discourse among decision makers and different stakeholders is important for a coherent curriculum (Graves, 2008). Therefore, to connect the different domains of the curriculum writing and implementation process, communication among decision makers and different stakeholders in each successive stage is central. This means understanding the development of educational policy as a process, examining the degree to what contextual factors influence its transfer is vital (Phillips & Ochs, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006).

Teachers play the key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997) and so their voices need to be heard particularly in centrally driven curriculum (Canh & Barnard, 2009). Thus, this study focusses on the perceptions and experiences of the implementation of the PWA of grade seven and grade eight English teachers and principals in Bhutanese secondary schools drawn from a number of districts across the Kingdom. The investigation involved successive cycles of interview and classroom observations.

Principals were interviewed to ascertain their reflections on the implementation of PWA. These interviews suggested refinements of the intentions formed by previous literature and document review. These refinements were implemented in observations and recordings of grade seven English classrooms and interviews with their teachers. The
principals had actively participated in PWA implementation, five years before, and the English classes observed were in rural areas of Bhutan.

The rationale for choosing principals and teachers who taught grades seven and eight as participants for the study was that grade seven has the rate of highest school dropouts (Bhutan Annual Education Statistics, 2011). The rationale for selecting schools which are located in the rural areas is that the findings from the first interviews indicated these areas as problematic in regard to low level of student English and widespread illiteracy in their family backgrounds (see section 4.6.1.). Observation and subsequent interview were used to unpack the cultural components of this case of curriculum borrowing.

The researcher’s inside knowledge of the culture provides a deeper understanding of what Hall (1959) calls the hidden part of the culture: beliefs, values and social norms. However, my background knowledge of the context may be biased and interfere with validly interpreting the findings. Therefore, three additional teachers from the regions providing the observed English classes were recruited to share their perspective on the same cultural events.

Thus, this investigation of one instance of cross national/cultural development of educational policy may help identify strengths and weaknesses in the process in general. It is hoped that the five year time lag between implementation and study has allowed the curriculum to settle, so that the participating teachers have become familiar with the PWA documents, experienced how the change has shaped their classroom practices and formed their opinions beyond the impact of mere novelty.

1.4. Aims of the Study

This study intends to identify factors affecting the implementation of PWA as teachers experienced it and explore how contextual factors influenced their experience. The study also attempts to suggest ways to close gaps between the intended and the implemented
curriculum by formulating strategies to tackle the problems appropriately both during curriculum development and in providing training to the teachers.

The study began by exploring the alignment and misalignment of the intentions of teaching PWA to the stated activities, assessment and other sections of the *English Curriculum Guide for Teachers: Grade seven* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a: hereafter referred to as “the Guide”) and two other supporting curriculum documents, *Reading & Literature: Grade seven* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006b: hereafter referred to as “the Reading and Literature book”) and *The Silken Knot: Standards for English for Schools in Bhutan* (Centre for Educational Research and Development, 2002: hereafter referred to as “The Silken Knot”).

This was followed by a subsequent set of face to face semi-structured interviews with a group of Bhutanese secondary school principals to uncover salient PWA implementation issues. Subsequently, the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular how its foreign nature plays out in classrooms; was explored by videotaping three single teachers’ lessons. Interviews with the observed teachers and three other teacher informants explored teachers’ reasons for the way that they are implementing PWA and the matches and mismatches between PWA and the Bhutanese classroom culture. Such intentions led to the following research questions.

1.5. The Research Questions

The main research question of this study is how consideration of the implementation of the Process Writing Approach in Bhutan might inform understanding of cross-national borrowing in small jurisdictions whose educational developments are often driven by externally funded projects. The specific research questions are:
1. *To what extent do the objectives stated in the English Teachers’ Guide for grade seven (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a), other curriculum documents and the designed activities for teachers and students for teaching writing using Process Writing Approach in Bhutan indicate constructive alignment?*

2. *How has a group of Bhutanese principals experienced: the proposed change, the support and training, and other factors that influenced the implementation of PWA, and how have they responded and reacted to the experience?*

3. *How has one group of Bhutanese teachers understood and enacted the mandated Process Writing Approach in their classrooms? How have the cultural and educational differences between Bhutan and PWA influenced its implementation?*

**1.6. Conceptual Framework**

This study applies three conceptual frameworks. The first conceptual framework is provided by the four stage model of policy borrowing (attraction, decision, implementation, internalisation) proposed by Phillips and Ochs (2003). The second is provided by Biggs’ work on curriculum alignment (Biggs 2003a). The third is provided by Hofstede’s (2001) five cultural value dimensions of individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity-femininity and long term versus short-term orientation.

Consequently, the study looks at the borrowing of Process Writing Approach by Bhutan through the lens of the Phillips and Ochs (2003) model, analyses the documents produced by that borrowing in terms of the Biggs (2003a) notion of constructive alignment and uses the Hofstede’s (2001) model of cultural difference to illuminate aspects of the implementation of the western, NES-derived approach to the Himalayan, English-medium schools in the Dzongkha-speaking Buddhist context of Bhutan. Such
theoretical triangulation may suggest useful insights for other curriculum development situations.

1.7. Significance of the Study

The findings from this study have the potential to significantly impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. This may help in providing appropriate intervention by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. As a result, it is hoped that students in Bhutan will improve their writing standard in English and the number of children leaving school prematurely will decrease thereby increasing the high school completion rate in accordance to the educational goals stated in the National Educational Framework (2009). This may subsequently contribute to the Gross National Happiness philosophy of the country that stresses national happiness as being more important than the national product (The Centre for Bhutan Studies, 2004).

Bhutan will also serve as an example of problems inherent in the direct import of educational pedagogy across culture particularly from the NES to NNES contexts. Many researchers have reported on the challenge faced when importing foreign methodology into contexts such as China (Hu, 2002); including Hong Kong (Careless, 2003) and Tibet (Carney, 2008); Turkey (Kirgoz, 2007), the Asia-Pacific region (Nunan, 2003) and Nigeria (Sonaiya, 2002).

However, most of these earlier studies were related to the Communicative approach to teaching language. Pennington & Cheung (1995) did look at possible factors that might shape the introduction of PWA in Hong Kong, prior to implementation, but few studies appear to have investigated how the cultural dimension of PWA impacts on local classroom practice after five years’ supposed implementation of the innovation. The
findings from this study will add new dimensions to understanding how borrowed pedagogy across cultures is implemented in different educational contexts.

The findings are also of significance to educators who are considering teaching in an English as second language (ESL) context with a similar culture and context to Bhutan. The study may be of interest to people who are developing curriculum in either small project or aid-based educational jurisdictions.
1.8. Structure of the Thesis
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Figure 1.1 Structure of the Thesis
Chapter 1 introduces the research, identifying the research problem of borrowing a cross-cultural educational approach in the Bhutanese English curriculum for teaching writing. The chapter presents the purpose and aims of the research defined by the research questions, with the potential significance of the study and a brief description of the conceptual frameworks the study will employ.

Chapter 2 presents a critical literature review. It begins with the status of writing in ESL in the past and now. The three dominant approaches of writing and their strengths and weakness are discussed. The chapter also discusses curriculum defined from three main perspectives and approaches to curriculum in Bhutan. The chapter concludes by describing the three conceptual frameworks the study will employ.

Chapter 3 presents a brief background of Bhutan of its size, literacy in the past and now, the Bhutanese cultural aspects, challenges with curriculum developments.

Chapter 4 describes the research design and the process of obtaining the data required to answer the research questions, beginning with an explanation of the rationale for undertaking a qualitative design. It also outlines the details of the sampling and research sites, the ethics clearance and validation processes, and concludes with an overview of the plan for the data analysis. Chapter 5 and chapter 6 report the field work. Chapter 5 focuses on alignment and misalignment of the curriculum documents and the findings from the initial interview with the group of principals who had the first experience of implementing the proposed approach. Chapter 6 concentrates on the findings from classroom video recording observation and the interviews with the participating teachers. Chapter 7 provides a discussion of the research findings reported in the chapters 6 and 7. The discussion of the findings structured around the links across the findings from the different phases of the data collection and ends with the resolution of the research questions. Chapter 8 briefly reiterates the research context, the methods
used and summarise the overall findings, the contribution of the study and its limitations, the implications of the study and offers some recommendations and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This section begins with a brief discussion on the status of English as Second Language ESL writing in the past and now. It also offers some description and discussion on the three most dominated approaches of ESL writing: the Product approach, Process writing, and the Genre approach as outlined and compared by Badger & White (2000), both the linguistic factors (how the approaches conceptualize writing) and educational factors (how the approaches conceptualize learning to write). Some strengths and weakness of the approaches are also presented to show some insights of the different approaches, their theories, and practicality in the ESL classroom. Views on how the three approaches can complement each other in the real classroom situation are also presented. This will be followed by a discussion of curriculum, viewed from three main perspectives: curriculum defined as plan or intentions, curriculum defined as experience, curriculum defined as enactment or implementation.

The details of the three models providing the conceptual framework for this study will be presented: Phillips and Ochs’ four staged model (Ochs & Phillips, 2003), Biggs’s constructive alignment (Biggs, 2003) and Hostede’s five dimensions of culture (Hofstede, 2001).

The chapter concludes by describing the approaches to curriculum in Bhutan and discusses the locus of responsibility for the introduction of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) as a curriculum innovation.

2.2. Approaches to Writing in English as Second Language (ESL)

The importance attached to spoken language and other language skills in the realm of teaching ESL seemed to have neglected writing in the past (Dequi, 2005; Matsuda, 2003c). Matsuda (2001) argues that this could possibly be due to the dominance of
Audio-lingual approach in the mid twentieth Century; Matsuda also argues that the negligence of writing went back to the late nineteenth Century when teaching the language was immensely influenced by the early phoneticians of applied linguistics. Henry Sweet (1899/1964) and Paul Passy (1929), in particular, emphasised spoken forms of language over writing (Matsuda, 2003b). So writing came to be seen as “the handmaid of the other skills” (Rivers, 1968, p. 241) and was taught after students had some control over listening, speaking and reading.

However, by the second part of the twentieth century more ESL students were attempting higher education in English medium institutions. This increased the need for writing for academic and international purposes, which in turn prompted many teachers and researchers to search for effective ways to teach ESL writing. Because of the urgency of this task “some ESL specialists attempted to extend the application of existing principles of second language pedagogy (i.e., the oral approach and the Audio-lingual approach) to the teaching of second language writing” (Matsuda, 2003b, p. 20). However, others dismissed the notion of applying oral approaches to teaching writing as being not applicable to teaching ESL writing, preferring to rely on existing studies of writing with Native English speakers (NES) (Kroll, 1990; Myles, 2002; Silva, 2001). This latter tendency contributed greatly to developments in ESL writing instruction. Among these applications of writing instruction from the NES to the ESL context is the Product approach.

### 2.2.1. The Product approach.

This approach views writing as related to linguistic knowledge, focusing extensively on vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices (Pincas, 1982). The main focus of writing is students’ mastery of elements of the language mentioned above through four stages:
familiarization; controlled writing; guided writing; and free writing. The Product approach rests on a structuralist view of language and a behaviourist view of learning.

During the familiarization stage teachers create learner awareness of some specific features of a particular text, and then the learners practise these skills of writing in the controlled and guided writing stage. They practise the skills till they “use the writing skill as a part of a genuine activity such as a letter, story or essay” (Pincas, 1982, p. 22). A typical product class:

…involve[s] the learners familiarizing themselves with a set of descriptions of houses, possibly written especially for teaching purposes, by identifying, say, the prepositions and the names of rooms used in a description of a house. At the controlled stage, they might produce some simple sentences about houses from a substitution table. The learners might then produce a piece of guided writing based on a picture of a house and, finally, at the stage of free writing, a description of their own home (Badger & White, 2000, p. 153).

Since accuracy and knowledge about the structure of the language are the main focus, teachers aim to help student avoid making mistakes by setting exercises, presenting them to the students and then getting students to practise and then produce similar writing. In other words, the teachers’ role is to transmit knowledge and students’ role is to imitate (Badger & White, 2000). Therefore, students write accurate sentences, but without making context related meaning and without creativity. The Product approach did not escape criticism. Over-emphasis on accuracy was blamed for limiting students’ creativity, imagination, and fluency in writing (Leki, 1992; Mahon & Yau, 1992). Such criticism coincided with weakening support for both the structuralist view of language and for the behaviourist theory of learning. Increasing acceptance of constructivist views of learning and acquisition views of language co-incided with the rise of the Process Writing Approach.
2.2.2. The Process Writing Approach (PWA).

As an answer to problems identified in relation to the Product approach, teaching of writing shifted from Product approach to Process Writing Approach in English writing (PWA) for NES in the USA during the late 1960s and the early 1970s (Dequi, 2005; Matsuda, 2003a). In this approach, novice writers are encouraged to follow the pattern of professional writing, which is recognised to be a process consisting of different stages: prewriting, writing, drafting, editing and finally publishing (Leki, 1992). Therefore, students are expected to write multiple drafts before writing the final copy. The teachers are to set enough time for students’ writing. The different stages are thought not to be linear but rather recursive. Consequently, although the process of writing is thought to be same for all, all students may not follow the stages in the same manner (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Hillocks, 1987). Some might go back and forth through the stages while some might move ahead without returning. In contrast to the Product approach, the Process Writing teacher plays the role of a facilitator, guiding the students through these different stages. Correcting the language for errors takes place during the editing stage (Ballator, Farnum, & Kaplan, 1999).

According to Matsuda (2003b) the advocates of PWA emphasise that teaching writing is a process for helping students express their ideas in their own voice, “to choose their own topic; of providing teacher and peer feedback; of encouraging revision; and of using student writing as the primary text of the course” (Matsuda, 2003a, p. 67). This approach seemed to have gained increasing acceptance, with a number of scholars claiming that it as an effective way to teach students to be good writers (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Advocates of the PWA argue that the approach does not only enable the communication of written messages but it also develops other literacy skills in speaking and reading (Heald-Taylor, 1994). Reviewing and revising successive drafts, enable and
encourage the creation of new ideas. This approach was in full bloom in Australian classrooms from the late 1970s.

As recently as 2004 and 2006 advocates of PWA claim that this ‘learner-centred’ approach helps learners to develop efficient ways of conveying meaning, and to discover what they want to say and write successfully (Ho, 2006; Unger & Fleischman, 2004). Earlier researchers, such as Zamel (1982), asserted this approach as also suitable for teaching ESL writers and, according to Reid (1993), by the mid-1980s many ESL teachers were implementing Process Writing Approach in their classrooms.

Some ESL scholars who investigated second language writing using the Process Writing Approach reported that the needs of ESL students, which differed from those of first language writers, challenge teachers attempting to implement the approach. Myers (1997) reported that ESL University students had a greater need for knowledge of “English vocabulary or syntax to write fluidly” (p. 2) than they did for skills and techniques to generate ideas. The students already had the ideas, or their purpose in writing was to provide evidence of conceptual acquisition, rather than communication of individual creativity. Several other studies of ESL writers during that decade exposed similar needs (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki & Carson, 1994). These studies suggest the need to directly teach ESL writers the language skills that NES’s naturally acquire. A need to develop a Process Writing Approach tailored to the second language writer seems evident, “relatively little seems to have been done to develop a process approach which is specifically oriented towards L2 writing” (Caudery, 1995, p. 15).

2.2.3. Reduced Importance of PWA in Australia.

During the 1980s, PWA was criticised by a group of genre-theorists, particularly in Australia, on basis of various perceived shortcomings. Studies conducted by Martin & Rothery (1993) on the writing of Australian primary students with different backgrounds
indicated that children were missing out on important aspects of their writing development which were not emphasised in the process approach (Wyatt-Smith, 1997). The student’s knowledge of writing was limited to a few texts; with continued repetition of both texts and topics and writing was not suitable for secondary, let alone higher education. Teachers’ indirect guidance was criticised for not providing enough correction. More recent critiques, such as of Badger & White (2000), also criticised process writing for paying less attention to linguistic knowledge required for grammar and organisation of written text. The final stage of the PWA, which is to deal with the grammar and conventions of writing, is criticised for dealing only with mechanical features of the language with the main focus only on the skill of processing ideas.

The shifting of the views on teaching writing from “self-expression towards greater emphasis on skills and direct instruction” (Wyse & Jones, 2008, p. 1210) led to the rise of Genre approach during the 1990s. This approach emphasises the teaching of particular genres that students are presumed to need for later social communicative success. The main focus of a genre writing class is on the teaching of language and discourse features of particular texts for particular contexts (Paltridge, 2004). The contextualised and social function of language distinguishes Genre from the earlier Product approach. The Genre approach replaced PWA in Australian school curricula in the 1990s (Cope & Kalantzis, 1993).

2.2.4. PWA still on the go.

Although Process Writing Approach went from dominance to official neglect in Australia, it remains influential in Canada and United States (Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, 2010), and its implementation in teaching writing in the schools in different parts of the world continues to show positive results.
In the USA, Goldstein & Carr (1996) examined the 1992 NAEP results for writing, administered to a representative national sample of approximately 7,000 fourth-grade students, 11,000 eighth-grade students, and 11,500 twelfth-grade students from about 1,500 public and private schools. The results showed that the highest average student proficiency scores were associated with classes using the Process Writing Approach. The 1998 nationwide NAEP study surveyed approximately 160,000 students. It also showed evidence that those students who used PWA techniques attained higher writing scores.

Investigation on how middle secondary students in United States responded to the type of feedback that they get from the teachers revealed that students who received content related feedback from the teachers at the early drafts of writing responded with well-developed content in their final copy. When they were asked to standardise their work related to grammar, punctuation, spelling and or format, the students responded accordingly (Patthey-Chavez, Matsumura, & Valdes, 2004).

Studies in Hong Kong revealed that PWA has positive results in improving students’ writing ability and their attitudes towards writing (Cheung, 1999; Ho, 2006; Mahon & Yau, 1992). Ho (2006) also discovered that the approach not only improved student writing abilities, it also developed their confidence in writing, particularly those with higher English proficiency and at the upper level.

Investigation in one district of Kentucky, where writing instructions are focussed on PWA, indicated that teachers spent twice as much time teaching writing and students engaged in writing 2-3 times more than other elementary students. These students’ writing showed higher levels of thinking, compared to a study conducted in 1982 (Bridge, Compton-Hall, & Cantrell, 1997).

Although all the above studies indicated effective results for PWA, another study by Stahl, Pagnucco, & Suttles (1996) found no difference in students’ ability of writing in
Process versus traditional teaching methods. Thus, the effectiveness of PWA to writing is still open to question.

2.2.4.1. PWA did not disappear.

Although criticism of PWA had been most vehement in Australia, it did not completely disappear, even there. Turner (1991) discusses how PWA evolved into a whole language approach that influenced Melbourne Primary schools and training institutes after genre-theorists rejected it. By using samples collected over two years’ of writing of an ESL learner from her class, Turner shows the development of the learner as a writer in English in the context of a whole language approach that drew practices from both genre and process approaches. She pointed out that both genre and whole language approaches have evolved from PWA and suggests using good practices from both the approaches rather than rejecting one over another.

Elliott (1991) points out that both the PWA and genre approaches are influenced by different disciplines. PWA is formed by “a psychology theory about language learning [and] the genre movement is informed by linguistic theories about the nature of language and socio linguistic context” (Elliott 1991, p. 5). Since each theory can contribute in understanding about language learning from different disciplines, they can complement each other rather than competing in classrooms.

Silva (1990) explains that studies on ESL writing instruction from 1945-1990 show that particular approaches gain dominance and then fade away but in reality they rarely vanish completely from the classroom. PWA has evolved in response to new research and new theories of teaching. Earlier non-directional models of instruction involved teacher roles with very little place for intervention. However, a more contemporary approach to the writing process “…now demands careful scaffolding of the entire process” (Pritchard & Honeycutt, 2005, p. 276). The emergence of a new approach (such as genre) may be an
extension of the existing approach (such as PWA) rather than a rejection of it. For instance, the Genre approach is regarded by some as an extension of PWA which brought increased attention to providing systematic planned experiences to students (Dequi, 2005) and as an extension of Product approach, because both give focus to the linguistic knowledge of the language (Badger & White, 2000).

Based on the benefits and drawbacks of Product, Process, and Genre approaches to writing, many teachers and researchers argue that the three approaches are complementary, and suggest using an eclectic approach (Badger & White, 2000; Mountford, 1996). Badger & White (2000) point out how deficiencies in one approach can be complemented by the other approaches. Similarly, other scholars, for example Mountford (1996), suggest that teachers use the best elements from each approach for planning or reflecting on interactions of students about choices they make to write. By using an eclectic approach it is hoped to address the major problems of college English writing which over emphasised linguistic accuracy and overlooked the development of students’ writing ability.

From these discussions, the different approaches seem to have integrated with each other and most classroom practise an integrated model of teaching writing. Thus although theorists argue about popularity of one approach over another, in practice no particular approach seems to replace or reject another approach but work by complementing each other.

Most of the studies on PWA took place in Native English Speaking contexts. Studies of teaching PWA in the English as a Second Language context mostly concentrated on testing the effectiveness of some outlined programme. These studies only lasted for two or three months, with thoroughly trained teachers (Cheung, 1999; Ho, 2006). There is no longitudinal data or study available, or research that assesses what happens when largely
untrained teachers attempt to enact a new curriculum based on such ideas. There are also fewer studies of implementation of PWA in secondary schools, the only studies available being undertaken to check the feasibility and effectiveness of the approach in terms of students’ writing proficiency and learning attitudes (Pennington & Cheung, 1995).

Caudery (1995) investigated whether ESL teachers have similar concepts of the PWA to writing conducted through a network, or whether the concept has now evolved in different ways in different places. The findings from his study revealed that there were different emphases and contradictory ideas of PWA among the small group of 19 teachers who responded to his survey. Ruth (2006) investigated links between teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and teaching practices with respect to PWA, but this study focused on teachers’ pedagogical beliefs in regard to students with learning difficulties. Patthey–Chavez, Matsumura & Valdes (2004) had a wider study that investigated the implementation of PWA to writing in middle school classrooms. However, particular focus was given only to one element of the writing process – teachers’ written feedback on the early drafts of students writing and how the feedback on the draft influence the quality of the final draft. Pennington and co-workers (1997) carried out a comparative study on the implementation of PWA by native and non-native teachers of English as a Second Language in Australia, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand, and Singapore. The study revealed that there was a gap between non-native English teachers’ ideal and actual practice in regard to teaching writing using PWA due to lack of training. Many teachers took a middle-of-the-road approach combining product and process teaching philosophies, with a somewhat more traditional approach taken by non-native speakers of English and those teaching in Asian countries. The study did not investigate how cultural factors affected the implementation of the approach in the non-native speakers’ context.
2.3. Definition of Curriculum

The Latin root word of curriculum is derived from the word “*currus*” which literally means “a chariot” (Niculescu, 2010, p. 23) or a “running track” (Lovat & Smith, 2003, p. 7). This suggests curriculum to be a kind of a race or a course to be run, in which education played a central role (Niculescu, 2010). Therefore, according to Niculescu “life [was] seen as a project with a known outlined final [point]..” (p. 19) or as a course of study to be completed in an educational institute (McKernan, 2007). However, the meaning of the word has evolved over the years and today curriculum can be defined in multiple ways such as the explicit, the implicit, and even the null curriculum: the things that are not done (Eisner, 1979). Subsequently, recent theorists define curriculum as experience shared by the teachers and learners in a particular context which emerges from implementation of the curriculum influenced by various context related factors. Thus, it is difficult to come to a specific definition of what the word curriculum means and it is best understood according to the context in which it is being used (Lovat & Smith, 2003). In the literature reviewed, the researcher has noted how theorists define curriculum from three main perspectives.

2.3.1. The explicit curriculum.

Curriculum can be viewed as all plans or intentions (Lovat & Smith, 2003; McKernan, 2007), in the form of written documents (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Niculescu, 2010; Sakui, 2004). This vision of curriculum is also known also as the explicit curriculum with the objectives/goals and contents of the subjects are publically presented in the “curriculum guides or course planning material” (Eisner, 1979, pp. 74-75). These written intentions and plans consist of selected knowledge, skills and values (Marsh & Wills, 1999) usually of those with power in controlling over educational contents by centralising and approving the contents (Niculescu, 2010). Celce-Murcia and Olshtain,
(2000) define it as “A document of an official nature, published by a leading or central educational authority in order to serve as a framework or a set of guidelines for the teaching of a subject area …in a broad and varied context” (p. 185).

It is also seen as “an educational policy proposal composed of intentionally planned knowledge, values and skills” (McKernan, 2008, p. 4). These intentions are mostly developed by those people involved in developing the curriculum, rather than those who implement it (Lovat & Smith, 2003). When curriculum developers assume that there are no differences between the intended curriculum and the classroom reality, or fail to consider how the intended curriculum is being implemented, the actual experiences that the learners and teachers encounter in the classroom get overlooked (Lovat & Smith, 2003). All too often a particular enacted curriculum and its desired outcomes and the learning experiences designed by the teacher in the classrooms do not complement each other (Adamson & Morris, 2007; Apple, 2009). State choice of an efficient way of teaching “does not guarantee that this will be acted upon by the teachers … once the doors to their rooms are closed” (Apple, 2009, p. 203). Many theorists point out that curriculum does not remain linked with official documents; that there is the other realised version, the actual implementation in actual classrooms, “in socially and culturally-situated contexts rather than in abstract, idealised and de-contextualised learning environments” (Sakui, 2004, p. 155). Therefore, at the classroom level the curriculum document becomes the experience of teachers and learners or, more often, what happens differs from what was intended by those who framed it.

2.3.2. Curriculum defined as experience.

Curriculum is viewed as all the learning events which are experienced by students (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 1994; Rodgers, 1994). Thus curriculum includes not only what is intended but the entire range of experience, both
directed and undirected (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattey, & Taubman, 1995). These learning experiences also involve the less formal experiences a learner goes through, such as field trips or experiments or role plays. It also includes the student’s experience of interaction with the materials and people in the classroom in the process of learning. Therefore, the curriculum includes social and cultural elements as well. This definition of curriculum presents a very broad view of the experiences of the learner, not restricted to the learning experiences that are explicitly written and designed by the teacher to be enacted in the classroom. It contains everything that is intended and unintended. As Eisner has stated, the contextual particularities schools offer, such as the social expectations that the schools implicitly set for the students to meet are “...profoundly more powerful and longer-lasting than that what is intentionally taught or what the explicit curriculum of the school publicly provides” (Eisner, 1979, p. 79).

Although such a definition includes everything that is experienced by the students in the school as ‘curriculum’, this study intends to explore only the explicitly written curriculum delivered to the teachers and how the curriculum intentions are understood and implemented in the classroom by the teachers. The major ocus of this investigation is the enacted curriculum and its cultural specifics.

2.3.3. Curriculum defined as enactment or implementation.

It has been argued that “...without enactment, there is no curriculum” (Graves, 2008, p. 153). In other words, a mandated document has no meaning if it is not implemented at the classroom level, at the level of the teachers and learners for “curriculum is not only intentional but also actual” (Lovat & Smith, 2003, p. 18). In this sense, the curriculum is what actually happens in the classrooms, the “ongoing social process comprised of the interactions of students, teachers, knowledge …significantly shaped by the context” (Cornbelth, 1990, p. 5). Marsh and Wills (2003) suggest that the relationship between the
planned curriculum and the enacted curriculum is similar to the text of a play and an actual production of that play on the stage by living actors. As the text of a play is interpreted by the director and then further by the actors, there cannot be a single authentic play without interpretations. Similarly, during the implementation of the curriculum different teachers can interpret the written text differently. The beliefs and perception of the teachers also influence and determine teacher’s choice of techniques.

Therefore, teachers make decisions based on their perception of teaching and learning of the learner and of themselves (Borg, 2006; Heald-Taylor, 1994). Moreover, the realisation of the intended curriculum which emerges from the curriculum implementation in the actual context needs to be examined as many factors affect its implementation (Sakui, 2004). One such important factor that needs to be considered is the context in which the curriculum is situated for “Ignoring contextual considerations is like planting seeds in dry clay - or bringing in rich soil but no water” (Cornbleth, 2000, p. 11).

2.4. Approaches to curriculum in Bhutan

2.4.1. Who is Responsible?

Education is the full responsibility of the Ministry of Education in Bhutan. Curriculum planning, developing materials, monitoring teaching and learning activities and evaluating are functions of the central government (Gyamtsho & Dukpa, 1998; Policy and Planning Division, 2004, 2010). The content of the subject with national goals and general learning objectives is decided centrally by the Policy and Planning Division (Policy and Planning Division, 2004). The Curriculum and Professional Support Division develops the school curriculum, which consists of the Curriculum Framework, The Guide and textbooks for students. These curriculum products are handed over to the schools; the
teachers then interpret and implement the government policy in their classrooms (Gyamtsho & Dukpa, 1998).

This kind of approach to curriculum can lead to lack of alignment between the intentions of the curriculum and classroom reality (Goff, 1998; Markee, 1997). Firstly involving different groups of people for different curriculum writing functions, each group utilizing different discourses, results in the development of different curricular products and when those products are passed on, they get interpreted in different ways (Graves, 2008). This results in mismatches between different domains and contributes to a lack of coherence in the curriculum. Secondly, the curriculum intention gets further separated from implementation when classrooms are placed at the end of the curriculum development process, positioning teachers and students as recipients and implementers rather than decision makers (Graves, 2008).

2.4.2. Introduction of PWA in English Curriculum.

2.4.2.1. Various groups of people involved.

In 2002-2007, the Ministry of Education in Bhutan planned “the revision of English curriculum for classes Pre-Primary to XII [twelve]” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a). The Minister for Education, in the foreword to the 2006 Guide, states that the main motive for the revision of the curriculum was as a response to a general feeling that the standard of English has deteriorated over the years. These findings were:

As reported in The Silken Knot, and later confirmed by a study commissioned by CAPSD in 2003, observers of classes, especially in classes VII –XII, found English teachers talking and explaining texts while students sat passively or made notes on what the teachers were saying, directly into their textbooks. As a result, they were not able to practice Speaking and Writing, nor were they being taught how to read at higher levels required of an adult reader (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xv).
Therefore, the revision of the curriculum calls for “a shift in teaching and learning practices to student-centred learning” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xiii). Thus, at the “early stages of policy borrowing process” the desires for revising the Bhutanese curriculum seem to have originated as a result of “internal dissatisfaction” (Phillips & Ochs, 2003, p. 451).

The revision of the curriculum was undertaken with the financial and professional assistance from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the consultants from University of New Brunswick (UNB) Canada and the Royal Government of Bhutan (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2005). Various groups of people were involved in developing The Guide:

… a committee of primary and secondary school teachers, educators from Curriculum and Professional Support Division (CAPSD) Centre for Education Research and Development(CERD), Bhutan Board of Examinations Divisions (BBED), Education Monitoring and Support Service Division(EMSSD), the National Institute of Education Paro and the National Institute of Education, Samtse, Sherubtse College and the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB, Canada (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xvi).

The revised curriculum introduced the PWA to the Bhutanese education system (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xiii). The new curriculum guidelines make it clear that teachers should promote student-centred learning, encouraging Bhutanese teachers to develop learners’ writing skills in English. Students should take an active part in the writing process by choosing their own topic and writing multiple drafts before producing the final copy. The role of the teacher is specified as that of a guider or facilitator of the writing process, rather than a transmitter of knowledge.

According to the coordinator of the writing of the English curriculum for Bhutan from a personal communication (see Appendix O), the actual writing of the English curriculum took place in stages, starting with grades eleven and twelve curriculums in 2003, nine and ten in 2004, followed by grades five to eight followed by grades pre-
primary (PP) to four. In the same way the training for the teachers also took place in different phases. For instance, teachers of grades eleven and twelve were trained in 2004 and teachers of grades nine and ten in 2005. The main writers of the curriculum were involved in training teachers for teaching the new curriculum. There appears to have been no pilot program.

However, the training for the teachers of grades five to eight and continuing to grades pre-primary to grade four seem to have changed as the number of teachers increased. Training the trainers began by selecting some teachers from the school who are responsible to train the other teacher at their regional or school level.

According to Villegas-Reimers (2003) who reviewed a body of international literature on teacher professional development and found out from several cases that:

…educational reforms that do not include teachers and their professional development have not been successful. Professional development initiatives that have not been embedded in some reform of structures and policies have not been successful either (Villegas-Reimers, 2003, p. 24).

2.4.2.2. Innovation and training.
Innovation and professional development interact in both directions (Nunan, 1988; Villegas-Reimers, 2003) but not all models of professional development seem to achieve their goals.

Training a “cohort” of teachers for a short time and then expecting these teachers to “pass on their new knowledge and skills to further cohorts of teachers, through formal courses” (Peacock, 1993, p. 24) is very common in the developing countries because of its cost effectiveness (Leu, 2004; Schneider, Krajcik, & Marx, 2000; Villegas-Reimers, 2003). Although this cascade of training may be economical in reaching large number of teachers, it often fails to make changes in teachers’ practice. Teachers in South Africa who received cascade training from educators trained by innovation initiators or experts during the introduction of ‘Outcomes-Based Education’ and ‘Curriculum 2005’
complained that trainers did not have adequate knowledge of the new skills and knowledge. Fisk & Ladd, (2004) refer to this “watering down and/or misinterpretation of crucial information” (p. 162): the intended message sometimes may get misinterpreted and passed on incorrectly to the next level. This often happens when the core ideas of innovation are reified into slogans or acronyms that lose connection with the basic concept. In the South African example, Outcomes Based Education (a programming concept) was discussed as ‘OBE’ and identified with group work (a teaching strategy), which was impractical in the context of impoverished schools, whose explicit function until relatively recently had been the production of a barely literate labouring class.

Teacher beliefs and their understandings of an innovation are essential for successful implementation of a curriculum change (Blignaut, 2007; Haney & McArthur, 2002). Implementation of the Process Writing Approach required Bhutanese teachers to learn and understand a whole new set of educational practices that was intended to replace their own teaching style. Such a large-scale innovation asks teachers to learn new concepts, new ways of presenting content and also new ways of interacting with students (Vandenberghe, 2002). Careless (1998) suggests that if teachers are to implement an innovation successfully, it is essential that they understand both the theoretical principles and classroom applications of the proposed change. Thus, teacher training and support play important roles in influencing teachers’ understandings and their classroom practice for the success of implementing curriculum innovations.

PWA is of Western origin, developed in a different cultural and educational context to that of Bhutan. This is a major issue that needs to be considered in designing training courses, if it is to take account of contextual realities by recognizing the values of the ‘host culture’ for a given teacher and classroom situation (Holliday, 2001). Curriculum change for English Language Learners (ELLs) can fail or only partially achieve its stated
objectives when planners are firstly, “unaware of the cultural shift that they are requiring teachers to make” and secondly, “when planners fail to consider what factors will influence how teachers experience the proposed change” (Wedell, 2003, p. 445).

Therefore, it is important to identify the extent of cultural shift and the factors that influence the proposed changes before the curriculum is implemented. In this way trainers are able to provide meaningful bridges between the culture of the innovation and the existing local professional culture in order to achieve “cultural continuity” (Holliday, 2001, p. 169) and help teachers make the transition.

It is also essential to consider teachers’ existing beliefs, behaviours, and the classroom context in order to achieve harmony between the old and new ideas to be introduced (Holliday, 2001). Teachers’ own beliefs concerning teaching greatly influence how new approaches are interpreted and they are implemented in different ways even in seemingly similar contexts (Ruth, 2006). As Wedell (2003) stresses “…the embedding of new practices in teachers’ existing professional culture will not be completed solely by the provision of a single brief in-service programme” (p. 13). The literature suggests that introducing PWA in Bhutan with a single orientation workshop would predictably have minimal impact on teachers’ instructional beliefs and classroom behaviour.

When there is inadequate support for teachers to make these cultural and professional adjustments, non-native English speakers experience difficulties in implementing unfamiliar classroom practices, particularly those borrowed from a Western approach to English language teaching (Dushku, 1998). Adjustment to the local context results in a gap between the intended official curriculum and the enacted curriculum (Careless, 1998; Nunan, 2003; Wedell, 2003).
2.4.3. Shaping the curriculum to fit the new context.

As much as it is important that Bhutanese teachers adapt their teaching methods to the PWA, it is equally important to adjust or place the innovation in the situation where it will be implemented. Curriculum exists in context and cannot remain on its own, so altering the context will result in altering the innovation (Cornbelth, 1990; Jeffs & Smith, 1999). As Sadler (1900) cited in (Higginson, 1979) puts it:

We cannot wander at pleasure among the educational systems of the world like a child strolling through a garden, and pick off a flower from one bush and some leaves from another, and then expect that we stick what we have gathered into the soil at home, we shall have living a plant (Sadler, 1900, p. 49).

Education is embedded in context (Bray & Thomas, 1995; Ochs, 2006; Watson, 1998), “all aspects of educational policy are embedded in context and the degree of contextual influence varies according to each situation” and so one cannot deny that “the centrality of context... is axiomatic” (Ochs & Phillips, 2002, p. 330) in borrowing and implementing educational practices. The success of a borrowed practice is determined by a set of complex inter related contextual factors not just by simply by its success where it came from.

Thus, for the efficacy of the such educational borrowing, detailed examination of the context for cross-national attraction needs to be considered in the light of “how the context conditions have created the need to look to examples ‘elsewhere’ (and) the suitability of the ‘home’ conditions for particular kinds of educational transfer from elsewhere” (Ochs & Phillips, 2002, p. 330). The four main stages of policy borrowing proposed by Phillips and Ochs are explained below.

2.4.4. Four stages of policy borrowing.

The four stages of educational policy borrowing developed by Phillips and Ochs (2003) and these four stages are presented in Fig. 2.1.
2.4.4.1. Cross National Attraction: impulses and externalising potential.

The first stage of the model refers to the reasons why one nation may desire to borrow from another. Such reasons can vary from internal dissatisfaction, collapse of a system due to a natural disaster or war, negative external evaluation like the results of international studies or research, sudden economic change and competition, political and other imperatives for satisfying voters, for new of learning new knowledge skills. Identifying the motives behind educational borrowing plays a major role in understanding why the foreign curriculum is being borrowed. Evidence from a case study by Ochs (2006) which examined the positive result in the London schools of borrowed educational practices from Switzerland around 1997 revealed that “from the earliest stages of cross-national attraction, there was a clearly understood and fundamental motive” (p. 614) for
borrowing the Swiss educational policies, “to improve the educational attainment of pupils in Barking and Dagenham schools” (p. 602). The types of policy borrowed can also vary from

… what we have termed a ‘guiding philosophy’ (equality of educational opportunity, for example through ‘ambitious/goals’ (‘Education for All’, increased access to higher education, gender equality), ‘strategies’ (additional funding, training), ‘enabling structure’ (new types of school, general organisational reform) ‘and process’ (assessment procedures, grade repetition, reporting, certification) to ‘techniques’ (teaching methods) (Ochs & Phillips, 2004, p. 779).

Ochs & Phillips (2002) claim that development of educational innovation is a process which begins with a guiding philosophy or ideology relating to ambitions/goals, moving through its strategies followed by enabling structures and finally the process and techniques. Any changes of the process will lead back to the guiding philosophy.

2.4.4.2. Decision.

The second stage refers to the kinds of decisions made by curriculum authorities. Decisions can be theoretical, realistic and practical, quick fix and/or phoney. Decisions that can be described as “theoretical”, “quick fix” or “phoney” are difficult to implement (Phillips & Ochs 2004, p. 780). “Theoretical and “quick fix decisions” are usually made by government for political reasons. Often such decisions involve aims that are too broad and pose problems for implementation; or the local contextual factors are not considered and no follow up activities take place. However, borrowed policies become more realistic and practical when motives are clear and contextual factors of feasibility and suitability are considered.

2.4.4.3. Implementation.

The underlying factors that contribute to the success of the implementation are identified as “the contextual conditions of the borrower’s country” and the speed of change of “attitudes of the “significant actors.” (Phillips & Ochs, 2004, p. 780). According to Ochs,
particular people in place have the power to delay, speed up or stop the change, thus implementation can be more effective with applied with reduced amount of power.

2.4.4.4. Internalization/indigenization.

The last two stages refer to what Phillips and Ochs (2004) calls “internalization” or “indigenization” or “domestication” of policy (p. 776). At this stage the borrowed practice “becomes part of the system of the education of the borrower country” (p. 780).

While considering the ways to assess the effect of the borrowed policy on the existing system of the borrower country the above authors have identified the following four steps.

- Impact on the existing system/modus operandi; here we can examine the motives and objectives of the policy makers, in conjunction with the existing system;
- The absorption of external features: close examination of context is essential here to understand how and to what extent features from another system have been adopted
- Synthesis: here we can describe the process through which educational policy and practice become part of the overall strategy of the ‘borrower’ country.
- Evaluation: finally, internalization requires reflection and evaluation to discern whether the expectations of borrowing have been realistic or not. The results of evaluation might then start the whole process again, with further investigation of foreign models to put right perceived deficiencies (Phillips & Ochs, 2004, p. 781).

Ochs (2006) made a detailed case study analysis of a very successful implementation of borrowed educational practices from Switzerland to London schools. The systematic analysis of all the four stages of the model developed jointly with Phillips (see Fig 2.1) suggested “careful consideration of the local and national context across all the four stages” (Ochs, 2006, p. 616). This meant careful and detailed study of what could be directly copied from Switzerland and installed in Barking and Dagenham schools and what needed to be adapted. This included components of the culture of the classroom such as tolerance for students’ mistakes, the respective roles and responsibilities of the
teachers in both countries and the seating arrangement in class. All of this contributed to the successful implementation of the borrowed approach.

The findings also suggested that a pilot programme, which involved teachers in selecting practices which were applicable directly and in deciding what needed to be modified, was central to the success of innovation. Thus although the educational practices had Swiss-roots, they did not remain Swiss; they were adapted to suit the London classrooms. Another example of such a successful implementation was the borrowing of the “Reading Recovery” scheme from New Zealand to Britain. Careful consideration of the contextual factors allowed the borrowed practice became successful in Britain.

Nevertheless, Phillips & Ochs (2003) also identify two previous instances of unsuccessful borrowing of educational practices. For example, the United Kingdom could not implement the borrowed practice of German vocational education in their local classrooms and an attempt to transplant the US practice of ‘magnet schools’ into a British context in 1988 provoked even more dissatisfaction and proved ultimately unsuccessful.

Ochs (2006) reports that although the four staged model seems to have very discrete cycle of stages linking one to another; it does not follow a linear process. Evidence from that study of the mathematics education reform in London revealed that results from the implementation and internalisation stages triggered another turn of cross-national attraction. In other words, positive result of the students’ achievement after implementing the Swiss educational practices led the investigation team to go back to Switzerland and learn lessons for schools in London. Thus, Ochs (2006) suggests evaluating the whole process of educational borrowing. The boundaries between stages have also been indicated as a source of another uncertainty in its use. Difficulties in identifying where one stage begins and another ends may prove a serious drawback of the model. As much
as “implementation spark[s] interest in looking to other alternatives, it might include revisiting earlier observations” (Ochs 2006, p. 612).

The examples provided above highlight the importance of making detailed study of what works exactly in terms of classroom techniques in other countries and to investigate whether the extent to which they are context-bound or might be easily adapted to improve practice at home. It also suggests the wisdom of including evaluation at all of the four stages of the model and being aware that sometimes the four stages are not distinctive and obvious. The literature also indicates that teachers make significant changes to the curriculum to suit the students, their school, and their own teaching style and goals (Ball & Cohen, 1996). Therefore, new curriculum is transformed into lessons with which teachers are familiar and the purpose of the innovation may not be achieved (Brown & Campione, 1996).

2.4.5. Cultural differences: Native English Speakers and Nonnative English Speakers.

The PWA originated in the United States and was designed for teaching writing to students of NES (Matsuda, 2003b). The cultural differences between Bhutan and other contexts in which English is taught as a native language must be recognised.

Based on study of cultural differences between employees of a large multinational corporation in 50 countries around the world, Hofstede (2001) conceives national cultural differences in terms of five dimensions, as follows:

1. **Power distance**, which is related to the different solutions to the basic problem of human inequality

2. **Uncertainty avoidance**, which is related to the level of stress in a society in the face of an unknown future.
3. **Individualism versus collectivism**, which is related the integration of individuals into primary groups

4. **Masculinity versus femininity**, which is related to the division of emotional roles between men and women

5. **Long-term versus short-term orientation**, which is related to the choice of focus for people’s effort: the future or the present (Hofstede, 2001, p. 29).

The result of his statistical analyses of the surveys revealed that in general all English speaking countries, such as United States, Australia, United Kingdom, and New Zealand, rate Individualism highly (with Canada ranking highest) and countries from Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America reflect more strongly Collectivist views (Hofstede, 2001).

Hofstede (2001) explains that societies with more individualist attitudes tend to have loose relationships with others beyond their close family members and are thus relatively independent and more distant from others. In societies with more collectivist attitudes, people’s identity tends to be tied to values shared by the social majority. They maintain interdependent relationships with more distant others. Therefore, it is understandable that teaching approaches emerging from individualist contexts (such as characterise native English-speaking societies) will incorporate more independent relationships. Hofstede explains that an individualist’s strong desire for students to speak in the class may contradict a collectivist culture because most collectivist cultures also maintain large power distance; their education tends to be “teacher-centred” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 100) with little two-way communication.

Similar to this, societies also differ in “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations” (Hofstede, 2003, p. 113). While some societies have a low level of stress with ambiguous situations, some societies have a
high level of stress and individuals from societies with high stress levels try to avoid uncertainty. However, often uncertainty avoidance and risk taking behaviours are misunderstood. Hofstede differentiates between uncertainty avoidance and risk taking. He pairs ‘fear with risk’ and ‘anxiety with uncertainty’ to differentiate the two concepts:

Fear and risk are both focused on something specific: an object in the case of fear and event in the case of risk. Risk is often expressed as a percentage of probability that a particular event may happen. Anxiety and uncertainty are both diffused feelings. Anxiety…has no object. Uncertainty has no probability attached to it. It is a situation in which anything can happen and we have no idea what. (Hofstede, 2003, p. 116).

Societies with uncertainty cultures reject ambiguous situations by looking for “…a structure in their organisation, institutions, and relationships which makes events clearly interpretable and predictable” (Hofstede, 2003, p. 116). Ironically, people from these societies take risks and seek out limits instead of waiting. Thus, approaches which incorporate unpredictability and unclear aspects from one society may cause nervousness and stress in another context.

The masculine versus feminine dimension of culture is associated with dominant sex role patterns in the majority of a society. The masculine characteristic is related to competitiveness and assertiveness in contrast to feminine modesty and nurture. The key differences that Hofstede (2003) explains between Feminine and Masculine cultures are summarised in the Table 2.1 below.

What might seem appropriate in the context of one culture may contradict common practices in another culture (Hofstede, 2001). However, Hofstede himself warns against using nations as unit of analysis in studying culture: “modern nations are too complex and sub-culturally heterogeneous for their cultures to be determined this way” (2001, p. 23).
Table 2.1. The key differences between Feminine and Masculine cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In society: caring, warm, modest</td>
<td>• Material success/money and things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Men and women: be tender, concerned in relationship</td>
<td>• Men: assertive, ambitious and tough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In family: Both father and mother deals with facts and feeling</td>
<td>• Women: tender and care in relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both boys and girls: can cry but not fight</td>
<td>• In family: father deal with facts, mothers with feelings girls cry do not fight, boys do not cry fight back when attacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sympathy for weak</td>
<td>• Sympathy for strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average student is the norm</td>
<td>• Best student is the norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Failing in school is minor</td>
<td>• Failing is disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Friendliness in teacher appreciated</td>
<td>• Brilliance in teachers appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boys and girls same subjects</td>
<td>• Boys and girls different subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work in order to live</td>
<td>• Live in order to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers use intuitions and strive for consensus</td>
<td>• Managers to be decisive and assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stress on equality, solidarity and quality of life</td>
<td>• Stress on equity, competitions among colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resolve conflicts by compromising and negotiating</td>
<td>• Resolve conflicts by fighting them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tobin, Wu & Davidson (1989) suggest that, rather than relying on the traditional ethnographic approach of researcher observation and production of thick description and interpretation, the informants of the study should be allowed to speak for themselves. Therefore, this study will deploy Hofstede’s (2001) concept of cultural difference as the frame for analysis, and Tobin’s modification of the ethnography method for collecting and applying field data which highlights building on the “insider/outsider dialogic encounter” as the main method (Tobin, et al., 1989, p. 124).

2.4.6. Constructive alignment.

There are two aspects to Biggs’s notion of “constructive alignment”: the ideas that students learn by doing activities and constructing meaning for themselves; and that systems that connect “teaching method used and the assessment tasks, are aligned to the
learning activities assumed in the intended outcomes” (Biggs, 2003a, p. 11). The first aspect challenges the notion that school is about the teacher simply passing on knowledge and students receiving passively. The second aspect asserts that the learner cannot get away without learning what is intended in an aligned program (Biggs, 2003a).

In short: “alignment means agreement” (Ananda 2003, p. 2). It is the agreement between standards, assessment and other educational elements and all these together contribute to students’ effective learning (Webb, 1997). Evidence from the results of achievement tests indicates that such alignment can have immense impact on student improvement (Cohen, 1987). Conversely, evidence suggests that misalignment in the US between the written curriculum, what is being taught and tested contributes to low achievement by poor students (Porter, Smithson, Blank, & Zeidner, 2007). Most of the prior studies on alignment have looked at the link between various tests and standards (Biggs & Tang, 2007; Porter, 2002; Porter, et al., 2007; Webb, 1997, 2007; Ananda 2003).

A well aligned system supports and enhances student attempts at high level thinking by aligning all aspects of teaching and assessment levels. ‘Constructive Alignment’ is a way of designing the curriculum which enhances conditions for quality learning. A system is poorly aligned when assessment does not match with the aims of teaching, as is often the case when a program outline states that students will be graduating with the skill to solve problems creatively and then creative problems solving is delivered through lecture and tested with multiple choice items (Biggs 2003a). Stable harmony between intended outcomes, teaching strategies and assessment methods in curriculum work represents alignment and its positive consequences are widely recognised (Hewitt, 2006; Martone & Sireci, 2009; Porter, 2002; Porter, et al., 2007; Webb, 2007).
‘Curriculum’ includes curriculum objectives, teaching and learning activities (Seigel, 2004). Analysis of change in curriculum should include an examination of alignment of the stated objectives and the activities. This investigation deals with Process Writing as a curriculum innovation in Bhutan. It seems clear that the documents prepared for teaching PWA will be critical for the success of the PWA implementation in Bhutan.

2.4.7. The curriculum documents.

The Bhutanese curriculum documents central for this study as mentioned in the earlier section (see 1.4) are:

1. The English Curriculum Guide for Teachers: Class VII (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a) (or The Guide) contains different sections for each of the four strands of listening and speaking, reading and writing language and grammar. It provides standards, objectives and activities, assessment timelines for each each strand with justification and rationale.

2. Reading & Literature: Class VII (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006b) (or The Reading and Literature book). This document contains literature materials to help students develop reading skills, to support the development and practice of writing, listening and speaking and language.

3. The Silken Knot: Standards for English for Schools in Bhutan (or The Silken Knot).

The Reading and Literature book is examined to see how this book supports the implementation of the Process Writing Approach as mentioned in the Reading section of the The Guide. Similarly, The Silken Knot is also examined to crosscheck the standards mentioned in the The Guide.

The present investigation pays attention to cultural and educational factors influencing the implementation of the PWA in the Bhutanese classrooms, the alignment
between the intentions and writing of the official curriculum, teachers’ understanding, and implementation of PWA undertaken in a single study. No studies in regard to implementation of PWA seem to have incorporated an ethnographic method in which teachers from both from inside and outside the observed context are able to comment on the same event.

Little attention has been paid to how teachers of English in Bhutan perceive the PWA as a curriculum innovation and implement it in their classrooms. So, this study will explore this issue also. While the single study conducted by Buggie et al (2009) made some general classroom observations in the English classes followed by some informal talk with the teachers, the looseness of its methodology make its results less useful than they might have been. This fact is critical given the empirical evidence of the frequent incongruence between teacher beliefs and their actual practices in the classroom (Borg, 2006). It is within this research space that the present study is located with an investigation of the understanding and practices with which ESL language teachers are faced while introducing the PWA as incorporated in the English curriculum in Bhutan.
CHAPTER THREE - BACKGROUND OF BHUTAN

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a brief background of Bhutan, its size and location before outlining the Bhutanese historic literacy context and the purpose of literacy within this nation. It describes the purpose and the language of instruction used when Bhutan adopted a general education system. The use of previous borrowed approaches within the general education system of Bhutan, issues faced with these practices and also problems faced with locally initiated curriculum development are then investigated. This thesis is concerned with cross-national curriculum borrowing and so such background is particularly important.

3.2. Brief background of Bhutan

Bhutan is a small country covering an approximate area of 38,394 square kilometres, and measuring roughly 170 km north to south and 300 km east to west, with a population estimated at 671,083 (National Statistics Bureau, 2011). Bhutan is landlocked and sandwiched between China in the north and India in the south (National Statistics Bureau 2011). The local population speak Dzongkha and Choke (a classical Tibetan language) is used for religious and prestige purposes.

3.3. Early literacy and its effect on Bhutanese lives

Until 1920, education in Bhutan was confined to Buddhist monasteries that focused on Buddhist religious teachings (Gyamtsho & Dukpa, 1999). The monastic form of education included Buddhist scriptures, ritual, philosophy, astrology and the fine arts such as painting, sculpture, music and dance besides memorising prayers in Choke (J. Dorji, 2005; Driem, 1994; Gyamtsho & Dukpa, 1998). Choke also known as the "language of the dharma" (p. 88) is the classical Tibetan language which Bhutan used for writing and reading “sacred Buddhist texts, medical and scientific treatises” (Driem, 1994, p. 88). The
monastic form of education is believed to have existed much earlier informally in the villages, although it was formally introduced in 1662 (J. Dorji, 2005). This was the only source of education in Bhutan until 1920, and most of the Bhutanese lives are still profoundly influenced by the values of Buddhism, which “are indispensable in day-to-day life of the people” (Tulku, 1997, p. 142).

3.3.1. Bhutanese culture and traditions.

Preservation and promotion of cultural and traditional values play a central role in Bhutanese education. Preserving culture and heritage has been repeatedly stressed in the developmental strategies (The Planning Commission, 1999). It is one of the guiding principles to assist in educational reforms (National Education Framework, 2009). The National Education Framework (2009) describes the Bhutanese set of values based mainly on two concepts: the (ley judrey) and the (tha damtshig). Ley judrey means “actions have consequences” (p. 15) and tha damtshig means “sacred commitment to others” (p. 17). The values of sacred commitments are identified as relationships between various pairs such as:

pha da bhushi gi damtshig (parent and child), lobey da lobtu gi damtshig (teacher and pupil), nyen da drok gi damtshig (husband and wife), poen da yok gi damtshig (master and servant). Such pairing of relationships is used to state the duty and obligations of one to the other (National Education Framework, 2009)

Wangyal (2001) explains that the relationships are based on responsibility and commitment to each other. For instance, as much as the parents need to commit to care in upbringing the child, the child in return needs to commit to obeying parents and taking care of them in their old age. In a marriage, both husband and wife are expected to commit to each other and develop trust and faith within the marriage. In the master and servant pairing, as much as the master is committed to look after the welfare of his servant, the servant in turn is expected to serve his master with dedication. Thus, if one fails in committing to the above responsibilities in a relationship then the result of one’s
action known as *jumdrey* will determine the future of the individual: “metaphorically just as sowing good quality seeds brings about a good harvest, and vice versa” (Wangyal, 2001, p. 109).

The ultimate purpose of traditional value is that each individual in the paired relationships accepts their role and takes responsibility for committing to it. The relationships are interdependent and sustained by values shared by the society at large which Hofstede (2001) would define as a collectivist culture.

Among all the relationships, the relationship between teacher and pupils (*lobey da lobsu gi damtsig*) is traditionally a very sacred one.

The teacher is expected to show compassion and love for the students by observing impartiality among his pupils and ensure that all his students acquire knowledge and wisdom. In turn the student is expected to concentrate on his studies and show lifelong gratitude to the teacher (Wangyal, 2001, p. 110).

Hofstede (2001) would recognise this as a wide power distance culture with high acceptance of inequality in relationships.

The idea of interdependence underlining relationships extends even further to “all forms of life regardless of religion, law, education survive by mutual cooperation based on their interconnectedness” (National Education Framework, 2009, p. 16). The notion of interdependence among different forms of life resulting in harmonious relationship is noticeable from the Buddhist iconography of four friends (the bird, the monkey, the rabbit and the elephant known as the “thuenpa puenshi”; see Appendix R). It is a common sight on the walls of the monastery and sometimes used as a wall painting in private houses. Such interconnectedness and acceptance of power imbalance suggests that educational practices borrowed from English speaking contexts that value individualism may perhaps encounter obstacles to implementation.

Bhutan is very keen to preserve its culture and tradition, and extremely cautious in its approach to modernisation. Dressing and behaving as a Bhutanese in public or formal
settings in an orderly and disciplined manner is important for Bhutanese as a way of preserving one’s identity. Bhutanese men wear *gho*, a coat like knee length garment held at the waist with a woven belt and women wear *kira* which is an ankle length rectangular piece of cloth held with silver and gold clips at the shoulder and closed with a woven belt at the waist over a long sleeved blouse *wonju* and a jacket *tego* outside. This is promoted by the government and expected of Bhutanese in all public or formal settings. This displays another aspect of Hostede’s (2001) collectivist culture where identity of people leans towards values commonly shared by the society at large.

To avoid undesirable influences on its culture and heritage from outside, tourism in Bhutan was not allowed until 1974, when a high value - low volume tourism policy was approved, which allows the types and quantity of tourists to be controlled (T. Dorji, 2001). Introduction of the internet and television were delayed till 1999 for similar reasons (Faris, 2004; Siok, 2003). This reflects Hostede’s cultural dimension of a society that avoids the uncertainty of an unknown future.

Bhutan successfully retained its own culture and tradition with a minimum of influence from the outside world until the beginning of 21st century. The traditional monastic education played an important role in maintaining the national culture, tradition, and religious activities.

3.4. **Secular form of education: Hindi and Choke.**

In the Bhutanese culture, “education and learning have always been accorded a place of high esteem” (Driem, 1994, p. 94). In 1920, Bhutan began its first secular form of education initiative taken by the first king (Gyamtsho & Dukpa, 1999). *Choke*, the same Tibetan language which is mainly in the form of written texts as used in the continuing monastic form of education, was initially used in the schools (Driem, 1994). The
concepts and values of Buddhism written in Choke were read and explained in Dzongkha by teachers to the students.

However, there were inadequate materials in the Classical language for its use as part of a secular education (Driem, 1994; Namgay, 2002). As a result, the need for a second language emerged, despite the country’s keenness to preserve its identity and unique culture. Secular education was begun by importing Indian teachers, curriculum and language. This represents the first of Philips and Ochs’ stages (P&O stage I): Cross-National Attraction. The Royal Government wished to maintain control over the extent to which the highly valued local culture changed but also to make the advantages of modern life more available to its subjects. The extent to which internal dissatisfaction was general is uncertain. The Royal family always remains one of the major drivers for change within Bhutanese society (Mathou, 1999).

Phillips and Ochs (2006) suggest that discussions of feasibility and the consideration of the cultural issues take place during decision making. No studies exist that document the discussions that must have taken place at this time. The decision to borrow Indian curriculum and language seems to have been based on the perceived need for Bhutan to make a speedy start on acceptable modernisation. The lack of materials in Choke for secular education meant that Bhutan would have moved much more slowly had the government decided to rely entirely on local resources. This seems clearly to be a ‘quick fix’ at P&O stage II: decision.

However, “Bhutan also ended up replicating the old-fashioned didactic methods characteristic of Indian-style formal secular education” (Driem, 1994, p. 95) when they implemented the imported curriculum and language from India. This second phase of secular education was similar to the first: the teachers read the written text in Hindi (rather than Choke) and then explained the content in Dzongkha. Consequently, rote
learning remained very common (J. Dorji, 2005; Mackey, 2002). The situation required teachers who were literate in Hindi and could speak Dzongkha and such bilingualism seems to have been enough. The teachers did not seem to have taken much account of pedagogy. As Bhutanese monastic education already used rote learning and text written in one language being explained in another, the similar approach to learning within the Indian curriculum with the same approach seems to have suited the teaching in the general education in Bhutan.

Nevertheless, Bhutan realised that Hindi is neither a native language of Bhutan nor an international language and English is of more use in accessing international opportunities (Driem, 1994). This represents the third of Phillips and Ochs stages: (Implementation P&O stage III and Impact and Evaluation P& O stage IV) and the beginning of a new cycle of borrowing (P&O stage I).

3.4.1. Modernisation and language switch: English and Choke.

Bhutan began to modernise its education from 1960s. In 1961, as part of its first five year plan secular education was established “to address the basic educational needs, and to develop human resources required for socio-economic development of the country” (Bhutan Annual Education Statistics, 2009, p. 5). It was in the same year that

… His Late Majesty King Jimi Doji Wangchuk[ ] decreed Dzongkha the national language of the Kingdom of Bhutan, thereby conferring official status to the role which Dzongkha had acquired in the course of Bhutanese history. Dzongkha has traditionally served as the spoken vernacular of the royal courts, the military elite, educated nobility, government and administration at least as far back as the twelfth century (Driem, 1994, p. 93).

The Royal Government Bhutan also initiated programmes to “modernise and codify the national language” (Driem, 1994, p. 95) to replace Choke in the schools. However, Dzongkha could not be used in the schools only until 1970s. Although Dzongkha was originally derived from the old Tibetan language, it differs from classical Tibetan as much as modern French differs from Classical Latin.
The English language replaced Hindi as the language of instruction in 1964 (Driem, 1994; Mackey, 2002; Powdyel, 2008). According to Mackay (2002) Bhutan seemed to have adopted an Anglo-Indian curriculum from Darjeeling Jesuits of St. Joseph’s College with English as the medium of instruction. This represents local recognition of failure at Phillips and Ochs’ fourth stage (P&O stage IV) and the beginning of another cycle (P&O stage I): Failed Indigenisation followed by Internal Dissatisfaction.

Learning the English language helped Bhutanese to access “the discoveries of science and mathematics, medicine and information technology” which otherwise were not available in Dzongkha (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. ix) and so greatly contributed to the development of the country in line with its Gross National Happiness philosophy. It is noteworthy that these developments were made at the initiative of the Royal government and not as a result of past or present colonialism or local hegemony being perceived as greatly influential. As Phillips and Ochs provide a model based on European experience, not unduly corrupted by colonialist pressures, Bhutan provides a case which may either exemplify or challenge that model, not unduly corrupted by hegemonic pressures.

The contemporary education structure in Bhutan comprises eleven years of free education (grades pre-primary to ten). It has adopted a pattern of seven years of primary education (pre-primary to grade six) and six years of secondary divided into two years for Lower Secondary (grades seven to eight), two years of Middle Secondary (grades nine to ten) and two years Higher Secondary (eleven to twelve) (Policy and Planning Division, 2011).

3.4.2. Problems with borrowed practices.

Nevertheless, learning the English language brings in a set of educational practices and cultural characteristics related to English language teaching which does not always match
closely the Bhutanese culture and education system. Thus practices related to teaching of English have not always been successfully implemented in the schools.

One such unsuccessful implementation took place in 1986 when the Royal Government of Bhutan, with assistance from United Kingdom, attempted to introduce a New Approach to Primary Education (NAPE). The dissatisfaction mentioned earlier prompted a change in the guiding philosophy (P&O stage I) from teacher to child-centred education, implicit in the choice of a foreign-derived approach (P&O stage II). This may well have represented a ‘quick fix’ (Phillips & Ochs 2004, p. 780) solution as it was funded from the same source that provided the borrowed approach. This new approach from the United Kingdom had an activity-based learning style and was based on the philosophy of child-centeredness.

Western proponents of the approach advocated a more Bhutanised, "learner-centred" and "environmental" curriculum in which little stress is placed on forms of knowledge acquired by rote learning. These new materials had to be developed in both Dzongkha and English (Driem, 1994, p. 102).

The project was pilot tested, teachers were trained, and it was implemented nationwide. However, the activity based learning style demanded resources that the schools in Bhutan lacked and students could not communicate confidently in English. Bhutanese classes are characterised by 50-60 students congested together in one room and such large class sizes did not permit group activities to take place. The nature of the approach did not match the local context. The new approach demanded interaction between the teacher and the students that was problematic because it is unnatural in Bhutanese culture for students to have free interaction with teachers (J. Dorji, 2005). It is probably unsurprising that implementation of the new approach was not successful and the reform was abandoned after fifteen years. Again, this represents failure at internalisation/indigenisation (P&O stage IV). The existing system and modus operandi
were incompatible with the centrally mandated change. Again, it provoked dissatisfaction that prompted another cycle of change, although not of foreign borrowing in this case.

### 3.4.3. Problems with locally initiated curriculum development.

Student difficulties with English and the national desire to maintain and develop the local culture led to a later attempt to develop aspects of the curriculum from local, rather than foreign roots. A new curriculum for teaching History for grades 6-10 switched the language of instruction from English to Dzongkha in 2006.

Much translation of materials from English to Dzongkha was carried out during the implementation of this language shift. Several workshops were conducted for the history teachers to support these changes. After pilot testing, the new curriculum was implemented nationwide. However, the history teachers who taught history in English could not teach it in Dzongkha due to their own difficulties in that language, and the Dzongkha teachers did not have sufficient history content knowledge (Sherab, 2008). The students had similar difficulty with the Dzongkha terminology to that of the history teachers. Thus, teachers during history lessons ended up teaching Dzongkha language rather than history. These problems were not foreseen during the planning and curriculum development periods but, as a result of them, history teaching in Dzongkha ceased in 2009. The costly and time-consuming curriculum innovation process could not be implemented.

Although curriculum planners cannot anticipate in advance all potential problems and factors that influence experience of proposed changes, implementation difficulties sometimes lead to teachers being accused of being recalcitrant, uncooperative and unknowledgeable (Graves, 2008; Widdowson, 2004). A contemporary media report (Bhutan Times, 2008) suggested that this was the case in Bhutan when the medium of
instruction for history was returned to English. Teachers were blamed for something that had much more complex problems.

3.5. **Implications of local background for the present investigation.**

The discussion so far has revealed a situation where a small, relatively homogenous population has managed to maintain its cultural integrity due to isolation and relative disinterest on the part of the imperial powers of the 19th and hegemonic powers of the late 20th century.

Attempts at direct curriculum borrowing (Indian teachers, teaching Indian curriculum in Hindi for verbal translation into Dzonghka), some adaptation of borrowed curriculum (NAPE: UK-derived child-centred primary education) and local development from the local language (Senior History taught in Dzonghka) have all been abandoned after unsuccessful attempts at implementation. It is likely, although beyond the scope of this thesis, that each of these attempts was driven by different groups within the Royal government or bureaucracy.

However, it does appear from this chapter that the Phillips’s and Ochs’s model (Phillips & Ochs, 2003) of cross-national policy borrowing and the Hofstede’s (2001) model of cultural difference may provide a pair of useful lenses through which to look at another, subsequent attempt at curriculum borrowing in considerable detail. Such investigation of the more recent attempt to introduce Process Writing from Canada may allow us to test both models and the justice of press claims of teacher intransigence.
CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

The literature reviewed in chapter 2 indicates the importance of alignment of stated objectives, teaching methods and assessment for successful curriculum implementation. Moreover, it suggests that curriculum innovations borrowed from elsewhere can only become practical when they are considered in relation to the culture and context where they will be used. Therefore, there is a need to examine how the Process Writing Approach (PWA) aligns in all these various fields and to the culture of the Bhutanese classroom.

The consequent aims for this study are:

- to explore the alignment; and misalignment; between the intentions of implementing the Process Writing Approach and the stated activities, evaluation and assessment set out in the The Guide (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a) and other supporting curriculum documents
- to uncover salient PWA implementation issues and obtain details about the teachers’ experiences, particularly relating it to how PWA’s foreign nature plays out in the Bhutanese classrooms
- to explore the teachers’ approaches to teaching writing and obtain reasons from the teachers as to why they are implementing PWA as they do
- to compare and contrast the characteristics of PWA and the Bhutanese culture

This chapter describes the research design and the methods adopted for obtaining the data required for answering the specific research questions mentioned (see 1.5.) and to achieve the above aims. It begins by explaining the rationale for choosing a qualitative research design. It also describes the details of sampling and selecting research sites and the
various data collection methods used. Then it proceeds with explanation of ethics
clearance and validation process with an overall plan of data analysis.

4.2. Rationale for Qualitative Research Design

The study employed a qualitative research design that made use of a number of data
collection methods. Qualitative research can help one understand the “central
phenomenon” through detailed study of people and sites (Cresswell, 2008, p. 213) and
such approaches have been identified as particularly suitable for research questions which
address curriculum innovation (Janesick, 1994).

The study followed a sequential approach involving various data collection methods.
One stage was followed by another, which built upon the findings of the previous one,
“following a thread” through the emerging qualitative data (Moran-Ellis et al., 2006, p.
54). Although that phrase was originally used for mixed methods of data collection, it
will serve equally well for this study. The different strategies of data collection were
intended to provide both a broader and deeper understanding of the research problem,
address threats to validity (Mathison, 1998; Stake, 2000) and further help in
understanding a phenomenon about which very little was known in its natural setting
(Patton, 2002).

The sequential data collection methods involved four different phases of data
collection. Figure 4.1 shows the logical connections between each research questions and
the four phases of the methods used for collecting the data.
Research Questions

1. To what extent do the objectives stated in the English Teachers’ Guide for grade seven and other curriculum documents, and the designed activities for teachers and students for teaching writing using Process Writing Approach in Bhutan indicate constructive alignment?

2. How has a group of Bhutanese principals experienced: the proposed change, the support and training and other factors that influenced the implementation of PWA, and how have they responded and reacted to the experience?

Data Collection Method

Phase 1.
Curriculum Documentary Analysis

Phase 2.
Semi-structured interview (winter workshops) with Lower secondary school principals

Phase 3.
Video-recording classroom lessons of 3 teachers. Same teachers then explain their actions of the recorded lessons

Phase 4.
The Problem of Typicality
Video-recorded lessons as stimulus for cultural reflections with 3 additional teachers

Figure 4.1. The research questions and the process of data collection
4.3. Research Questions and Data Collection methods

The study involves four phases of data collection, connected to the three main research questions. It begins with Phase 1, the analysis of the three curriculum documents that mandated and explained the introduction of the Process Writing Approach in Bhutan. Phase 2 involved interviews with eight school principals who were familiar with the PWA implementation. Phase 3 comprised recorded observation of single classroom lessons delivered by three teachers, which provided stimulus for interviewing the three teachers whose lessons were recorded and led into Phase 4, where the recordings were used as the basis of interviews with three additional cultural informants.

4.4. Curriculum Documentary Analysis (Phase 1)

4.4.1. Curriculum documents.

The curriculum documents that were chosen for analysis comprised the syllabus for teaching English in Bhutan after the 2006 introduction of Process Writing. The documents selected to investigate the constructive alignment of PWA are:

a. Curriculum Guide for Teachers: English Class VII (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a: The Guide). This contains specific learning objectives and activities for each of the four language strands: listening and speaking, reading and writing. It also suggests methods for assessing each strand and a timeline for each week for each strand with justification and rationales for the suggestions.

b. The Silken Knot: Standards for English (Centre for Educational Research and Development, 2002: The Silken Knot) which contains the overall aim of the implementation and the standards that students should achieve for each class level.
c. Reading & literature: Class VII (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006b: The Reading and Literature book). This document contains literature materials to help students develop reading skills, to support the development and practice of writing, listening and speaking.

The links between the curriculum intentions and the stated activities in the The Guide were examined, followed by an investigation of how PWA is represented in The Silken Knot and the Reading & Literature book. The Guide asserts that “writing and reading are reciprocal skills which strongly support one another” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xxxi). How the curriculum documentary analysis was carried out is described in section 4.9.1.

These documents were analysed with particular regard to alignment between intentions and suggested activities; considering the cultural and educational context of Bhutan. Points of concern exposed by this analysis were used to generate the initial protocol for semi-structured interviews.

4.5. The Initial semi-structured interview (Phase 2)

4.5.1. Research site and participants.

The initial interview was conducted using a purposeful selection of the participants and research sites to obtain useful information (Cresswell, 2008). The rationale behind using this sampling technique for this research is that the study follows a “discovery” rather than “hypotheses-testing” process (Denscombe 1998, p. 25). The researcher visited a government-sponsored, M.Ed. programme during their winter residential school for the purpose of obtaining general views on those points which emerged from the documentary analysis and to explore for additional information. The workshop participants were all secondary school principals from various parts of the country gathered in one place, which allowed the researcher to access principals who work in very far-flung schools in
the eastern and southern regions of Bhutan. The residential school provided a very convenient context for the researcher to gain useful data for the study within a short time (Best & Kahn, 1998; Mertler & Charles, 2008).

There are 93 Lower Secondary Schools in Bhutan. These schools consist of grades seven and eight (Policy and Planning Division, 2012). There were 59 Secondary School principals at the winter workshops but some were from Middle Secondary Schools comprising grades nine and ten. The participants were recruited to provide an illuminative pattern of responses, rather than to be representative in any quantitative sense. This investigation sought to understand innovation participant attitudes, motivations and actions and the results of such study is not predictable. According to Denscombe (1998), generally the sample size for such qualitative research can be relatively small, so long as choice of the participants is done with a clear purpose. The researcher made an effort to recruit eight principals who currently teach in Lower Secondary Schools for the study. Principals of lower schools were selected because of the data on school dropouts and repeaters. Grade seven had the highest dropout rate from Pre-Primary to grade ten in Bhutan for the past five years (Bhutan Annual Education Statistics, 2009) and all of the schools selected have grade seven. Process Writing was intended to improve the quality of student writing and so it could be expected that teachers with student groups experiencing the greatest difficulty might be most likely to be implementing the innovation.

Another reason for selecting this particular group of principals was that they had taught the current curriculum since 2006 and 2007 (see Table 4.1, section 4.5.1) and were expected to oversee the implementation of the new curriculum, including the Process Writing Approach. The researcher was involved in teacher training, not in schools, in 2006 and 2007 and was only marginally familiar with one of the participants. According
to McEvoy (2001) although “shared experience may act as a catalyst that helps to generate new avenues of inquiry by opening up and extending the depth of a discussion” it is more likely that any “ongoing relationship” (p. 52) with the colleagues will influence the interview in various ways as the parties hesitate or move to contradict ideas or assume that they share similar experiences with the interviewer. However, in this research such relationships had minimal influence on the interview since most of the participants were unknown to the researcher and the only previous acquaintance was with one Principal who had been trained as a teacher in the same institution as the researcher 15 years previously. The lack of any ongoing relationship minimised any impact of previous acquaintance. The rest of the participants shared the same status as the researcher did and so there was no power imbalance to threaten the validity of the interview results. These facts allowed the researcher to obtain rich data through conversations which were both natural and authentic. The researcher took care to ensure that the participants have a good spread across the country by choosing schools from different districts (see Figure 4.2, section 4.5.1).
A maximal variation sampling strategy was used for selecting the principals. Maximal variation sampling is a purposeful sampling strategy in which the researcher uses individuals that differ on characteristic traits (Cresswell, 2008). School principals in Bhutan have teaching as well as administrative responsibilities. These eight lower secondary schools principals included both male and female participants directly involved in teaching English to grade seven using the current English curriculum. Principals who taught PWA were chosen to obtain data on their experiences and the use of The Guide. Their experiences in teaching in different schools located both in urban and rural areas contributed to understanding the implementation of PWA in different natural settings. Their training background for Process Writing varied from a receiving a single orientation program of ten days or a 45 days’ of Writers’ Workshop to receiving both or none at all.

**Figure 4.2. The spread of participants across the country**

[Map of Bhutan showing the spread of participants across the country.]
Table 4.1 shows that all the principals taught the new curriculum from 2006 and 2007. It also shows that out of the eight principals, three principals received only a ten day orientation to the new curriculum, three received the orientation to the new curriculum plus a forty-five-day Writers’ Workshop, one principal received a Writers’ Workshop and the last principal did not receive any form of training. There are six principals who are currently teaching in rural areas but two of them used PWA in the urban schools as well. Similarly, the two principals from the urban schools have taught in rural schools. Therefore, training of the teachers and their geographic teaching location were useful variables for analysis (Wiersma, 2000).

**Table 4.1. Training/Experiences of Principals in the New Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Training received</th>
<th>Grade Specified</th>
<th>Taught PWA</th>
<th>School Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 (F)</td>
<td>The Writers’ Workshop 45 days</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 (M)</td>
<td>Orientation program 10 days</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rural, also taught in urban schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 (M)</td>
<td>Orientation program 10 days</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 (F)</td>
<td>Orientation programs 10 days, Writers’ Workshop 45 days</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban, also taught in rural schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 (M)</td>
<td>Orientation program 10 days</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rural, also taught in urban schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 (M)</td>
<td>Orientation program 10 days, Writers’ Workshop 45 days</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 (M)</td>
<td>Orientation program 10 days, Writers’ Workshop 45 days</td>
<td>9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 (M)</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the gender of the participating principals, the training that they received specified for certain level or grades for teaching the new curriculum. It also
presents the year when the principals started teaching and the location of their schools. P8 did not receive any training for any specific grade.

A variety of perspectives across the different individuals was obtained by sampling individuals that differ on characteristic traits, as “…sampling is usually quicker, cheaper, less damaging, and more accurate than a nearly completed census” (Brown, 2006, p. 43).

The final decision about the inclusion of participants in the semi-structured interview was made after the workshop co-ordinator provided a list of workshop participants’ names and the name and location of their schools and after discussing the research with the principals and gaining their consent. The participants had a very busy schedule. They had daily scheduled classes and free periods were used for writing their course assignments or visiting their families. As Bell (2005) suggests, mutually convenient interview times were negotiated with participating principals, so as to minimise disruption of participants’ social requirements. Consequently, the interviews with the eight participants normally took place at night around 7-8 pm, when the principals had finished their daily classes and writing their course work. The participants squeezed one hour out of their personal time and the researcher was available at the institute in case the participants finished their work a bit earlier or even later than the scheduled time. The researcher also took extra care to adhere to the ethics of social research by not exceeding the time limit agreed between the researcher and the participant.

4.5.2. Data collection method.

Conducting semi-structured interviews allows the researcher to probe and prompt views of the participants (Corbetta, 1990). The face-to-face verbal interchange can elicit information or expression from one person by another (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1995). Therefore, a semi-structured interview was conducted with the sample of selected principals. The interviews were conducted in English. Both researcher and
participants can communicate efficiently about PWA in English. Dzongkha (the national language) does not have appropriate terminology for such discussions. The interview was assisted by an interview protocol consisting of lists of questions and topics related to the problems emerging from the documentary analysis participants’ understanding of and their experiences with Process Writing and the matches and mismatches between PWA and the Bhutanese classrooms with which they were familiar.

The interview protocol helped in covering all related areas in a systematic way (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) and also helped the researcher to record information and take down notes during the interview. Therefore, as suggested by Cresswell (2008), a header recorded the general information of the time, place and the interviewer and the interviewee. A draft copy of the interview protocol is attached as Appendix M. The interview was conducted for one hour each with the chosen principals. The eight interviews were transcribed and analysed via Nvivo. (see section 4.9.2).

4.6. Video-recording Lessons (phase 3)

4.6.1. Schools and teachers.

The third phase of the study involved three English teachers who were involved in teaching grade seven in three different schools in Chukka. None of the participants in the initial semi-structured interview came from the Chhuka district.

Chukka is one of the twenty dzongkhag (districts) in Bhutan. It is situated in the south of Bhutan before reaching Phuentsholing, the main town of the district. Phuentsholing is near the border with India and is a busy commercial centre. Commodities sold in India are cheaper than in Bhutan, so many Bhutanese visit the town to buy them. However, security is tight there, as it is an Indo-Bhutan border area. There are security checks for identity, when returning from Chukka and travelling from Phuentsholing. The security situation may explain why the earlier study initiated by
Buggie et al in 2006 did not include this area, providing an opportunity to expand their work to include a different group of teachers in another place.

Figure 4.3 provides a map showing the research site for this phase of the investigation.

The schools were chosen from those located in the rural and remote areas of the region because such regions were identified as problematic for implementing PWA during the interviews at the Winter Workshop. The remote location also suggested that any cultural factors impacting on implementation would be more noticeable in Chhuka than in more urbanised regions. PWA implementation was more problematic there because students’ families were mostly illiterate in the English language. This affected the level of the students’ English because they had limited access to reading and writing material and parents could not give any guidance on literacy in English. The parents of these three schools came from diverse backgrounds.
4.6.2. Parents from diverse backgrounds.

The parents in School 1 were mostly from the Royal Bhutan Army, one of the branches of the armed forces of the country (The Constitution of the Kingdom of Bhutan, 2008). Although most of the army officers in higher position would have achieved literacy through the general education system, the rest of the army are illiterate particularly in the English language. Therefore, although students live quite close to the school as day scholars, the parents are not in a position to provide guidance on writing in English. There was also one student who was a juvenile delinquent who came from the juvenile centre which means there is no parental guidance in writing for him as well.

The parents of students in School 2 are nomads, who live in very faraway places, moving from one place to another in search of grass and water for their cattle. Therefore, the students at this school lived in as boarders. They met their parents only two times in a year: once during a long break in the middle of the year and once at the end of the year when the school closes for winter vacation. Guidance on literacy from these parents was clearly out of question and these parents have no knowledge on literacy at all. Although the boarding hostels run evening and morning study for students, this allocated time was for students to write their homework and do self-study. This normally takes place with all the students gathered in a big room and the attending teacher’s role is to ensure quietness for the study hour. There seems to be no real oral interaction between students or with the teacher during this time and so these students have little writing guidance outside class time.

School 3 also served some nomad families and other parents are labourers who work on the local hydro-electric project. The hydro project labourers are also mainly illiterate, meaning giving literacy guidance to the students at home is quite challenging. They also
live very far from the school but students from these families are day scholars and walk long distance to school and back.

### 4.6.3. Feeder schools and other schools.

School 2 was a feeder school that began at grade seven and drew students from different primary schools after completion of grade six. The other two secondary schools (School 1 and School 3) had grades beginning from pre-primary to ten. Consequently the participating teacher from School 2 was introducing Process Writing to a class of new students while that from School 3 was working with students who might be expected to have already been introduced to the approach. Nevertheless, the participating teacher from School 1 said that he had not taught his students in grade six, so he also introduced the whole process of PWA to his grade seven students as though they had not encountered it before.

### 4.6.4. Data collection: Method.

Incorporating a focussed examination helps to carry out detailed studies on small groups of participants (Wiersma, 2000). Observing and describing the nature of a phenomenon in its natural setting can help to “develop a deeper and fuller understanding” of it (Babbie, 2004). Therefore, this study involved only six teachers; three for video-recording lessons and another three for commenting on the typicality of the lessons. The study followed the visual and multi-vocal ethnography method that Tobins, Wu, & Davidson (1989) used for studying Japanese, Chinese and American preschools. Tobin used video of preschools to compare three different cultures. Their idea of visual ethnography by using video tapes of particular preschools to stimulate a multi-vocal text where teachers explain their own actions while watching themselves on the tape and other insiders retell the same event from different perspective was adapted for this study.
This section describes how the writing lessons were video recorded, edited and used for teachers themselves in explaining their own action. The subsequent section describes how another three insiders retell the same event from different perspectives.

4.6.4.1. Video-recording and editing.

The researcher videotaped the three Bhutanese teachers’ writing lessons in grade seven classrooms in three different schools. Each recording lasted for 45 minutes. The number of writing lessons taped was determined by how the teachers taught PWA in their classrooms.

The video was edited making special effort to choose the images from the taped lessons pertaining to ambiguous, problematic areas of teaching PWA. These carefully selected areas of concern were used to open up discussion and interpretation with the observed teachers, who provided a running commentary, explaining their actions.

4.6.4.2. Running commentary.

The best way to understand teachers’ perceptions is through their reflection on their own action (Gatbonton, 1999; Hedgcock, 2002). Participating teachers were engaged in discussion as they watched their visual ethnographic accounts, first checking if the video succeeded in reflecting the lessons as they saw it. They then provided a running commentary, following what Tobin et al., (1989, p. 7) call “a post-hoc play-by-play analysis” of their actions as shown in the recordings. The researcher recorded the video-prompted interview, listening to the teachers’ explanations and raising questions about the video recording. This process took place individually with the particular teacher after the recorded lesson was edited. These commentaries were transcribed for analysis. This method also gave teachers in Bhutan a chance to speak directly and to bring up reasons for enacting the curricular intentions as they do. How data is analysed is described in section 4.9.3.
4.7. The Issue of Typicality

4.7.1. School and cultural informants.

Three additional Secondary teachers who teach grades seven or eight were chosen, one each from the selected school, to comment on typicality of the lessons. The three additional teachers from the same schools where the video-recording of lessons were done were chosen to gain more information on the how another teacher from the same school implements PWA. Moreover, since the selected schools were all located in far flung places particularly school 2 and 3, to get teachers from different schools meant spending long hours of travelling on very rough roads. To reduce time and extra expenditure, it was the best strategy to recruit three teachers from the same schools.

4.7.2. Comments on typicality.

The same recorded lessons were later viewed by this other group of three teachers. Each teacher watched one video-recorded lesson and commented on the cultural aspects of the lessons. The rationale behind this was to ascertain the typicality of the video-recorded lessons and validate comments by the teachers whose lessons were observed and recorded. These other teachers were asked to identify usual or unusual writing instructional practices from each video-recording. The reactions of these teachers were audio recorded and then transcribed for analysis. This procedure is a response to the problem of typicality: inferences from these three lessons may be invalid if the lessons are not typical of Bhutanese writing instruction practice. This final stage of the investigation provided a check on any idiosyncratic interpretations that the researcher may have placed on cultural aspects of the lessons observed.

These methodological approaches were also chosen for their ability to provide inferences about “what cultural values, ideas and experiences lie beneath observed practices, because…cultural is an integral part of, rather than an extraneous factor
contributing to what goes on in schools and classrooms” (Mason, 2007, p. 191). The researcher studied writing instructions in a Bhutanese culture, and studied culture as seen through the classroom. See section 4.9.4. regarding how data is analysed.

4.8. Research Procedure

The project was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the University of Newcastle, Australia, on 11-Nov-2011 (Approval No.H-2011-0304) (see Appendix A).

Consent for the initial interview was obtained by visiting the research site and getting direct approval from the Course Leader and the principals themselves. The Course Leader was presented with an invitation letter and Information Statement (see Appendix B) outlining the purpose of the study, its implications for the Bhutanese lower secondary English curriculum development and for conducting pre/ in-service training of the teachers. The Course Leader made an announcement at the morning assembly giving full details of the research and seeking the teachers’ participation. Information statements and consent forms (see Appendices C & D) were kept on a table in the corridor available at the time of the announcement. The principals were given 24 hours to decide whether they wished to participate. They were informed that to participate in the study was strictly voluntary and will not entail any benefits or disadvantages. They were also informed that they could withdraw from the study any time, should they wish to do so. If they chose to participate, they were asked to complete the consent form and return it by dropping in a secure box hung in the workshop campus.

Formal approval for the classroom observation and interviews in the public schools was obtained from the Ministry of Education (see Appendix G) and they notified all the schools in that particular district of that approval. The researcher pre-visited five schools located in the remote district to distribute the information statements and the consent
forms. For school principals (see Appendix H) for teachers (see Appendices I & J). After obtaining the principal’s consent to invite the teachers in the school to participate in the study, the researcher requested the principals to send a notice around giving full details of the research and seeking the teachers’ participation. The information statements and consent forms were left on the staff room table. Teachers were asked to tick the boxes indicating in which part of the study they would be interested (e.g. classroom observation or to comment on recorded lessons) and return the consent form by dropping into the box hung in the staffroom.

After two days, the researcher made a second visit to all the selected schools to collect the consent forms. Only three schools from the five schools visited were selected after teachers gave their consent. Two schools were left out of the study as in one there were no grade seven English teachers and in the other there were Indian teachers instead of Bhutanese teaching grade seven. Moreover, as the schools were located in far flung remote areas and the roads were too rough, it was too difficult to get to more than three schools for classroom observation within the limited time and budget.

Since it was likely that children in the classes of selected teachers might appear on the video, the researcher provided information statements for the parents of two schools and the hostel warden for one school explaining that the focus of the study was entirely on the teachers and not on the children (see Appendices K & L). For one school, the hostel warden was given the role of guardian for students who are all boarders and do not go home for the entire school sessions. The consent forms for these students were signed by the hostel warden. The other consent forms were given to the students to take home and read to their parents and get it signed by the parents. The students were asked to inform parents that they could ask any questions they wish and discuss the research among their friends. They were asked to return signed forms to a locked box hung outside.
the school building. They were also informed that they could withdraw their child from being video recorded. Such students would be identified by the class teachers and kept in a spot in the classroom where they are completely out of the way of the camera in capturing their image, so that no student would miss any lessons. After both parent and warden consent was gained, the students were offered the opportunity to participate in the study and sign the consent forms.

After obtaining all the necessary permission and consents from all the concerned people involved in the observation phase of the study, the researcher and the participating teachers in the three different schools organised schedules for classroom observation and time for subsequent discussions. This was done by considering both the researcher and the teachers’ convenience. The researcher edited the video record from 45 minutes to 20 minutes, keeping mainly to issues of teaching PWA to reduce the time teachers spent reviewing and discussing the videos.

All electronic forms of data stored such as the video and voice recordings were password-protected. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project had access to the data. All these electronic data will be kept for five years on computer protected by password.

All hard copies of the consent forms and transcriptions of the interviews were stored in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office at the University of Newcastle, Australia. The data contains no information that could identify any of the participants. The participant’s identities on any of the records were replaced with ID codes before the data analysis began.

4.9. Data Analysis


The researcher read through The Guide and compartmentalized it into different sections:
Part A: Intentions of PWA,

Part B: Learning objectives and activities,

Part C: Standards,

Part D: Reading and Part E Assessment.

These sections, as well as *The Reading and Literature book* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006b) and *The Silken Knot* (Centre for Educational Research and Development, 2002) were entered into Nvivo 9. The analysis of how PWA is represented across the curriculum was carried out by using both Nvivo and manual work in the following manner.

**Step 1:**

The official intentions and rationale for introducing PWA were examined by reading the Introduction on pages 132-133 and the Foreword on pages 135-140 of the writing section in *The Guide* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a). From this reading it was apparent that PWA as implemented in Bhutan emphasised writing as a process of planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing.

**Step 2:**

Then to draw out other characteristics of the approach, Nvivo was used for coding and thematic analysis. The different themes which emerged from this analysis were copied manually onto a table to visualise the information and then the meaning of each emerging theme was summarised in few words (see Table 5.1, section 5.3).

**Step 3:**

The researcher examined the listed standards on the page 17 of *The Silken Knot* (Centre for Educational Research and Development, 2002) and the specific objectives of the writing on page 134 of *The Guide* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a) systematically and entered the objectives on a table to identify the areas of
writing at the focus of each objective (see Table 5.2, section 5.4.1) to reveal how PWA was represented in the standards and specific writing objectives.

**Step 4:**

The stated specific objectives and the set activities for writing on page 141-182 of *The Guide* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a) were explored to find out whether these activities are really reflecting the various suggested steps of PWA.

**Step 5:**

A similar process examined the alignment between intentions in the Reading & Literature section of *The Guide* on pages 1-130 (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a). All these contributed to answering Research Question 1: alignment between intentions and activities.

The documentary analysis revealed matches and mismatches of intentions to stated activities, and matches and mismatches with the cultural and educational context of Bhutan. This analysis was used to generate an interview protocol for subsequent semi-structured interviews with teachers and principals to extend the findings of the documentary analysis and to identify new points of concern.

**4.9.2. Initial semi-structured interview analysis.**

The transcribed data was loaded onto Nvivo 9 and open coded. Open coding helped identify themes from the original data (Strauss, 1990) by “assigning tags and labels to the data based on our concepts” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 26). The major themes which emerged from the open coding were copied manually to aid visualisation (see Table 5.4, section 5.6). Issues and concerns related to teacher understanding of PWA, their experience, matches and mismatches with local context emerged. Demographic information about the participants’ training related to PWA and their geographic teaching location helped in classifying variables for analysis (Wiersma, 2000). The most prevalent
node which had the maximum references from all the eight sources was re-examined by breaking into smaller nodes and breaking further till all the underlying factors and issues were displayed.

The researcher also gained direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, and knowledge. Links between the problematic areas (relating to the different stages of Process Writing, location of the schools and teachers training background, students’ family background) and particular areas/teachers were identified.

4.9.3. Video-recording lessons analysis.

The researcher watched each teacher’s videotaped lesson several times. After watching the taped lessons, the Bhutanese classroom factors that were easily interpretable across the videotaped lessons were noted, for example, the classroom setting, the large numbers of students and students’ seating arrangements. The issues that emerged were similar to those that the principals indicated as challenges for implementing PWA at the initial interview. Each teacher’s running commentary was transcribed and then loaded into Nvivo 9 and coded. The running commentaries were always cross checked with the corresponding scene of the video record of each lesson to relate the comments to the scene. Then the commentaries corresponding with the captured scenes were divided, based on teachers’ practices and comments, into different themes such as Bhutanese Classroom Factors, Task Related Factors, Culture Related factors, and Other Factors. The researcher made a summary of all these themes and confirmed with the teachers that the summary accurately reflected their experience.

Then the researcher compared these explanations and experiences of the teachers to examine how the other three teachers who share similar contexts and culture viewed the typicality of the lessons. The findings helped in answering the research questions on matches and mismatches of PWA to the Bhutanese educational context, as well as
providing data regarding how the teachers enacted the curriculum and their reasons for enacting the curriculum as they did.

4.9.4. The typicality analysis.
As a next step, an intercultural comparison between the key themes which emerged as characteristics of PWA and Bhutanese teachers’ classroom observations and comments was carried out. To compare and contrast all these, Hofstede’s (2001) concepts of national cultural difference was used as a theoretical framework in terms of five dimensions: the Power distance, Uncertainty avoidance, Individualism versus collectivism, Masculinity versus femininity, Long-term versus short-term orientation. This identified the matches and mismatches between cultures in Bhutanese educational context and PWA characteristics. This helped to answer Research Question 3, and gain in-depth data to answer Research Questions 1 and 2. This helped to understand the nature of the approach and what cultural dimensions are dominant with this approach.

4.10. Conclusion
This chapter has presented several aspects of the methods used for this research. First it has explained how the literature review and the goal and nature of the research have shaped the research design consisting of four phases of data methods in relation to the four main research questions. This is followed by a list of curriculum materials used for Phase 1 and a description of research sites and participants used for the other three phases. The chapter has also presented the research procedure outlining how data collection is done after getting approval from different authorities. Finally, the chapter explained how data from each phase would be analyzed.
CHAPTER FIVE - FINDINGS FROM THE DATA ANALYSIS

5.1. Introduction

Chapter 5 and 6 will present the findings of the data analysis. Chapter 5 deals with the curriculum content analysis: the alignment and/or misalignment between the intentions of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) and the stated activities in the different sections of The Guide, leading into how PWA is represented in The Silken Knot and the Reading & Literature book. This will be followed by the findings from interviews with eight Lower-Secondary School principals who were involved in implementing the approach from the beginning of the new curriculum.

Chapter 6 deals with observations of lessons presented by a small group of selected teachers teaching writing through the Process Writing Approach in grade seven, the analysis of their explanations of how and why they implemented the 2006 innovation and the analysis of comments on the typicality of the observed lessons by another small group of teachers.

5.2. The Guide

There was a complete revision of the English curriculum from grades pre-primary (PP) to grade twelve between 2003 and 2008. The actual writing of the curriculum was done in stages: beginning with grades eleven and twelve, nine and ten in 2004, five to eight in 2006, and concluding with grades PP to four. The English Curriculum Guide for Teachers was then published for each grade level for the English teachers in Bhutan (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a).

The 2006 curriculum responded to the twelve 2003 recommendations of the Ministry of Education (see Appendix T), following two local studies which reported on the passivity that the Bhutanese students displayed in the classroom and the limited
opportunities in practising speaking, writing and reading in English provided for them. *The Guide* states that the main change to the curriculum was to move away from teacher-centered classroom instruction to a more learner-centered approach. The teacher role was intended to shift towards that of facilitator and students were to be actively engaged in their own learning. This is interesting in light of the contemporary failure of the broadly similar New Approach to Primary Education (NAPE), to which earlier reference has been made. *The Guide* seeks to provide a balanced approach that consists of both teachers’ input and students’ participation. It contains “a description of the materials for each strand; justifications or rationales for each piece of literature, and suggested activities for each strand” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xii).

Figure 5.1 shows how the different components of *The Guide* are organized.

---

**Organisational Chart**

[Diagram showing the organisational chart for the Guide]

*Figure 5.1. Organizational Chart for the Guide adapted from (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006, p. XVIII)*

The general introduction to the *The Guide* starts with a brief history of English in the schools of Bhutan before moving on to a fairly conventional division of language into
four strands. The four strands are specified as: Reading & Literature, Writing, Listening & Speaking, and Language. The specific Foreword to each of the four strands provide the principles used for choosing materials and the approaches adopted for developing that particular strand. The Standards represent the overall aim of what the students are expected to accomplish at the end of grade twelve which are presented in The Guide and also in a separate document called The Silken Knot (refer to Appendix U). Each standard is elaborated as set of objectives for a particular class level (refer to Appendix V for grade seven). The specific objectives are followed by a set of activities and materials. A weekly Timeline is also proposed to ensure that each strand gets its share of time allocated. Assessment methods for each strand are included as appendices in The Guide.

A systematic analysis of the The Guide was conducted to investigate the constructive alignment of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) and teaching English in grade seven. The analysis began with Writing as that is the main focus of this study and then considered the Reading & Literature sequence.

5.3. The Key Principles of PWA

The foreword and introduction to writing in The Guide emphasises writing as a process of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing to discover what a student wants to communicate. These sections of the document present writing as a skill. Writing is intended to be taught and practised using the Process Writing Approach. Therefore, students are expected to write many drafts before a final copy is written (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a).

The other characteristics of the approach were tagged under different themes using the Nvivo coding facility. Then the different themes as displayed under each node were copied manually onto a table. The researcher went back to The Guide and re-read it to
clarify the meaning of each theme, which was then summarised sometimes using the exact words from the text to avoid changing the meaning.

Table 5.1. The Key principles: what they mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key principles</th>
<th>Meaning…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing Process is recursive not linear</td>
<td>The process does not take place in a fixed line of steps - can move back and forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Writers are idiosyncratic</td>
<td>Writing is individualistic - no two people write in the same manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The role of the teacher</td>
<td>Guide or facilitator, motivator, to expose students to different stages or strategies of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The role of the students</td>
<td>Find strategies which best works for them, take ownership of their writing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conferences</td>
<td>Informal conferences - asks a student to read what he has written - the teacher comments on what is working well asks questions about content that is not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) regular teacher-led conferences</td>
<td>One writer reads - other students respond by pointing out things which are not clear and ask questions The writer writes and incorporates the changes Initial conferences - do not deal with mechanics of writing, this comes in editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) self-selected peer conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation</td>
<td>Both on the product and process Bulk of the evaluation - on the final product A sample of rubric, credit for both process and product is suggested (refer appendix G) Indicated - most weight be given to the product</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different themes that emerged and what they mean are presented in Table 5.1, which suggests that PWA should be regarded in the following manner.

5.3.1. Recursive versus linear.

The writing process is regarded as being recursive not linear, made up of different steps (planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing) that are not fixed points in a linear sequence. Therefore, writers may move forward and backwards through these steps in
their individual ways: writers are idiosyncratic and have individual ways and no two writers can be expected to write in the same manner.

5.3.2. Role of the teacher.

The role of the teacher is specified to be guide or facilitator. The job of the teacher “is to expose students to the stages of writing and to the many strategies that writers use to make their writing say what they want to say” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 135). Students are intended to discover tactics which work best for them and incorporate them in their writing. Gradually, as students write more, they learn about their own writing process and are expected to take ownership of their writing by drafting many times until they produce the final copy.

5.3.3. Conferencing.

Conferencing during writing is also one of the aspects of PWA. Both teacher-led and peer conferences are highlighted in this approach. In the teacher led conference, initially, in an informal manner, the teacher asks a student what has been written, and comments on what is working well in regard to the content. Other conferences, such as self-selected peer conferences, are indicated as being effective as students can open up and share their writing for giving and getting feedback from their friends. In a self-selected peer conference, one writer reads and the other students respond by pointing out things which are not clear and ask questions. Then the writers incorporate the changes in their writing. For both teacher-led and peer conferencing it is suggested that in the initial conferences the mechanics of writing should not be addressed, this comes in editing conferences.

5.3.4. Writers’ Workshop.

The Guide proposes that a Writers’ Workshop be employed in the writing activities to introduce students to the Process Writing Approach. All the tenets of the PWA are expected to be introduced to the students through a ten day Writers’ Workshop. This
workshop involves the whole class and the teacher in writing for ten writing classes doing prewriting activities, drafting, redrafting, editing, and publishing. The students will also experience shared and discussion about their writing by participating in teacher-led and peer conferences.

5.3.5. Use PWA for all genres.

Finally The Guide indicates that it is important when students are familiar with the approach it is expected to be used for writing in all genres. Thus, the different genres presented in The Reading and Literature book are intended to serve as models for student writing.

5.3.6. Evaluation.

In the evaluation stage, teachers are to consider both the process and product of students’ writing. Focus on the students’ participation in the various writing roles is mentioned as necessary to make the ten-day Writers’ Workshop more effective and evaluate students’ participation (for details see section 5.4.2).

The Process Writing Approach occupies a large part of the rationale in the Bhutanese English curriculum for teaching writing. Six and half of the nine pages of foreword and introduction state the importance of PWA, describe its different features and explain how the approach should be introduced to the students. Using a query facility of text search in NVivo confirms that the words “Process Writing” appear one hundred and twenty two times, representing 38.95% of the Foreword and Introduction text.

5.4. Alignment and Coverage of PWA

5.4.1. Alignment of standards/objectives and the set activities.

An examination of the writing standards in The Silken Knot reveals that PWA is presented as one out of the eight standards for writing (see Appendix U). The eight writing standards were further elaborated into thirteen specific learning objectives on
The researcher specified these thirteen learning objectives into nine main areas of writing focus: starting from building on the earlier writing strategies, teaching grammar and language, skills of taking notes, use of dictionary and thesaurus for learning spelling and meaning, using figurative speech for writing poems, writing different genres, write for thinking and learning, making a portfolio by choosing the best writings, responding to examination /assignments/homework questions. The last objective is to enjoy writing by participating in a writing community, which presumably means at least the Writers’ Workshop as suggested in the Introduction and Foreword of *The Guide*.

**Table 5.2. Specification of the listed Learning objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning objectives</th>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Mistakes in numbering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>Earlier writing strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>Spell correctly the words they are using</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>Grammar, Use punctuations, Coherent paragraphs + compound and complex sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>Use of Dictionary and thesaurus to spell correctly and for word meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>Take notes to prepare reports/summaries/complete information transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>Use of Dictionary and thesaurus to spell correctly and for word meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>Writing poem using figurative speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 8</td>
<td>Write for range of purposes and different forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 9</td>
<td>Writing for thinking and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 10</td>
<td>Portfolio making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 11</td>
<td>Responding to examination Questions Assignments/homework Participating in a community of writers</td>
<td>No. 12 missing No 13 is as 12 No 14 as 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Table 5.2 displays a spread of focuses including PWA as mentioned in learning
objective 14, a thorough and closer look at these listed learning objectives reveals that there is a mismatch in sequencing or numbering the learning objectives. The learning objective which states “Enjoy writing by participating in a community of writers’ (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 135) specifically means to conduct the initial ten day Writers’ Workshop for teachers to introduce students to the different aspects of PWA so that students continue to take part in writing activities. However, this apparently preliminary activity appears as the final objective, learning objective 14.

There are apparent typographical errors in the list of learning objectives on page 134 of *The Guide*. Number 12 is missing making 13 as 12 and 14 as 13 thus making number 13 as the last objective when it is actually 14 (See Appendix V).

The objectives are repeated in the next section starting from page 141 of *The Guide*, followed by set activities but there were no set activities for objectives 11, 12, 13 and 14 (see Table 5.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3. The objectives that were numbered wrongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectives on page 134 of <em>The Guide</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: spell correctly the words they are using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 8: Writing poems using figurative speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of suggested activities reduces the likelihood of teacher focus on conducting Writers’ Workshops; choosing the best examples of a student’s own writing; learning how to respond to examination or assignment questions; and portfolio making.

Some mistakes in numbering the specific objectives were also observed causing mismatches between the listed objectives on page 134 and the objectives followed by the set activities in the following section of *The Guide*. 
Further investigation of the objectives and the set activities section of The Guide revealed the Process Writing Approach listed under objective 8 as a type of writing along with other types of writing (such as Explanations, Summary, Resume) rather than as an approach to teaching writing. This mistake appears in the first edition and repeated in later editions of The Guide).

Learning objective 8: Write for a range of purposes and audiences using a variety of forms encountered in their reading including, explanations, summaries, resume, reports and fantasy.

Many activities in the Reading and Literature strand require writing for the purposes and audiences listed above. The teacher should take note of these purposes and ensure that each of these types of writing is done sometime during the year.

- Writing process approach
- Explanations
- Summary
- Resume
- Reports
- Fantasy-fiction writing – imaginative-features

(Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 182)

There is no clear information provided on how to implement PWA. It is left to the teachers to individually interpret and implement the approach. The analysis of The Guide displayed that while the Process Writing Approach is emphasized strongly in the Foreword and the Introduction of the Writing section of The Guide, the specific learning objectives and set activities for writing mainly focus on teaching grammar and developing language. There is very little emphasis on PWA. The intentions of teaching PWA as mentioned in the Introduction and Foreword do not align with the objectives and set activities in the Bhutanese English Curriculum.

### 5.4.2. PWA Alignment in the evaluation and assessment.

The introduction to the writing section of The Guide suggests that evaluation of students’ writing focus both on the process and product, proposing evaluation to “focus on how well they [students] learned their roles when teachers teach Writers’ Workshop
(Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 137). A sample rubric for writing, suggested as giving credit to both process and product, is supposedly provided as Appendix G to the document. However, that Appendix G deals with “working with words” in the 2006 edition (see Appendix X) and “memoir writing” in the later editions (see Appendix Y). The sample rubric remains simply absent. Moreover, the assessment package (pp. 233-240) suggests allocation of only 15% for continuous assessment in which “process of work” is mentioned as one of five components. The actual writing process therefore has minimal emphasis in the overall assessment of student work. Importantly, the final writing product is the basis for student promotion to the next class level. The emphasis on PWA in the Foreword and Introduction seems poorly aligned with later assessment guidelines. Such misalignment within foundational written curricula provides little hope for alignment during program implementation.

5.4.3. **PWA in The Reading and Literature book and Reading and Literature section of The Guide.**

*The Guide* emphasizes that “writing and reading are reciprocal skills which strongly support one another” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. xxxi), so how PWA is represented in the *The Reading and Literature book* will indicate how other curriculum documents support PWA implementation. *The Reading and Literature book* is organized with a variety of texts under different themes such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Self:</th>
<th>Who am I?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>My world:</td>
<td>Relationship &amp; family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>Our Community:</td>
<td>What matters in our world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>Our global community:</td>
<td>Living together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>Reaching beyond:</td>
<td>Courage and heroism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>Reaching beyond:</td>
<td>Media and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Reading and Literature book* suggests a process that consists of different stages of reading: pre-reading, guided reading, responding to reading, felt response and text to life connection. Unlike Process Writing, clear instructions are provided for teaching reading.
The timed activities are explained in detail describing the roles for both teachers and students.

A detailed analysis of the Reading and Literature section of *The Guide* displays 17 writing activities as follow up to the reading texts. Five of the 17 writing activities are aligned with Process Writing Approach. A closer observation of the activities reveals only briefly mention of PWA. There are no detailed instructions provided as to how to carry out PWA in the classroom. This lack is apparent from the two activities provided below.

**Activity 4: Speaking formally (synthesis) 50 minutes**

Teachers will ask students to write a three-minute speech on a global issue they feel strongly about. Teachers will direct students to follow the Writing Process. Teachers will explain that a Formal Speech is longer and requires more preparation than an informal talk and that students should follow these basic steps in the writing of their speech:

1. Know your audience (your classmates) and write to them.
2. Select a topic that is narrow enough to cover in the time allotted - (three minutes).
3. Define your purpose – (to persuade, inform, or entertain)
4. Gather your material and information.
5. Organize your material and information.
6. Practise your presentation several times.
7. Deliver the speech to your class.

Teachers will direct students to both deliver their speeches orally and add their written version to their portfolio (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 65)

**Activity 4: Story Writing (synthesis) [45 minutes]**

The teacher will ask students to write a story based on the poem. Students can expand on the ballad as written, write its prequel, or write its sequel. Teachers will remind students about the features of story writing (see Glossary). Students will be instructed to follow the Writing Process (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 76).
The Reading and Literature section of *The Guide* appears to assume student familiarity with Process Writing Approach to writing and further that they are able to apply it to writing different genres after reading different proposed texts.

A cross-check with *The Reading and Literature book* (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006b) shows most of the pre-reading activities involve brain-storming sessions where the teacher gets students to talk and share their opinion on a particular topic of the text. As follow up activities after reading the text students are encouraged to do a similar type of writing. Such brainstorming on a topic which leads to a writing task connects to the first step of the Process Writing Approach as it is one of the strategies for planning to write. However, when it comes to the writing part, there are no detailed instructions on how to write using the process approach.

To summarize, although PWA has been taken up as the major approach for teaching writing in the introduction and foreword of *The Guide*, there are no specific set instructions presented either in the Reading section of *The Guide* or in the *Literature and Reading book*. This might reduce the incentive for teachers to implement the proposed approach.

### 5.5. Findings of the Initial Interview

Participating principals were interviewed about how they have experienced the proposed change, the problems and the factors that influenced the implementation of Process Writing Approach and how they have responded and reacted to the experience. The interview data is categorised with a focus on the research questions:

- Teachers’ reflection on the training received
- Understanding of the innovation
- Summary of principals’ reflection on training
- Working with *The Guide*,

Positive Attitudes and Initiatives

Challenges faced with PWA

Effective Aspects of PWA

5.5.1. Principals’ reflection on the training.

An examination of the principals’ reflection on the training that they have received for teaching PWA reveals a divided opinion with both positive and negative feelings. The three principals who received only an orientation to the new curriculum expressed negative feelings. The common negative views on the orientation course were that it was extremely brief, it only provided some basic ideas on the usage of The Guide, it tried to broadly cover as many topics as possible within the limited time so that it lacked focus and that it was inadequately facilitated.

... the orientation I feel is not enough because we were 200, more than 200 English teachers from six dzongkhags (districts). There were only 5 or 6 facilitators. They could hardly break us into smaller groups for proper orientation. Of course we grasped a few things but more is needed when we have such programs [P 3, p. 2].

The principal who only participated in the Writers’ Workshop suggested that the course was not related to teaching PWA:

No I didn’t go for training but I attended the Writers’ Workshop. It was for class nine and ten. We were basically selecting texts for essays. So actually I didn’t get training in writing process in the new curriculum. It was just that I went for text collection [P 1, p. 1]

These principals also noted that not all English teachers had an opportunity to attend the workshops and orientations. Only a few teachers from each school attended the workshops. These teachers were then expected to return to the schools and pass on information gained from the workshops to the other teachers in the schools through a School Based In-service Program. However, these subsequent school sessions only lasted one or two hours and the participating principals mentioned that this was a very short period for passing on all the required information.
And the Ministry takes it for granted that “Oh these teachers are trained.” I think that is not fair. I think each individual to ...I think curriculum to be successful, all the English teachers should be trained. Then only we can carry out the new English curriculum effectively. If things are taken for granted people are doing things in their own ways. So I think that’s the problem. We are not trained in process writing not even in our training colleges so we just carry on what we feel is right. We try to design our own activities and make the children do. That’s all [P 1, p. 7]

All eight of these principals suggested that more training be given to the teachers

... because in the schools when we [teachers] teach with small, limited knowledge, it is difficult to impart what we [teachers] are supposed to teach, ... so we [teachers] need more workshops” [P 2, p. 2].

However, the principals who received both the orientation to the new curriculum and a Writers’ Workshop made more positive comments. These principals suggested that receiving the orientation helped them in getting clear information on the overall structure and organisation of the curriculum such as the set standards, activities and the assessment and that the Writers’ Workshop helped them implement PWA. As exemplified below:

I really got experiences and it really did help me because I knew how to use it [PWA & The Guide]. For instance I knew how to go about writing and writing process ... because I already have the idea about the organogram, organization, structure of the English curriculum, how it is structured, the standard and the activities and the assessments and all these. So I was confident while teaching [P 7, p. 1]

Similar views were shared by the other two principals that the orientation program assisted in knowing what is expected from the curriculum in general; and the Writers’ Workshop helped specifically in teaching PWA. According to Principal 6:

Actually the orientation helped me how to go about...the expectation of the new curriculum and ... in implementing the new curriculum...before that when I heard there is a new curriculum I was worried how to go about but this workshop for ten days made me better. Prior to this I attended the Writers’ Workshop in Phuentsholing. During that [Writers’ Workshop] we were taken through the writing process so for me writing process is not a new concept. I implemented and found it quite good [P 6, pp. 1-2].
5.5.2. Principals’ understanding of the concept.

The principals involved in this study demonstrated different levels of understanding of the PWA concept. Although most of them exhibited their understanding of the Process Writing Approach as being associated with making of multiple drafts, the principals who attended the Writers’ Workshop demonstrated clearer knowledge of the concept, displaying higher levels of competency and confidence on the subject. On the other hand, those who received only the orientation and the one principal who did not receive any training exhibited low levels of understanding, as indicated by comments such as “Actually I am not sure about PWA, what I feel is students choose topics for writing…” [P 8, p. 1]. There was an indication that some teachers in schools still had doubts about PWA as stated in one of the responses

...I think the English teachers in my schools also, they are not clear about the Writing Process Approach, what the curriculum guide says, and actually the designed activities in the curriculum guide I am talking about... [P 1, p. 6].

5.5.3. Summary of the principals’ reflection on training.

The principals who shared positive feeling on the training were the ones who received both the orientation course and the Writers’ Workshop. The reasons why they have positive feelings were the relevance of the training. The orientation specifically helped the principals to get a clear overview of the curriculum structure and organisation. The Writers’ Workshop specifically included steps for implementing PWA. Conversely, the principals who shared negative feelings were those who received only a brief orientation. They pointed out the focus of the training was too broad, covering many topics. They pointed out that the orientation only slightly touched PWA without details discussed which created uncertainty in them about the process:

P 3 stated “it touched bit on PWA,”

P 5 “we discussed on some process” and
P 2 shared a similar view “only two sessions were kept for PWA”.

The principals who received both the orientation and Writers’ Workshop seem to be specifically organised for grade nine and ten and the single ten days orientation mainly for grades six and seven. This findings indicate that the suitability of training and sufficient time for teachers to absorb the new practice help teachers in implementing new educational practices. The responses also revealed good impact of adequate training to the understanding of PWA.

5.5.4. Use of The Guide.

Half of the principals used The Guide for teaching PWA, while the other half said they did not use it. The principals who attended only the orientation to the new curriculum used The Guide. These principals referred to The Guide for assistance when they were uncertain about PWA. One principal said that “…other than this [The Guide] in the remote corners we don’t get other sources” [P 1, p. 5]. However, if participants had no prior training on PWA they found understanding The Guide for teaching PWA difficult.

_I have to read through The Guide many times but as I did not attend the workshops, at times it was difficult for me even to understand The Guide to use The Guide. So I might not have used The Guide as desired by the writer, I might not have used it that way. I am still doubtful_ [P 8, p. 2].

On the other hand, the principals who received a Writers’ Workshop did not use The Guide for PWA. Instead they all used handouts from the workshop because they found the handouts easier to understand. As stated by one of the principals:

_I did not use The Guide as I already have enough materials on this writing. Basically they talk about the same thing but I do not go to The Guide because I have my own materials which are very simplified and easy to implement_ [P 6, p. 4].

Some of these principals who went through The Guide were of opinion that The Guide “…is in the form of a journal, I don’t think new teachers will be able to use it … it was not a problem for me for I already had workshops” [P 6, p. 3].
They also identified other factors such as mismatches between The Guide’s expectation and students’ level that made The Guide difficult to follow. This difficulty was particularly related to the schools located in the rural areas. One principal indicated that the students in her schools come from a diverse background of parents who are mostly “apple orchard care takers” and students do not receive any guidance on writing. She argues that students are still learning basic writing skills so their needs are “basic foundation” in writing and “The Guide expects a lot” [p. 2] from the students. Therefore, she neither uses The Guide, nor teaches writing through the process approach. Instead she teaches free writing where students simply write freely on a topic they like and then she corrects their work from the first draft itself. Therefore, there are no multiple drafts writing process taking place.

The principal participants who had no proper training in PWA made use of The Guide. However, without proper training they found understanding The Guide for teaching PWA challenging. One principal stated “it was difficult for me even to understand The Guide, and I might not have used The Guide as the author desired”. Another factor which challenged the teachers in using The Guide was the mismatch between The Guide’s expectations to the students’ level particularly in the rural schools. These findings suggest that proper training of the teachers not only helps them understand The Guide but it assists teachers in teaching. The findings also suggest the importance of contextual factors which are specific to different situations.

5.5.5. Positive attitudes/initiatives.

5.5.5.1. Positive attitudes.

Despite all the challenges reported, all the principals expressed positive views of PWA. Those who have received longer training (both the orientation and the Writers’ Workshop) reported on the positive impact of PWA on students’ writing. They shared a
common view that allowing students to follow the process of prewriting, drafting and redrafting helps students who have no confidence in writing:

*I find that this [PWA] is a very good practice, one of the ways for students to learn better because this process gives students to make mistakes and to correct their own mistakes and also to explore. It[writing] is not confined to their own knowledge...what the process does is this process gives them room to go out of their knowledge, ask experts, refer books, like correcting their own mistakes. So that is one of the characteristics which appeals to me* [P 4, p. 2]

Another Principal said that teaching PWA not only helps students but it helps the teacher while writing “*whenever I write I do not forget these steps...so in a way it is not only helping students, it helps teachers as well*” [P 6, p 9]. Another principal said that PWA helps him in identifying students who are weak and those who are good at writing. Knowing this helps him to assign work based on their level.

*So in a way when I follow this [PWA] I will know who are weak and then in the process of teaching I will know my students who are good in writing...if they are not good how many times they need to do redrafting....those students who are good...then move to next level.*[P 7, p2].

Additionally, even those principals who received a shorter duration of training and implemented the approach with uncertainty still displayed some interest in PWA, considering it to be a good approach:

*Process Writing Approach is very interesting first of all. Secondly it is helpful for our children but one thing I would like to put here is this writing should be continuously supported by the teachers. It should start from the lower classes, five, six onwards where children in small ways should start early so that by the time they reach seven, eight, nine, ten, so they will be good writers* [P 3 p. 5]

Another principal who said he failed in following the whole process stated that despite all the challenges he wants to try again, “*I think I have to see again because this is a process universally, internationally accepted; I have to try again once more*” [P 5, p 5]. The principal who clearly stated that she does not teach PWA at all also mentioned wanting to try it once her students’ level of English improves as she states “*...when this class reaches class eight...I will be using this [PWA]*” [P 1, p. 2]
5.5.5.2. Initiatives.

When the principals who had no prior training or received limited training faced problems in understanding *The Guide*, they reported taking a variety of initiatives.

Principal 5, who received only an orientation to the new curriculum, said:

*The Guide does not give us appropriate directions how to go about the lesson. I go to the internet for more information...sometimes it is very difficult to correlate with Bhutanese system-the internet information on PWA* [P 5, p. 2].

The same principal said he failed many times in implementing PWA: “*I tried many times and still I fail ...something is wrong with the process*” [P 5, p 4]. He said he is going to carry out an action research on PWA as a fulfilment of his M.Ed. course to find out why implementation failed. Principal 8 taught PWA because there was no one from his school confident to teach through the approach:

*... back in 2006, when the new curriculum came to existence, no teachers wanted to teach because they were not confident so I volunteered to teach. But I did not attend the workshop. I went to seek advice from the District Education Officer. He did some studies on this and he gave a part of his thesis that he did in Canada...he gave me some papers to read* [P 8, p. 1].

The same principal invited teachers from the neighbouring schools who have attended the Writers’ Workshops to conduct a school based in-service workshops in his school.

These Bhutanese principals appear to remain committed to the new approach, in spite of difficulties in its implementation.

5.6. Challenges with PWA

Eleven major themes emerged from the open coding of the interviews and the node for “challenges” in implementing PWA was the most prevalent node with 82 references from all the 8 sources (all the eight interviews).

Re-examination by breaking the “challenges” node into smaller nodes displayed several sub-themes (see Table 5.4. section 5.6.). Apart from the principal who said that she neither uses *The Guide* nor teaches PWA, the rest of the principals (including the one
who had no training) initially attempted to implement the innovation: they attempted to teach writing by the Process Approach.

The responses from the principals who received less training indicated that challenges emerged from the very beginning, arising from doubts about the meaning of the approach and facing difficulties in understanding *The Guide*.

### Table 5.4. The themes from the semi-structured interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main themes</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other documents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers concept on PWA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers’ existing beliefs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How teachers managed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching background</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Views on The Guide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Suggestions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers who had adequate training and started off quite confidently later faced various challenges such as a) Challenges faced in general, b) Challenges specific to location of schools.

#### 5.6.1. Challenges faced by the teachers in general.

**5.6.1.1. Time issues/large class size.**

The eight principals generally agreed that PWA occupied too much of their class time as teachers responsible for a large number of students are required to provide feedback on multiple drafts.

*Owing to the large number of students in the class, it was difficult for teachers to assess the work because writing process involves continuous process ... they write first draft then ... continuous for four or five steps until they come up with the final draft. So this was a problem for the teachers [P 3, p. 3].*
These interviews indicated that checking students’ writing and teachers giving individual feedback seems to play an important role in the Bhutanese classroom. Students become demotivated and lose interest in writing if their teacher does not correct or give feedback on their work. As one principal describes it:

*In my class there were 52 in class seven so it was quite difficult for me to correct everyone’s book and then when we fail to correct what I have noticed students do not take interest in writing. They feel that we are not correcting it and then what I did was just to encourage them in writing I divided them into ten groups and then from every group I made it a point to check at least two or four notebooks [P 8, p. 4]*

However, only checking some few selected students because of the large number of students and time constraint makes the students whose works is unchecked feel hurt or consider that the teacher is being partial.

*... my failure part is that doing justice of correcting all the papers. In Process Writing as far as the steps say we have to do drafting, editing, and we keep on editing till we get the expected result. And it is very difficult. I have done with a few selected students but I could do with all the children. And then when you don’t do with others then sometimes children, they feel biased... [P 2, p. 6].*

One principal pointed out that the English curriculum has proposed seven periods of 50 minutes for English in each week, a total of 350 mins. The school schedule allocates 40 minutes for each period meaning that all the other subjects are taught for 40 minutes. When all the other subjects are based on the old curriculum, the English staff compromise with other subject staff and the school time frame therefore teaching English for seven periods of 40 mins or 280 mins instead of 350, thus losing more than 1 hour every week. This exacerbates the time limitations on the implementation of the process approach to teaching writing.

5.6.1.2. Vast syllabus.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, in view of the last point, the principals indicated significant difficulty in finishing the set syllabus for English, when class time is devoted to process writing.
... in the past for three years I concentrated on the Process Writing. Then later on, those syllabuses are uncovered then we just left it for them [students] to read it... This year I could not do much or focus on Process Writing [P 2, p. 3].

Students’ assessment at the end of the year will be based on the syllabus which makes completing the syllabus more important than PWA. Otherwise, teachers get blamed if syllabus is not covered. As one principal states:

... because we have ... syllabus we have to cover, especially where there are board exams where the paper comes from external like BCSEA (Bhutan Council of Examinations and Assessment). So if the topics are not covered and if something comes from there then the teachers get the blame that we have not taught, the syllabus is not covered. ... because as we are expected to cover we won’t be able to do all these [PWA] because we also have to meet expected chapters to be covered in time [P 3, p. 4]

Most of the principals emphasised finishing the syllabus over carrying out PWA. Therefore, their responses indicated that PWA was implemented partially or with some alteration made to suit the context.

...the problem is already I told in the beginning one is because of the size of the class, next one is because there are also set course from the curriculum saying that you need to cover this much text in the whole year. So keeping in mind that we need to cover the prescribed syllabus, now certain activities --most of the activities could not be done properly because we have to aim for learning and as well as we have to aim for meeting the required number of texts to be read or completed by the end of the year [P 3, p. 6].

Most of the principals commented that they are not sure if intentions of the curriculum and the set activities align or not for PWA.

5.6.2. Challenges specific to location of schools.

5.6.2.1. School location & family background.

Most of the participants claimed that school location and family background play significant roles in implementing PWA. The background of urban parents differs from that of parents in rural schools. Therefore, implementation of PWA differs from urban to rural schools:

... Process Writing Approach when we teach, differs from place to place, background of the children that counts a lot the background of the children.
Where before I was teaching was urban, the children are from mixed background but at present where I am teaching at present are only rural background and there I find it very difficult to teach... even my previous teachers said... The educated parents’ children do much better than those who come from the villages ... [P 2, p. 3].

Most of the students located in the rural areas come from a society of low literacy in English language which affects students’ level of English. Since parents have very limited knowledge of literacy, students have no access to any reading and writing materials at home. Students cannot get any guidance on literacy in English from their parents. Thus students in the rural schools have lower levels of writing compared to the urban schools. This makes it difficult to implement PWA as *The Guide* expects more than what the children can cope with.

*My school, the catchment area is the workshop area and we have children coming from faraway places. Their parents are apple orchard caretakers and they don’t have any exposure. So I don’t expect much from them. What I do is I just let them do free writing. So from there I can see the progress in them. I don’t refer *The Guide* because *The Guide* expects a lot. So I don’t go according to it but I have my own style to implement the writing process* [P 1, p. 1]

This is also pointed out as why principal 1 is not teaching PWA:

*I feel that my children in my school as I told you their parents are not educated, they are not exposed to reading materials and they don’t practice writing at home and I think it is difficult for them* [P 1, p. 1]

### 5.6.2.2. Peer conference issues: schools in the rural.

Conducting peer conferences was the most dominant sub node under the node for “challenges”. There are five people from the rural areas and three from the urban schools participating in this group of principals. However, all most all have experienced working both in the urban and rural schools (see Table 4.1. section 4.5.1). Thus, seven out of the eight participants emphasised the problem in conducting peer conference in Bhutanese classrooms because of students’ culture, particularly in rural schools. There were no significant variances between the different districts. The differences to be noted were
related to location of the schools in the rural and urban. Since each district contains both urban and rural areas, the main factors identified as issues were with the rural Bhutanese students and they are as displayed below:
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**Figure 5.2. Factors affecting PWA in the rural schools**

Issues in implementing PWA specific to rural schools are expressed by several principals:

...when we teach Process Writing Approach, it differs from place to place, background of the children counts a lot. Where I was teaching before was urban and at present is rural... I find it very difficult to teach here, family does not support, they have no habit of reading and writing, other teachers have same problems...[P 2, p3].

At this stage peer-conference is not effective mainly because first of all they are not very comfortable with English. And secondly they are shy ...not able to give critical comments because they are not trained... So peer conferencing is not effective ...it is not effective. [P 3, p 7].

When I was in school X, remote and there students have English language problem...confidence to do conferencing is a problem. That is my two years’ experience in that school that students are usually very shy...[P 7, p 8].

The students in the rural are, you know shy and they shy away. They don’t show their work. For instance children try to hide their writing with their
hands because they are really scared of showing their weakness to others [P 8, p 6].

A number of teachers argued that conducting peer conferences in the rural schools was more difficult than in the urban schools. The urban students with their better level of English were more open and less shy to take part in the peer conference. However, teacher-led conference seemed to work better in the rural schools as one principal stated:

Teacher-led is okay when teacher discusses the students take interest and they concentrate and give serious thoughts but when it comes to peer-conference, our Bhutanese ---now when I say Bhutanese we should have some exceptions but most of the children in our Bhutanese classrooms when we say peer-conferences, they don’t take it very seriously...it might take time for doing peer conference especially in the remote corners. If it is in the urban areas like in Thimphu and Paro [P 2, p 8].

Making multiple drafts by drafting and redrafting was found to be another difficult aspect of Process Writing. This group of principals suggested that this might be caused by a number of factors such as time constraints and lack of student experience and interest leading to reluctance to participate. For example one principal said “I feel students find it very monotonous and are not much interested. So by considering this, I don’t keep continuous writing classes” (P 1, p. 8). Another principal explained it by saying “Our children are not used to this writing and editing, even if we take the first draft and give it back to them to write, they are reluctant to do this [drafting]...” (P 3, pp. 2-3).

5.7. Effective Aspects of PWA

5.7.1. Prewriting.

Most of the principals claimed that the most effective aspect of PWA was the prewriting activity.

...prewriting activities and first drafting they do now till here it is easy because they keep on writing but when it comes to redrafting and editing, from here the struggling and problem arises from here...we find it difficult drafting and redrafting, it takes lot of time. Sometimes we don’t like to go ahead with all these... [P 2, p. 7]
Therefore, they indicated that most of them carry out the prewriting and the first draft of writing, a partial implementation of the PWA.

As soon as they get a topic and then what I did was, the whole process which is given in The Guide book is not followed in the classroom. What I did was, it was very much time consuming, and actually it was not practical if we do the whole process what is given in The Guide book in the classroom. So it was not possible, what I did was I just helped them in getting their topic and then get going with their first draft was in the classroom and then the second draft how to go about I ask them to do it at home as a homework, whenever they get free time. I did not force them…[P 4, p.5].

From the interviews, it appears that the whole process of PWA is not implemented in the current practice of teaching writing in these Bhutanese classrooms. They have applied their own writing instruction strategies which they considered appropriate to the needs of the students and particularly suitable for their own situation. Although most of them reported using a prewriting activity for planning and writing the first draft, teachers have reverted to correcting and giving feedback with the first shot of writing rather than making multiple copies or having peer conferences as The Guide suggests. This is evident from the statement of one of the principals who received both the training and started very positive in the beginning [P 6].

Actually first prewriting after the brainstorming and then they do the first writing. Then I ask them to submit to me and I correct...drafting, redrafting, again to make so many drafts is problematic to do because we cannot edit their work somehow and if peer do but it’s quite difficult because they don’t find the mistakes of their friend. And in a way that part is neglected [P 6, p. 6].

Some teachers stated giving direct input on PWA and asking students to practise if they are interested.

Then what I did is just give them the concept of how to go about it the Process Writing. And give them opportunity to if they want to learn about Process Writing I tell them to come, those who are interested only. I could do with the whole class. A few from 200 about 2 or 3 turn up. They take interest in Process Writing [P 8, p. 6]
5.8. Conclusion

This chapter has presented findings of the curriculum documentary analysis that generally revealed mismatches between the stated official intentions for teaching PWA and other equally mandatory documentation, both within the *The Guide* and also across other supporting curriculum documents. It has also presented the findings of a series of semi-structured interviews with a group of Lower Secondary principals. The findings reveal several challenges that the principals faced in the initial implementation of PWA and different strategies these principals used to cope with the challenges. The findings from Phases 3 and 4 will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX - FINDINGS OF THE VIDEO-RECORDED LESSONS AND THE INTERVIEWS

6.1. Introduction

The third data source for this study was video recordings of a small number of grade seven teachers who were implementing PWA. This chapter presents observations from these lessons and the comments those teachers made about their own practice. This is followed by a description of how three other teachers who teach in similar contexts commented on the culture and typicality of teaching PWA. The chapter concludes with an intercultural comparison between the key themes which emerged as characteristics of PWA and Bhutanese teachers’ classroom observations and comments. The comparison makes use of Hofstede’s (2001) concepts of national cultural difference.

6.2. Video-recording Observation

6.2.1. Location of the schools.

Three schools were selected from Chukka district in Southern Bhutan. Chukka is a predominantly rural district and the schools chosen were from its rural area. This was in direct response to the findings of the previous phase, which indicated that rural schools had greatest difficulty in implementing the innovation. Rural schools where the teachers were attempting to use PWA five years after its introduction should be particularly evocative of salient features of implementation of foreign borrowings across cultural boundaries. Three schools were chosen, rather than only one, to expose more issues related to teaching of PWA in an explicit way. Care was been taken to select schools where students’ families were mostly illiterate as the earlier interviews with school principals suggested that implementing PWA was most difficult in such contexts. Classes where the attempt was still being made five years after the innovation was supposedly
mandatory were thought to be particularly illuminative. The teacher in School 3 had already taught writing through the process approach to his grade seven class when he taught them in grade six. The teachers in Schools 1 and 2 were introducing the approach to their grade seven classes without any assumption of previous experience with it. School 2 began at grade seven and so the students in that teacher’s class came from a variety of feeder schools. School 1 included lower grades but that teacher was not confident of the students’ prior experience and so also introduced the approach with assumptions.

The parents of these three schools were from diverse backgrounds. School 1: Parents from the Royal Bhutan Army; School 2: Parents forming part of nomad families; and School 3: Parents were either nomads or labourers. To re-iterate: previous phases of this investigation have indicated that schools such as these were most problematic for the introduction of the Process Writing Approach and yet these three teachers had persevered with an innovation based on poorly aligned documentation five years after its inception. The context should be highly illuminative of cross national borrowing in situations of sharp cultural contrast.

6.2.2. Bhutanese classroom factors.

6.2.2.1. Number of students and classroom setting.

6.2.2.1.1. Video-recording 1 in school 1 (T1).

The videotaped lesson in school 1 revealed about 50 students entering a big room carrying their own chairs. There was a chalkboard and some old chart papers on the wall from a previous lesson. Surprisingly, although all the students carried an exercise book and a pen each, there were no tables or desks for the students to write on and the students sat in rows one behind the other.
6.2.2.1.2. Video-recording 2 in school 2 (T 2).

T 2 entered the classroom where about 40 students sat in rows one behind the other with long writing desks in front of them. The students sat on long benches. The room was quite spacious but the long writing desks where students kept their books on top looked congested with students jammed in. Some of the students sat back and some leaned front with their elbows resting on the desks in the overcrowded space.

6.2.2.1.3. Video-recording 3 in school 3 (T 3).

T 3 entered the class where about 50 students were sitting in rows behind long writing desks. The furniture with long writing desks made students sit in a congested manner, similar to School 2, although the classroom looked quite spacious.

The videotaped lessons supported the findings of the initial interviews that there were 40-50 students in each class. Generally students sat in long rows in all three classrooms. This seemed to be because of the long writing desks and the benches which seemed to control students’ sitting arrangement as in case of T 2 and T 3’s classroom. The style of furniture made the students sit in clustered rows making students’ movement more difficult in forming groups for discussion to take place and for teachers to get easy access to help individual students. The physical size of the classrooms was not an issue; they were spacious with big space between the chalk board and the students’ seats.

However, the video-recording 1 of T 1 revealed that even without the long desks and benches students still sat in rows. When this part of the video was shown to seek for explanation, the teacher explained that he was introducing the different aspects of PWA in his lesson and the school library was used instead of the classroom that’s why students carried their own chairs from their classroom. The library was used for this particular lesson because he needed to use the overhead projector (OHP) to show students all the different stages of PWA and explain what they were. The details of these lessons are
described in Section 6.2.4. Observation of this lesson indicated that not only the classroom furniture controlled students’ seating arrangement but the teacher’s teaching method also directed how students sat.

6.2.3. Culture related factors.

6.2.3.1. Teacher-Student Relationship.

The next parts of the videotaped lessons revealed the relationship between the teacher and the students and their roles. It captured a strong hierarchal teacher-student relationship which was contrary to the teacher acting as a facilitator and students taking charge of their own writing as the PWA proposes.

Students became very quiet as soon as any of the teachers entered the classroom; they all stood up at once and wished the teachers “good morning” in one voice. The teachers returned the greeting and students sat down as the teachers instructed. Students listened to teacher instructions and remained very quiet. One such example was very clear from the transcript given below. The teacher said:

...before we move on to today’s main topic, I want you to listen to me. I will ask you two questions. What do you write? And what would you like to write when you are given a chance to write? [T puts her finger on her mouth signalling students to be quiet]. I will write the questions on the board. Please take out your notebooks. [Students take out books] Please copy the questions. To answer these two questions you will be getting five minutes okay. This is individual work [T 2, p. 1].

This was observed as a common practice in all the three schools. Observation revealed teachers being very polite and friendly with the students by using “please” while getting students to do some tasks and “thank you” after a task was completed. However, there was a strong hierarchal distance between the teachers and the students. Teachers instructed students on everything and students followed instructions by remaining quiet. This was observed on numerous occasions even outside the class when teachers passed by, students immediately stood up and bowed down to show their respect.
Observation in all the three lessons revealed that teacher often asked questions to the whole class and the class responded with answers in chorus. Individual students talked only in response to the teacher questions or to read what they written.

6.2.3.2. **Introducing PWA (similarities).**

There were some similarities in the steps involved in introducing the three lessons observed from the video clips. The recorded lessons of T 1 and T 2 revealed that both the teachers began the lesson by briefly discussing the different types of writing and different texts. They asked students “what do you write?” and then followed the same procedure of verbally naming some different texts such as “letters, poems, summary and stories”. After that, both the teachers also discussed the various steps involved for a daily activity: T1 discussed the process involved for “cooking rice” and T 2 the process involved in “taking leave from school”. Then both the teachers related these processes to process of writing. This fitted with how PWA was done because the teachers pointed out that there was a process for any activity as discussed for cooking and taking leave, similarly any kind of writing also has a process.

When the edited versions of the recorded lessons were shown back to the observed teachers themselves to seek for their explanation of their action, they said they always introduced a new concept by relating to something familiar to the students as they did with PWA. This was what one of them said:

> In order to make the topic clear, easy and understandable I tried to link with some examples like cooking rice. Everybody including a small child to big, they have seen how the parents cook at home. So in order to show that everything has a process like the topic of writing process, I have given the process of cooking as example so ... there is process in everything [T 1, p. 1].

T2 pointed out that the group of grade seven students at School 2 were new to the school. Since the teacher was not sure if the students were taught PWA in the previous school or not, the teacher introduces all the tenets of PWA. The observations and teachers’
explanation above indicated that Bhutanese teachers introduce new topics or concepts particularly PWA by relating the new concept to a familiar topic or a daily event.

Although all the above observations revealed similarities of the recorded lessons, a number of distinguishable differences were observed in how teachers teach the different stages of PWA. These differences included how T 1 and T 2 introduced PWA to new students and how T 3 applied PWA in the writing lesson.

6.2.4. Teacher differences on teaching PWA.

6.2.4.1. T1 introduced PWA within 45 minutes.

T 1 introduced his students to the different stages of PWA by explaining all the stages in detail within a period of 45 minutes in the following manner.

On the overhead projector T 1 displayed all the five different steps of PWA:

- Prewriting(Thinking)
- Drafting (Write)
- Revising (Make it better)
- Proofreading(editing, make it correct)
- Publishing (Share the product)

Then each step was displayed on the overhead projector systematically starting with the Prewriting as presented below:

Step 1-Prewriting, followed by five bullet points:

- Decide on your topic,
- Consider who will read or listen to your written work
- Brainstorm ideas about the subject
- List places you can do your research for information
- Do your research

T 1 went over each bullet points one by one explaining in detail with examples. Students sat listening to the teacher without doing anything besides nodding their head indicating
agreement to what the teacher was saying. T 1 read the first point and explained it in the following manner:

Before we write anything we have to think okay. So decide on a topic. As soon as the teacher asks you to write, don’t write. As soon as the teacher gives you the work, think what you want to write. There are so many topics, isn’t it? You can write about a girl, you can write about a boy, you can write about a teacher. First decide about the topic, think about the topic. The prewriting is to think....[T 1, p. 1]

The teacher continued explaining all the five stages of writing process following the same approach. Thus, the lesson ended after 45 minutes. A handout of the power points was given to each pair of students. The teacher then asked students to use this process when they do their different types of writing. Somewhat surprisingly, students did not do any writing throughout the whole lesson.

6.2.4.2. T2 Focus on one aspect.

T 2 displayed all the five different stages of writing process on a chart but she did not explain all the different stages of PWA like T 1 did. T 2 informed the students that there about the five main stages of writing process. Then she picked the first aspect of PWA, the prewriting activity and started explaining and demonstrating how was carried out. The teacher listed all the different strategies involved for prewriting activity. Each strategy was demonstrated, such as how to carry out brain storming, jotting down ideas and webbing the ideas. Then students were involved in choosing a topic and carrying out the same steps as the teacher has demonstrated.

Each teacher introduced PWA in a slightly different way. One teacher introduced all the five stages of PWA by explaining each stage in detail and students listened to the teacher’s explanation instead of practising writing. Another teacher picked up one stage to explain and demonstrate how to carry it out and students followed instructions and carried out the prewriting activity. None of these teachers followed The Guide to use the Writers’ Workshop to introduce the different stages of PWA. Each teacher used a slightly
different way in introducing the different stages of PWA. However, the degree of control maintained by all three of these teachers over their students was quite obvious from how the students remained quiet and followed each instruction without questions.

6.2.5. Reasons for differences.

Several reasons were given by the teachers for their classroom practices. All the teachers explained that, although *The Guide* suggests spending ten writing classes “in prewriting activities, drafting, redrafting editing and publishing” (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a, p. 134) to introduce students to the different stages of writing process through a Writers’ Workshop, local time limitations made such a workshop impractical. T 1 presented all the information within a period of 45 minutes because this way saved time to finish the syllabus.

...as what the curriculum demands for one process to be carried out on a daily bases...I have not followed...we face a lot of problems. Firstly it takes a long time and secondly we have to cover syllabus, the syllabus is very vast...

[T 1, p. 2]

The reason for not doing the peer conferencing in his class is that T 1 said:

Peer conferencing is impossible it becomes very noisy...they will be engrossed in other talks than the topic...I don’t like let students to be free as whole class because one thing is the noise level...it become very high and eventually we have to be answerable to the school head. That is the reason I don’t have whole class have peer conference

[T 1, p. 4]

Similarly T 2 explained that she demonstrated only prewriting because “it takes more time...” and doing peer conferencing cannot happen because “students are same level and their content knowledge is of quite similar level ...so end product is always visited by the teacher”.[p. 3].

These teachers had persisted with the mandated innovation but they did not use the Writers’ Workshop as *The Guide* suggests, they used their own method and as a result there were differences in the how teachers introduced PWA to their students.
6.2.6. PWA applied in writing lesson.

T 3 did not introduce his lesson this way. According to the teacher he already introduced PWA to this group of students while they were in grade six. Therefore, the students were presumably familiar with the whole process.

The steps of using the writing process for writing were comparatively faster and more spontaneous in this class. The teacher informed the students that they would be writing a poem. He simply mentioned each step one by one and students performed tasks like listing down topics of interest, choosing one topic they like to write about, brainstorming and jotting down ideas on the topic. The teacher also asked the students to write the first draft and then exchange their books with the next desk partner. The students looked at each other’s book, circled some word with spelling mistakes and then returned the books to each other. The teacher encouraged students to write the final copy by saying “now you can see the circles, yes? The spelling mistakes and all, you correct them and write a fair copy at the back of your page.” The students started to write again incorporating the words circled by their friends. The teacher asked a few volunteers to read their writing to the whole class. The class listened while a boy read a short poem about “life” and a girl on the topic “when I grow up.” The students carried out all the PWA steps within the 45 minute period. The students who could not finish were asked to complete the work at home. They were reminded to take care with the language and spelling and then to put their writing in their portfolio when finished.

T 1 explained that he made his students follow the steps one after another without taking much time although:

... we were suppose to take longer time, actually we are suppose to take ten classes to follow up this whole process but I just took a period and did everything in a period because mainly the reason that they[students] are all familiarised with the process. And the time available for a teacher is also a factor that compels us do all the process in one period. It is because of time
and number of students, it is very hard. .. to cover the syllabus... minimising the number of periods ... I can focus on the syllabus” [T 1, p. 3]

However, apart from what the other two teachers stated, T 3 added family background and long distance that students had to walk between the school and their homes as some reasons why he had cut short the process of writing. T 3 stated that most of the:

... students come from illiterate background ...They [students] are days scholars... stay very far off places, they have to come to school at 5 o’clock in the morning and it takes more than three hours to reach school because they have to walk and that is one problem... Normally when they go back home, our school will be over by 3.45 and when they reach home it will be 6.30 and after they reach home, they have to go for house hold chores and it is a factor that declines learning [T 3, p. 5].

Therefore, he made sure that 80% of the writing was done in the class. The drafting, redrafting or conferencing did not happen because “I teach two sections with 80 students and I teach class 5 and 6 so it becomes 200 and plus” [p. 4].

Therefore, instead of students making multiple drafts and having peer conference or teacher-led conference, the work of the students’ one shot writing were collected for teachers to assess or correct students’ work at home and returned with comments. Teacher-student face to face conferencing happened when the teacher thought a student needed special attention. The findings from these observations and teachers’ explanation revealed that although teachers’ used different ways of carrying out PWA, the main aspect of PWA which was implemented effectively in the Bhutanese classroom were the prewriting and the final editing.

The other three stages of writing (drafting, redrafting and conferencing) did not take place due to Bhutanese classroom factors such as large number of students, time constraints and coverage of syllabus. However, in the explanations that the teachers gave to explain the practices captured on the videotapes, the factors which imposed Bhutanese teachers to alter and cut short the writing process were mainly the students’ family
background and the cultural differences in carrying out both peer conference and teacher-led conference.

6.2.7. The parts of PWA adapted.

From the above observation on the implementation of PWA in the Bhutanese classroom, the drafting and redrafting where students make multiple drafts seemed not to be very common. Although teachers said they ask students to do drafting outside classrooms in hostel or during free class time and in the evening study’s time, there was little evidence of students carrying out this multiple drafting. Even though some were boarding students who got study time in the evening and morning, this time was used for completing their writing task that was not finished in the class but there was no way students could have peer conferencing and redrafting.

The classroom observation data also revealed that peer conferencing with this group of Bhutanese teachers had been reduced to students exchanging books with their desk partner and marking some language or spelling mistakes. T 3 referred to the students’ common knowledge level as a hindrance to peer conferencing.

Teachers indicated that student writing was collected for teacher correction and feedback, rather than teacher-led conferencing. This reflected normal classroom practice in Bhutan. The teachers suggested that the alternative approach suggested in The Guide was impractical because students did not talk in presence of the teacher.

However, one teacher (T 1) developed a different way of conferencing. Students came to see him during lunch and interval breaks to discuss on the drafts after his input on the different tenets of PWA. The focus of the discussion was on the language and grammar mistakes. Students corrected the mistakes and showed the draft to the teacher a couple of times. T 1 kept a record of how many times the student came for conferencing and the number of articles in the student portfolio. Please refer Appendix F to see the
records teacher maintained. This suggested that, although teachers might refer to such practices as teacher-led conferencing, the main focus was on the language and grammar. Students were asked to write repeatedly, incorporating correction of the language mistakes identified by the teacher.

6.2.8. Teachers’ attitudes.

Teachers exhibited very critical attitudes by pointing out challenges faced in implementing PWA in terms of time constraint, syllabus coverage, the challenges of making multiple drafting. However, paradoxically they exhibited very positive attitudes towards PWA itself. This was obvious from all the efforts teachers made in implementing the approach and still carrying out the parts which seemed applicable. The positive attitude of the teachers was also clear from a statement made by a teacher regarding how PWA helped his students. He said “in the past two to three years the students in this school had very lowly results in the examination because students’ level of writing was very poor”. He informed the researcher that he (the participating teacher) and a group of his friends were sent by the Ministry of Education to help the students improve their writing. According to the teacher the students showed improvement in writing after teachers taught writing using PWA. Notwithstanding the challenges, this particular teacher still implemented what was applicable in the Bhutanese classroom and thought the approach would bring benefits to students’ writing.

It appeared from this phase of the study that the prewriting activities and the editing part of of PWA was most commonly implemented by the teachers in Bhutan. “I just do the first component that is prewriting and the last part editing because we are not getting time” [T 2, p. 2]. However, the drafting, redrafting and conferencing were not implemented as the curriculum suggested, although the teachers said that they try to make
use of them. Process writing in this context appeared to reduce to multiple re-drafting to approach accuracy at the word and sentence levels.

6.3. Typicality of observed practices

The fourth source of data for this study was the opinions of three other teachers from three different schools in the same region, who commented on the ways in which the videotaped lessons were typical or atypical of local practice. The validity of the lesson observation and the explanations that the observed teachers gave was enhanced by the additional opinion of the three other teachers who shared similar contexts and culture. It was important to note that the researcher replaced one teacher observer (TO) as the teacher did not receive any training on PWA for making any comments. Similarly, (TO 1) also mentioned not receiving any proper training other than the School Based In-service. The teacher expressed frustration by saying “they will never give us a proper training and now we are also not asking” [TO 1, p. 5].

The other three teacher observers (TOs) watched the edited tapes and commented on what they saw. On the parts which the TOs did not make any comments, the researcher asked questions such as “Is this a normal practice? Does this look like your PWA lesson? Is there anything that surprised you?” Comments from the three TOs supported the point that location of the school and social position of the parents were significant factors which affected the implementation of PWA.

6.3.1. School location and family background.

The observer teachers upheld the problematic nature of using the PWA in rural and remote areas of the country to students who came from low literacy family backgrounds.

... this school is a feeder school and it is situated in the remote area, students are very very poor in English...most of them[parents] are illiterate. There is a vast difference between the students those who are from family who are literate and educated... They [students in the remote] don’t even know, some of them don’t know how to write capital letters where it is necessary. They write their
names with small letters. So with these students we are really having a tough to teach process writing [TO 1, p 3].

They also identified teacher-shortage in the schools located in the rural region as a possible factor for obstructing implementation of PWA. Some of students who came to feeder schools after completion of their primary schools were not taught PWA because “they come from remote areas like school X and Y where they have teacher shortage”.

6.3.2. Bhutanese classroom factors.

As the teachers watched the next part of the taped lessons which revealed 40-50 students in each class sitting in long rows in all three classrooms, the researcher asked if this was a normal classroom setting. All the three teachers responded unanimously that that was just normal and typical in the Bhutanese lower secondary classroom for 40-50 students to sit in long rows.

6.3.2.1. Steps involved for introducing PWA.

All the three other teachers who observed how teachers used a daily event in introducing PWA said it was normal to introduce a new concept by taking an example of a daily activity. As one of them said “for every lesson what we do first is introduce the lesson...so that students will be familiarised with what they are supposed to do...that is what we normally do.”

Teachers also agreed that they did not use the steps mentioned in the Writers’ Workshop for teaching PWA, however, all the three teachers denied using the methods that the teachers on the video used for introducing the different stages of PWA or applying the approach in a writing class. To the question “Does this looks like your process writing lesson?” a teacher responded by saying:

Actually the process writing lessons should look same because we follow the same curriculum but because of the situation...the environment and classroom setting even one teacher...uses different strategies and methods in different classes [TO 1, p. 1].
Another teacher also reported that they did not follow the same practice “in the real class we cannot follow same steps as it is different situation.”

These findings revealed some similarities in how Bhutanese teachers generally introduced their lessons. However, the findings on how teachers introduced the different stages of PWA or apply the approach in a writing class revealed that variations in implementing PWA existed even within the schools in the remote and rural areas of the same district.

6.3.2.2. The ineffective parts of PWA altered to adapt.

The teachers who observed the videotaped lessons also shared their opinion that making multiple drafting could not take place in the classroom. One of the teachers said “no multiple copies, they never do in the class because they don’t have time”.

The ineffectiveness of drafting and redrafting of PWA seemed to be issues related to Bhutanese classroom factors such as limited time, large number of students, teachers lack of time to cover the vast syllabus.

6.4. Cultural Difference

6.4.1. Individualism-collectivism.

Table 6.1 illustrates the differences between PWA and Bhutan in terms of Individualist versus collectivist based educational context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1. Views of collectivism versus individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PWA: Individualist view</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PWA emphasises writing as a process of planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing to discover what a student wants to communicate. Thus, individuals are encouraged to be responsible for one’s own development creating “I” awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers are idiosyncratic: meaning - writing is individualistic - no two people write in the same manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The characteristics of PWA mentioned in the Table 6.1 displayed an individualistic view. This contrasts with the comments that the Bhutanese teachers made after observing the taped lessons, which indicated a collectivist stance. All the three teachers and the three cultural informants agreed that was a normal practice for a knowledge information input lesson to replace the ten day Writers’ Workshop suggested by *The Guide*.

### 6.4.2. Power distance.

Table 6.2 illustrates the differences between PWA and Bhutan in terms of Low versus High power distance based educational context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWA: Low Power Distance</th>
<th>Bhutan: High Power Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the teacher</strong></td>
<td>Teachers always instruct students on writing, decisions are always made by the teachers. Teachers mark what is right and wrong by underlining or circling the words. Students follow exactly teachers’ instruction. Students are used to teachers’ deciding on what is right and wrong and corrects the marked work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a guide or facilitator, motivator, to expose students to different stages/strategies of writing</td>
<td>All the teachers deal with mechanics of writing and language errors with one shot final copy. No opinion seeking informal discussion takes place. Students normally exchange books with their desk partner. Mark some language or spelling mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The role of the students</strong></td>
<td>Teachers’ comment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find strategies which best works for them and take ownership of their writing.</td>
<td>Teachers do not expect peer correction because all the students have problems. Students do not take peer discussion seriously without teachers’ supervision. Students value only teachers’ comments. Normally students are shy to comment on others work or get comments on their work by friends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Process Writing Approach pre-supposed a low power distance where both teachers regularly played the role of a guide, a facilitator or a motivator and students took equal
responsibilities and ownership of their writing. Opinion-seeking informal discussion between teacher and students was expected, particularly during peer and teacher-led conferencing. In contrast, the Bhutanese teacher-student relationships clearly demonstrated a high power teacher-student relationship both inside and outside the classroom (see 6.2.3.1). Teachers seemed to play major roles in decision making and students accept teachers’ decision.

Acceptance of high power distance was also observed not only between teachers and student. The Bhutanese teachers also demonstrated acceptance of a higher degree of inequality of power. This was clearly stated by a cultural informant who explained why he was not doing peer conferencing:

*If we engage the whole class in peer conference and when teacher reaches one corner the other corner will be engaged in a different topic...one thing, the noise level becomes very high and automatically...we have to be answerable to all these. That is also the reason that I cannot have whole class have peer conference” [TO 2, p. 4].*

The Bhutanese teacher showed respects for power and complies with the administrator by avoiding situations of students making noise.

6.4.3. Uncertainty avoidance.

The characteristics of PWA illustrated low uncertainty avoidance. Generally Bhutanese teachers displayed high uncertainty avoidance. The high uncertainty avoidance was exemplified in the comments that some teachers made in prior to implementing PWA. Some individuals indicated taking risks to reduce uncertainty tolerance by implementing PWA with even very limited knowledge.
Table 6.3. Low versus high uncertainty avoidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low uncertainty Avoidance PWA</th>
<th>High uncertainty Avoidance Bhutan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstructured situation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structured situation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writing process is recursive not liner, steps can go back and forth process does not take place in a fixed line of steps-can move back and forth</td>
<td>- Teacher instructs fixed line of steps of PWA one by one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Writers are idiosyncratic, no two writers write in same way</td>
<td>- Writers are treated as same-whole class follow same instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students may write as many drafts till one discovers strategies which best work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unpredictable to explore</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk taking and seeking out to reduce ambiguity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opinion seeking informal conferences</td>
<td>- Consult people/other sources to gain more knowledge of PWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leave mechanics of writing and language checks only during editing</td>
<td>- Some took risks tried teaching the whole process when it resulted in syllabus not being covered, teachers left out some steps and kept the ones which worked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4. Masculinity and femininity.

Table 6.4 illustrates the differences between PWA and Bhutan in terms of Masculinity and Femininity based educational contexts.

Table 6.4. The masculinity versus femininity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Femininity: PWA</th>
<th>Masculinity: Bhutan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers’ friendly and caring</td>
<td>- Top down teacher-dominated approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students’ co-operation, negotiation and working together are important</td>
<td>- Teacher academic knowledge is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students’ choose strategies that suit their interest</td>
<td>- Students’ academic performance is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students’ take responsibility of friends’ writing problems as well.</td>
<td>- Students should work towards for passing the examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhutan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students display modesty and solidarity by putting group harmony in place of personal goals, they avoid pointing friends’ mistakes during peer conferences</td>
<td>- Failing is school is a disaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notwithstanding popular, and even indigenous cultural, perceptions the Bhutanese teachers involved in this study appear to have valued the more masculine characteristics of a Product approach to writing (teacher control and focus on comparative student outcome) over the more feminine aspects of Process writing (greater student control and focus on achievement without comparison being necessary). This was somewhat surprising to the researcher and reflects the complexity of cultural impact on teacher decisions. Table 6.4 illustrates the impact of masculinity and femininity on teacher choice. Although, Bhutanese teachers’ seemed to display care for students’ feeling that they do not feel left out during multiple drafting and peer conferencing, they actually tend to be more focused and directed by the goals set by the syllabus than by the social adaption of the students.

6.4.5. **Long-term orientation versus short term orientation to time.**

Both PWA and Bhutanese teachers tend to have long term orientation to time. Bhutanese teachers’ long term seem to be oriented on future relationship and PWA on writing. Table 6.5 illustrates these characteristics of long-term orientation and short term orientation to time of PWA and Bhutanese teachers.

**Table 6.5. Long-term versus short-term orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term orientation</th>
<th>Short term orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWA: The thinking seems to be oriented to future rewards through perseverance. For example: a) To help students become good future writers, students need to do regular and constant practice of writing (the ten writing classes for Writers’ Workshop, making multiple drafts). Bhutan: However, it reveals a long term orientated future relationships among students, students to teachers.</td>
<td>Bhutan: Teachers seem to be oriented to short or present time. For example: a) students’ work needs to checked from the first draft and feedbacks should be given b) Students’ embarrassment or hurting their feeling should be saved by sidestepping multiple drafting and peer conferencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5. Conclusion

This chapter has presented the findings from the video-recording observation of the PWA being implemented in the rural schools of Bhutan, how the Bhutanese classroom and culture have affected its implementation followed by the rationales that the teachers provide for implementing it as they do. The chapter concluded with a summary of the cultural differences between PWA and Bhutan as observed and explained by the teachers.
CHAPTER SEVEN - DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the key issues which emerged from the overall findings of the curriculum documentary analysis, semi-structured interview and video-recording and subsequent interviews in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 reported on constructive alignment of the intentions of PWA in The Guide and how it is represented in other supporting curriculum documents such as The Silken Knot and The Reading and Literature book. It also reported the findings of the problems and factors experienced by eight Lower Secondary principals who were involved in the initial implementation of the Process Writing Approach as a curriculum innovation.

Chapter 6 described field observation of PWA implementation in a rural district. The earlier interviews had indicated that implementation was more problematic in such contexts and cultural issues might be expected to emerge more sharply there. Participating teachers provided reasons as to why they implement PWA as they do and a different set of teachers commented on the typicality of their practices in terms of Bhutanese culture.

The overall research question guiding this research was “How might consideration of the implementation of the Process Writing Approach in Bhutan inform understanding of cross-national borrowing in smaller, project-driven educational jurisdictions?” The first sub-question regards the alignment or misalignment of the objectives stated in The Guide and other supporting curriculum documents, and the designed activities for students and teachers and students’ assessment for teaching writing using the Process Writing Approach in Bhutan. The key findings were explored by carrying out a systematic comparative documentary analysis of the different sections of The Guide, The Silken Knot and The Reading and Literature book.
The second sub-question prompted exploration of the experience of a group of Lower Secondary principals who started teaching the mandated approach at its initial stage. They discussed the kind of support and training received and the usefulness of *The Guide*, and other factors that have affected the implementation of PWA. The findings emerged from a series of hour-long, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each of the eight Lower Secondary principals. The data was analysed by using NVivo 9.

The third sub-question concerned how the mandated Process Writing Approach has been received and enacted in actual classroom situations. This was to help to extend on the knowledge gained from the more general analysis to bring about more issues related to PWA in regard to the specific Bhutanese classroom and cultural factors. These findings were obtained by direct lesson observation through video-recording and interviews with 2 groups of participating teachers. The key findings from the different phases of data are briefly presented in Table 7.1 below. The table shows the key findings from one main phase or the main data source and how findings from other phases or data sources support each other.

Table 7.1 shows that the main findings which arose from the comparative curriculum documentary analysis (Phase 1 of this study) are:

a) misalignment of *The Guide* (inconsistency between intentions, activities, Assessment),

b) ambiguity of instruction on how to conduct the Writers’ Workshop,

c) limited instruction for teaching PWA in other supporting curriculum documents, particularly the *Reading and Literature book*.

The existence of these misalignments was supported by responses both from semi-structured interviews with the group of principals (Phase 2) and from observation of
teachers supposedly implementing the Process Writing Approach in rural Chukka (Phase 3).

**Table 7.1. Key findings and the sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Data Source: The key findings</th>
<th>Support from other data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Phase 1: Curriculum document analysis** | **Phase 2: Semi-structured Interview:** Principals support expectation of misalignment and ambiguity raised by documentary analysis  
**Phase 3: Observation & interview:** Rural teachers noticed the misalignment and ambiguity of the Guide |
| a. Misalignment of *The Guide*  
b. Ambiguity of instruction on the Writers’ Workshop  
c. *Reading and Literature (book):* lacked clear instruction for the process approach to teaching writing (PWA) | **Phase 3: Observation & interviews**  
Captured impact of inconsistency and misalignment of *The Guide* in classroom implementation.  
Upholds issues with educational and cultural factors  
The same positive attitudes and commitments observed  
**Phase 4: Other teachers’ comments:** Support educational and cultural differences and common practices in terms of Bhutanese culture |
| **Phase 2: Semi-structured Interview** | **Phase 3: Observation & interviews** |
| a. Adverse impact of the misalignment  
b. Issues on mixed training background  
c. Issues with local educational and cultural factors.  
Upholds issues with educational and cultural factors  
The same positive attitudes and commitments observed  
**Phase 4: Other teachers’ comments:** Support educational and cultural differences and common practices in terms of Bhutanese culture |
| **Phase 3 Observation & interviews** | **Phase 4: Other teachers’ comments:** |
| a. Observed partial implementation of PWA  
b. Captured educational and cultural context in its natural setting, extended knowledge on factors mentioned in Phase 2. | Supported common practices and Bhutanese culture |

The specific findings from the Phase 1, the semi structured interviews with school principals were:

a) **negative impact of the misalignment in *The Guide* in terms of its implementation in the classroom**

b) **complex impact of various forms of training in relation to how principals understand the concept and implement**

c) **tensions between PWA and the local educational and cultural context**.
Yet surprisingly the findings also revealed

\[ d \) positive attitudes towards PWA and different initiatives attempting to implement it. \]

The main findings from the classroom Phase 3, the video-recording observations

\[ a \) revealed partial implementation of PWA, \\
\[ b \) captured the educational context in its natural setting. \]

while running commentary by the observed teachers revealed

\[ c \) agreement with the problems that had emerged from the documentary analysis and semi-structured interview. \]

The findings from Phase 4, other teachers’ commentary extended understanding of

\[ a \) the Bhutanese classroom culture \\
\[ b \) typical classroom practice within that culture. \]

The extreme misalignment of the written curriculum will be discussed first, linking the misaligned curriculum to the experiences described by a group of school principals’ and a group of implementing teachers, five years after the supposedly mandated implementation of the Process Writing Approach. The subsequent key findings from the principals’ interviews will be discussed, linking to the implementing teachers’ classroom observations and interviews and extending the understanding by linking to three other teachers’ comments. The differences between the Bhutanese educational context and the foreignness of PWA will be presented. Then the chapter will conclude with a summary and resolutions of the research questions.

7.2. Misalignment of the core curriculum documents

The findings from Phase 1, the curriculum documentary analysis, indicated that the Introduction and Foreword of the core curriculum document of The Guide were highly focussed on Process Writing Approach, which was also one of the eight standards stated in The Silken knot. This represented apparently strong official support for the innovation. However, the specific writing objectives in the subsequent sections of The Guide, the set
activities and the assessment all focus heavily on teaching grammar and surface writing skills. The overall assessment of the products of student work carries more weight in the end of year assessment, which forms the main basis for student promotion to the next class level. In the main supporting documents for writing, the Reading and Literature section of *The Guide* and *Reading and Literature book*, the few writing activities that relate to PWA were not clearly explained. There was a disconnection between the mandate regarding PWA and support for actually using the approach to deliver the written curriculum. The lack of “constructive alignment” (Biggs’s 2003a, p. 11) leads to an expectation of confusion and constraint for those people involved in implementing the approach.

This expectation of the confusion and constraint was confirmed from the findings of the semi-structured interview with the group of school principals (Phase 2) and in the classroom observations and interviews with the participating rural teachers (Phase 3). Although the group of principals did not use the exact words “misalignment within the written curriculum documents”, they reported on the mismatches between intention and implementation resulting from the vastness of the syllabus, importance of end of year assessment and having to commit class time to syllabus coverage. This indicated inconsistency between the importance given to PWA in the Introductions and the lack of it in the assessment. The inconsistency in the written curriculum appears to have influenced the principals’ prioritising syllabus coverage over full implementation of the Process Writing Approach.

The findings from the Phase 3 observations and interviews provided evidence that syllabus coverage was also the teachers’ main focus in natural classroom settings. The reason that the rural teachers provided for this was that their ultimate goal in class was to cover the syllabus required of students for the end of year assessment. According to
Spratt (2005), such focus on high stakes examination narrows the curriculum by encouraging teachers to focus only on the areas that will be tested. The phenomena she observed in Sri Lanka seem to have appeared in Bhutan as well.

The findings from the documentary analysis also indicated that the written curriculum documents do not provide clear instructions on how to teach writing through its process. Although *The Guide* suggests a ten days’ Writers’ Workshop, it does not provide the instructions for all the ten days, only until Day 5 (see Appendix Z), after which clear instructions cease.

Phase 2 indicated that the principals who received less training found *The Guide* incomprehensible when they referred to it for learning about PWA. Other principals who received more thorough training reported that they used handouts from the training and workshops instead of *The Guide* because the handouts were easier to understand. This suggests that *The Guide* or the other curriculum documents did not support principals in learning about PWA. This is foreseeable given the misalignment in *The Guide* and the unclear information found in the *Reading and Literature (book)*. According to Ball & Cohen (1996) one good way to support teachers during curriculum is by making curriculum materials educative. Although curriculum materials cannot replace professional development, they can be used by the teachers over an extended period of time and can be used to address issues that emerge broadly after the training ceases (Schneider, et al., 2000). The same researchers who studied the role of educative curriculum material in supporting reform-based practices found that if the curricula have been developed to support teachers then those teachers who use it were more successful in interpreting the curriculum into practice. If face to face training is absent, documents such as *The Guide* become more critically important for implementation of new practices.
7.3. Issues with various forms of training

The findings of the semi-structured interviews indicated that the principals received various forms of training. Those who received a combination of “orientation” (a broad overview of the structure of the new curriculum) and the Writers’ Workshop (specific PWA information and experience) seemed more confident in understanding and implementing the proposed approach. However, those who received a single “orientation” or “Writers’ Workshop” or those who received only cascaded, school-based, in-service training from their “trained peers” were not sufficiently able to conceptualise and implement the new approach. The latter group of principals defined PWA as making of multiple drafts, which is a highly impoverished view of Process Writing.

Teachers in the schools held similarly varying knowledge of PWA. This emerged particularly clearly in Phase 4, when a teacher observer reported not having received training and so refused to comment on a recorded lesson (see section 6.3). Earlier studies have also reported the existence of different understandings of PWA by teachers in other places (eg., Caudery 1995). The present study reveals the impact of deficiency of training and ambiguous core curriculum documents (The Guide) creating a negative domino effect on the teaching and learning in the classroom five years after the implementation of PWA.

7.4. Educational/cultural tension between PWA and the Bhutanese context

The findings from the semi-structured interview (Phase 2) indicated that the experience of the principals was further compounded by tensions between the local educational and cultural context and the Process Writing Approach. These tensions were mainly associated with two aspects of PWA: multiple drafting and peer conferencing. Tensions surrounding the former are particularly relevant, as the study revealed that the approach
was reduced to multiple drafting by a number of participants. These findings were supported by the findings from Phase 3 and Phase 4 of the present study.

7.4.1. Multiple drafting and cultural tensions.

There are a number of notions that are central to a full implementation of Process Writing Approach: that teachers and students work as partners, that the teacher’s role is primarily motivator or facilitator and that the student role is to be seekers to discover the writing strategies that suit them best. The findings from the semi-structured interviews indicated that these notions seem to have created tension between the principals (some of whom were acting as teachers at the time) and the students. This seems to be particularly prominent during multiple drafting. The students’ expectations that teachers (now principals) check and give feedback on every draft and their incapacity to do so seem to demotivate students. The expectation that an authority will judge the quality of student work is deeply embedded in Bhutanese culture and this seems to have created a classroom tension grounded in cultural context.

7.4.2. Peer conferencing and cultural tension.

In a similar fashion, the principals also reported that peer conferencing was found to be ineffective for cultural reasons. Students appeared unwilling to speak freely in front of their teachers. Students also resisted commenting on the work of their friends for fear that any criticism would cause offense and damage important relationships. Peer conferences appeared to threaten gross classroom happiness.

7.4.3. The local educational tension.

The findings from the semi-structured interviews indicated that local educational factors contributed to the ineffectiveness and eventual abandonment of multiple drafting. Such factors included the large number of students in each class, the vast syllabus, time constraints, rural students’ low language skills, students needing more guidance from the
teachers and principals’ heavy teaching loads all. All the above factors suggest that PWA would only be partially implemented in Bhutan.

7.4.4. Partial implementation of PWA.

The findings from the three video lessons of the three different teachers observed in Phase 3 indicate only partial implementation of PWA in these rural schools in Bhutan. The suggested ten days’ Writers’ Workshop was altered to a single information lesson. The stages identified as being difficult and discussed in the earlier section (the multiple drafting and the peer-conferencing) disappeared so that only prewriting activities seem to have been implemented. The teachers commented that prewriting activities seemed suitable to the needs of the students and were an improvement on their previous practice that they thought was worth implementing. Consequently, this group of Bhutanese teachers implemented only the prewriting stage of PWA and then followed it with the transmission methods that were typical of the more traditional product-based approach to writing.

This echoes earlier studies (Pennington et al 1997: see section 2.2.4.1) that reported that teachers from Hong Kong, Japan and Singapore took a middle path approach by combining product and process when asked to teach PWA in their classes, which seems to be what Phillips and Ochs (2004) might call a mismatch between the “guiding philosophy” (p. 779) behind the written curriculum and the realities of the local context. This also seems to have been the case with the teachers in Bhutan.

7.4.5. Adaption.

The ten days’ Writers’ Workshop proposed in The Guide to introduce students to different aspects of writing by involving each student in writing multiple drafts for ten writing classes was conducted as a whole class lesson. After carrying out the prewriting activity along with the whole class then teachers collecting students’ work for correction
after one shot writing seemed to be the normal practice. Informal peer conference between students was adapted to students simply exchanging their exercise books with desk partners to mark some spelling mistakes.

The existing literature makes most of this unsurprising. What is more surprising is that, despite all of these challenges, the Bhutanese principals and teachers participating in this study still seem to be very positive about Process Writing.

7.4.6. Positive attitudes.

The findings from the semi structured interviews (Phase 2) showed that all the principals share very positive attitudes towards the mandated approach. The positive attitudes were evident from both the principals who received longer training and implemented PWA with confidence and from those who taught without much training or confidence. The principals who taught PWA indicated approval when reporting that students develop confidence in writing, the approach helps the teachers to identify weaker students so teachers can provide remedial help and that the approach helps teachers improve their own writing. Those principals who did not receive adequate training and were less successful in implementing the government mandate apparently saw it as their own failure, indicated sincere regret and expressed their strong desire to try again. They reported taking a variety of initiatives as they attempted to implement the innovation. Similarly the rural teachers revealed positive attitudes towards PWA, reasoning that the approach helps students in writing. This suggests that Bhutanese principals and teachers were not resistant to this proposed change, on the contrary they seem to be very committed and faithful to make the proposed approach happen in their schools. Previous studies showed that teachers normally reveal frustration and resistance during curriculum change (Ling, 2002). Hamad (2006) found that the English language teachers in the United Arab Emirates initially expressed total resistance towards the curriculum change.
by pointing out drawbacks on the curriculum materials and other aspects without actually consulting the relevant Teachers’ Guide. In this regard, many scholars have pointed out priority of achieving teachers’ acceptance for effective curriculum change. They have suggested different ways of facilitating acceptance of change to win teachers’ approval: by creating awareness of the change (Fullan, 2001; Barrow, 1984), exploring teachers’ views and involving teachers in material selection (Burns, 1995). In the current study accepting the change was not an issue with this group of Bhutanese principals. They seemed have begun by glorifying the approach and accepting it happily. This group of Bhutanese principals took risks in implementing the approach even though they lacked confidence through uneven training.

7.5. Summary of the combined findings

As a result of a combined documentary analysis of curriculum documents, semi structured interviews and classroom video recordings, the study indicated that there are several misalignments within The Guide and other curriculum documents for teaching Process Writing Approach in Bhutan. These misalignments had early negative effects on the experience of a group of principals who were involved when the curriculum was first implemented and later negative effects on another group of teachers in implementing the Approach in their classrooms. The implementation of the proposed Approach was further affected by several factors such as inadequate training of the teachers, inconsistency of importance given to the PWA in the Foreword and Introduction and the set activities and assessment, other educational factors specific to location of schools and strain between the foreignness of the approach and the local culture. These external factors seem to have more strongly motivated teachers to stop PWA rather than any resistance to change on their part.
Table 7.2 expresses these findings as a series of direct resolutions of the research questions.

### Table 7.2. Resolutions of research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Resolution, briefly stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the objectives stated in the English Teachers’ Guide for year VII (Curriculum and Professional Support Division, 2006a), other curriculum documents and the designed activities for teachers and students for teaching writing using Process Writing Approach in Bhutan indicate constructive alignment?</td>
<td>The curriculum documents are ambiguous and misaligned, both within the core document and between it and supporting documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has a group of Bhutanese principals experienced: the proposed change, the support and training, and other factors that influenced the implementation of PWA, and how have they responded and reacted to the experience?</td>
<td>The principals supported the change but experienced challenges to implementation for which the various approaches to inservice training left them unprepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has one group of Bhutanese teachers understood and enacted the mandated Process Writing Approach in their classrooms? How have the cultural and educational differences between Bhutan and PWA influenced its implementation?</td>
<td>A group of teachers in rural schools were still attempting to implement the change 5 years after its introduction but they had modified it to suit local conditions. These modifications were towards local culture and fundamentally altered the innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER EIGHT – CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Introduction

This chapter briefly reiterates the research context, the research methods, summary of the combined findings from the curriculum documentary analysis, classroom videoing, interviews in relation to the research questions in the light of the three conceptual frameworks followed by implications, contribution of the research to the existing knowledge, the limitation of the study, recommendations for future study and conclusion.

8.2. Research Context

The Process Writing Approach became a part of the National English curriculum in Bhutan when internal dissatisfaction arose with apparent decline in the level of students’ writing in English. Several local studies and classroom observation revealed that the methods of teaching writing used in the Bhutanese classroom followed a traditional method where teacher explained all the texts that students either took notes or answered questions. This did not allow any writing practice for students to take place. The Royal Government of Bhutan, drawing on the expertise and funds from Canada responded to this genuine concern by mandating, through English curriculum reform, that the way of teaching writing that had become traditional in Bhutanese classrooms be replaced by a foreign approach based on the ideology of child-centeredness. There seems to have been no attempt to study the local cultural and educational contexts to ascertain the suitability of the innovation for Bhutanese classrooms.

Review of recent literature reveals that the innovation itself is problematic. However, the major value of the present study is mapping how a foreign borrowing fares in a context where the more usual pattern of teacher resistance is absent. The results of the study suggest that the pattern of highly adapted implementation may have been similar, whatever the nature of the implementation might have been. Consequently, the remainder...
of this chapter will generalise the findings discussed in Chapter 7 through treatment of the findings as reflecting the process of innovation implementation in smaller, often project- or aid-based educational jurisdictions.

This study intended to explore how Bhutanese English teachers experienced the innovation and how it is being implemented in their classrooms, five years after becoming mandatory.

8.3. Through the Lenses of the Three Frameworks

The findings from this study are explained in the light of the three conceptual frameworks: Biggs’s (2003a) constructive alignment of the curriculum, Phillips & Ochs’s (2006), four staged model of borrowing educational and Hofstede’s (2001) five cultural value dimensions.

8.3.1. The misalignment of curriculum documents.

The foundational misalignment within the core document and between it and the supporting documents could be caused by the involvement of different groups of people in writing the different sections of the curriculum (see section 2.4.2.1). Literature states that when various groups of people are involved in writing curricular documents intentions can be interpreted in different ways, causing incoherence in the curriculum (Graves, 2008). *The Silken Knot* was written by the Centre for Educational Research and Development (CERD) in 2002. CERD seem to have only reached the introduction and foreword of the writing section of *The Guide* when they passed the development work on to a wider group. This more diverse assembly made different groups of people responsible for writing different sections of *The Guide*, including the specific objectives and the set activities, assessment and reading and literature. These subsequent groups seem to have emphasised grammar and other language skills, rather than the innovation itself, which was more characteristic of the sections on which CERD had worked. Thus,
the importance of the innovation, as outlined in the standards and introduction, does not align with what subsequent groups saw as needing to be taught and assessed. Such inconsistency and incoherence seems to have created confusion for the principals and teachers involved implementing the innovation. This was predictable and the more distressing for its predictability. Previous studies attributed students’ poor performance to such misalignment between the standards outlined in the written curriculum, what is actually taught and what is tested (Blank, Porter, & Smithson 2001). The present findings show a mismatch between the wider motive for the innovation and the intentions preserved in other official curriculum documents. This demonstrates an unclear motive for borrowing the current innovation at Philips and Ochs’ stages 1 and 2: Cross-National Attraction and Decision. Uncertainty at these stages may influence other succeeding stages. Clear understanding of the motives may directly affect implementation of any innovation and the success of that innovation can be measured by the extent of that implementation.

8.3.2. Different approaches to inservice training.

It is likely that the number of teachers escalated when this implementation shifted to the lower levels of schooling and that this led the curriculum planners to adopt cascade training pattern.

Hayes (2000) writes of “dilution of the training” (p. 137) and warns that the understanding may decrease further down the tiers. This seems to have happened with implementation of this innovation. Inadequately facilitated, brief training that broadly covers too many topics echoes Phillips & Ochs (2004) warning of “theoretical”, “quick fix” and “phoney” (p. 832) government decisions that become too broad and difficult to implement. The increasing focus on the general review of the curriculum as the number of teachers involved rose seems to have obscured the importance that the initiators had
placed on the innovation. The brief time provided for training as implementation loomed was not sufficient to bring the approach back into clear focus, echoing the lament that “Cascade is more often reduced to a trickle by the time it reaches the classroom teacher” (Hayes, 2000, p. 135).

8.3.3. Local educational and cultural context

The current innovation, like many others borrowed by smaller jurisdictions, emerged from an English native speaking, individualist context but was being implemented in classrooms that were quite different from the context in which the innovation arose. The differing views of implementation held by the different participants seemed to echo Hofstede’s (2001) axes of cultural diversity. Tensions appeared to emerge around local collectivist views as opposed to the individualist view of the innovation; the high power distance that is normal in the local society, as against the low power distance demanded by the innovation; and the high uncertainty avoidance characteristic of the target culture, as against the low uncertainty avoidance of the innovation. The fact that these differences exist was foreseeable. Earlier findings in the literature review suggested existence of extreme differences in classroom culture, roles of the teachers and students even when innovations are borrowed between countries of same individualist culture (e.g. Switzerland and United Kingdom) (see section 2.4.4.4). This study provides more evidence that borrowed innovation cannot be sustained without considering differences between the source and target culture.

These principals and teachers seemed to have accepted the innovation gladly and took initiatives and risks in implementing the innovation. This reflects what Hofstede (2003) explains as a society with high avoidance of uncertainty and the paradox of risk taking behaviour to avoid the unknown experience. It also resonates with the set of local values based on commitment and responsibility (see section 3.3.1). What Hofstede (2003)
describes as the collectivist acceptance of inequality in relationship, the local teachers seem to interpret as fear of failing to fulfil one’s duty as a teacher by carrying out the proposed change enthusiastically.

The innovation’s desire for students to take ownership of their own work clashed with the students’ expectation that teachers would give them controlled instruction. The more extreme rural set of local values places high priority on the final product of student work, echoing traditional religious and educational patterns of rote learning to produce exact copies of classic models. Assuring such high fidelity involved teachers checking and marking student work for assessment purposes, rather than encouraging experimental writing that involves different steps in a tentative writing process. This “collectivist view” (Ofstede, 2009) where education tends to be teacher-centred seems to have clashed with the innovation’s “individualist” view.

This was exacerbated by the general reluctance of local students to speak freely in front of their teachers. Such student initiative contradicts local culture, where talking freely can be interpreted as showing lack of respect to the teacher. This practice can be stronger in rural than urban districts as the rural parents would have some traditional education but low literacy rates in English. This means most of them live strongly by the principles of Buddhism and they have minimum exposure to outside culture. A common Buddhist principle stresses respecting the teacher at all times (see 3.3.1). Therefore, a traditional rural parent will always remind the children with a common Bhutanese saying “to consider one who teaches a single word as a teacher, and not to forget to respect and dedicate to the teacher all the time for, if one forgets, one would be born as a dog for 500 lifetimes”. This indicates that students in the rural will hold back in taking ownership of their own learning by doing and discovering instead they wait for the teachers’ instructions and approval. Thus, the existence of high power distance relationship...
between the teachers and the students is unsurprising as observed both inside and outside the classroom (see 6.2. 3.1). Secondly, in general students in the rural schools are more shy compared to the students in more urban districts, and the rural students are more likely to value group harmony. Thus, to keep the group harmony, students may not comment on the friends’ work for fear that a friend will interpret it as criticism.

A major impediment for rural students in responding positively to the innovation was reported low levels of knowledge of the English language. It was found that children from lower socio economic family backgrounds usually lacked language skills compared to children who come from higher socio economic family backgrounds (Education Week, 2011).

However, mismatches with local culture were not the only impediment to successful implementation of the innovation. Its incompatibility with the local educational context caused difficulties that were likely to remain, even if the cultures had more closely matched. The large class sizes and diverse levels of resourcing that are characteristic of the local context exerted extra strain on implementers who were left own their own to handle the problems.

These difficulties were compounded by the fact that the process of borrowing innovation was shortened in an attempt to make a speedy start. The current innovation in question neglected important aspects of Philips and Ochs’(2003) Stage 1 associated with uncertainty of the motive for the curriculum documents, lack of context study to determine what can be directly applicable and identification of what needs to be modified for local implementation.

The desire to improve local practice through foreign borrowing seems to have been genuine (see section 1.2.) but the perceived value of the innovation became blurred as the curriculum documents were developed. This had an adverse impact at the implementation
stage as apparently willing and enthusiastic teachers gradually stopped implementing the innovation. This problem may have been avoided or reduced if the detail study on the context recommended by earlier literature had been conducted to select practices that could be directly transferred to the borrower country and identify those that need to be modified. Instead, this innovation resulted from centralised decision-making that took little account of the cultural and educational contexts of the different localities within the borrower country, which in turn affected the speed and nature of the change.

The decisions leading to the implantation of the innovation considered in this study appear to be based on the willingness of a curriculum lending country to provide support for a reform that would address a locally apparent need, which the curriculum borrowing country appeared to lack resources to meet, resulting in what Phillips & Ochs (2003) would call a “quick fix” decision made by the government for political reasons. A pilot testing programme could have involved subsequent implementers having direct exposure to the innovation and sharing their thoughts to influence the shape of the innovation as actually borrowed. This would have moved some of the decision making to the local level but it did not happen. This neglect of those who would implement decisions regarding the borrowing of this innovation had predictable negative consequences, notwithstanding their uncharacteristically positive attitude towards it.

Problems also emerged at Philips and Ochs’ Stage III (Implementation): the initial, smaller scale training seemed appropriate but as it scaled up limitation of resources seems to have resulted in curtailment of duration, with a consequent drop in effectiveness. The lack of local resources may have contributed to this need to shorten the whole process. However, this seems to have exacerbated existing educational and cultural differences and created further tension for the people responsible for actual implementation. Willingness does not seem to have been lacking in the present case of policy borrowing
but these issues seem to have resulted in the innovation being diluted almost beyond recognition. The findings indicate that the current borrowed innovation made minimal impact on the existing system, when viewed five years after supposed implementation.

The findings of this study suggest the importance of three things:

(1) Consistency of alignment in the written curriculum documents that support or mandate any innovation,
(2) Provision of sufficient training and support to innovative implementers,
(3) Consideration of cultural and educational contexts during policy borrowing and implementation,
(4) Removal of external constraints to develop existing positive attitudes into successful implementation.

The implications and suggestions in the subsequent sections may improve the likelihood of success for those attempts at policy borrowing that will surely be made in other smaller, aid- or project-driven educational jurisdictions.

8.4. Implication of the Study

The findings from this study have implications for curriculum change managers such as planners, writers and the trainers.

8.4.1. Implication for curriculum planners.

The inconsistency of importance given to the innovation in the introductory material as opposed to the set activities and assessment seem to have forced these teachers to cover the local syllabus rather than implement the desired innovation. Lack of such syllabus coverage would mean student failure at examinations and these examinations seemed untouched by the intentions of the innovation. Such failure, in this local context, would result in students repeating grades or some dropping out of schools and official criticism for the teacher. Thus, limited implementation of the innovation was consequently almost inevitable. Thus, if implementation of curriculum innovation is seriously intended, change managers and curriculum planners need to work towards consistency of
objectives, activities and assessment and diverse groups of curriculum writers need to be co-ordinated to ensure alignment between the various parts of all material prepared to support implementation of the innovation.

8.4.2. Implications for teacher trainers and curriculum writers.

The findings from this study indicated that receiving both the orientation to the new curriculum and the Writers’ Workshop generated more understanding and confidence in the principals, while the single workshop orienting teachers to this innovation was not sufficient to change teachers’ instructional beliefs and classroom behaviour. As discussed in the earlier chapter (see section 2.4.2.2), training plays major roles in supporting teachers’ understanding and implementing innovations successfully. Thus, the findings of this study suggest that teacher trainers need to seriously consider giving sufficient training during curriculum change. Since these local teachers needed to learn and replace their traditional teacher-centred way of teaching with a whole new set of practices, giving specific training for the innovation may have helped them to understand both the theoretical foundations and classroom practices.

8.4.3. Implications educational and cross cultural differences.

The findings of the study indicated that disregarding the differences between the natures of this innovation and the context within which it was intended to be implemented resulted in persistent struggle for both teachers and students trying to accommodate cultural shifts during implementation. Several researchers have emphasised the importance of considering the cultural and educational context during curriculum change (Dushku, 1998; Holliday, 2001; Ruth, 2006). Wedell (2003) explains that gaps emerge between the intended and the implemented curriculum when curriculum planners fail to consider the differences between the two cultures, and that sometimes only a partial implementation of the proposed change occurs. Thus, curriculum planners need to
identify the extent of the cultural shift that the teachers need to make and consider designing curriculum or training for what Holliday (2001) calls bridging between the two cultures or “cultural continuity” (p. 169).

These findings also indicated that the challenges were stronger in schools located in the rural areas due to factors such as parents’ background, students low level of English and stronger cultural practices. Curriculum planners should consider the issue of centrally approved curriculum for varied contexts. Undertaking pilot studies of the curriculum in various contexts and revising and adapting it in response to the pilot(s) may reduce the risk of expensive curriculum not being properly implemented. Moreover, it may be necessary to reconsider the common practice of setting the same goals for all schools to finish all the set activities in a set time in the light of the above differences found specific to the contexts.

8.4.4. Teachers’ compliance for future change.

The findings of the study indicated that principals had positive attitudes at the initial stage of the curriculum change, that their attitudes remained positive even after the challenges they faced in implementing the innovation and that such positive attitudes were shared by the participating teachers involved in classroom observation and commenting on the video recorded lessons. They were generally excited about the innovation, five years after its mandated implementation. Although the innovation could not be continued because of many challenges, many principals and participating teachers remained committed to its implementation. This clearly indicates that external forces influenced teachers to manage their time to cover the syllabus and prepare students for the end of year examination. This implies that implementation might be more successful if such external constraints were removed.
8.5. Contribution of the Study to the Existing Knowledge

Based on the findings presented above, this study makes a number of contributions to the existing knowledge in the field of borrowing innovation from elsewhere to improve education at home.

In this study, an innovation with an individualist view clashed with views of a collectivist culture, resulting in limited implementation. Pilot testing the innovation locally, before introducing it nationally, would have allowed the appropriateness and suitability of borrowed innovation to be considered before committing resources to implementing it. Studying at the local level and considering these differences during policy borrowing and decision making is vital as this may save both time and money without having to wait for the innovation to fail. This study confirms the usefulness of the previous work which provided the triple lens through which its results were analysed.

Biggs’s (2003) work suggested the importance of innovation borrowers’ clear understanding of the reasons and motives for borrowing and the essential nature of alignment between what is intended, what is taught and what is subsequently assessed. Such notions were important in the design of this study and the analysis of its results. The study supported Biggs’ notion of the importance of such alignment for the success of proposed innovations and the adverse result of misalignment is evident from the current findings: Although these teachers remain keen to implement the innovation, confusion about the intent of the policy as a whole made such implementation difficult.

Hofstede’s (2001) work provided a tool for analysis of compounding implementation difficulties due to culture. His analysis of cultural differences along a number of continua helped the investigators to avoid facile interpretations of the reasons for failure as being merely due to documentary misalignment. This innovation would have faced significant barriers, even if the documentation had been aligned, because of the multiple ways in
which the culture of the borrowing nation did not match that of the nation lending the
curriculum innovation.

Phillips and Ochs’ (2003) provided a model that exposed the deficiencies of the
attempted implementation as a whole. The process was flawed at each of their Stages:
there was certainly internal dissatisfaction (early Stage I), so the Cross-National
Attraction was clearly present but the guiding philosophy does not seem to have been
well researched (significant doubts about the efficacy of the approach already existed in
the literature) and appropriate enabling structures seem not have been considered (late
Stage I), leading to a central decision that seems to fit into their ‘Quick Fix’ category
(Stage II). However, none of this seems to have led to predictable teacher resistance in
this case. The most significant actors (the teachers) seem to have adapted the innovation
to make it more suitable to their perceptions of their own context (Stage III). However, in
this case that meant little absorption of external features and a local synthesis that bore
little resemblance to the original supposed intent of the innovation (Stage IV).

The tendency to blame teacher recalcitrance for failed implementation of centrally
mandated policy changes and innovations was mention earlier in this thesis, as was the
use of this reasoning in a previous attempt at local innovation. This study challenged the
models represented by its three conceptual lenses against one recent attempt at cross
national curriculum borrowing. The models proved robust enough to stand such analytic
use in this context. However, their main benefit may have been to challenge the notion
that teacher resistance to change is the major barrier to curriculum innovation.

8.6. The Limitation of the Study

Like all such attempts, this particular study had some limitations. The investigation was
limited to teachers of grades seven and eight, although an attempt to obtain a somewhat
representative sample of respondents was made by visiting a national workshop site. The
The present study interviewed only eight Principals and six Teachers, due to limitations of time and the inconveniently wide spread of schools across Bhutan.

As much as the researcher’s insider knowledge of the culture may have provided deeper understanding, her background knowledge may be biased and interfere in interpretation of the findings. However, such interpretation was strengthened by involving different people’s perspectives on the same cultural event and such triangulation could be expected to enhance the validity of the results.

8.7. Recommendations for future study

Many of these limitations could be addressed by use of more participants and contexts. The degree of match between this qualitative study and existing literature suggests that a larger quantitative study might move its results from suggestive and evocative to potentially generalizable.

8.8. Conclusion

These Bhutanese English teachers chose to pay more attention to syllabus coverage than to the Process Writing Approach because of the misalignment between the intentions and importance given to it in the Foreword and Introduction of mandatory documents and that given in the set activities and assessment practices against which their work would be measured. This appears be a reaction to constraints from outside, rather than indication of teacher resistance to using its supposed Process to teach Writing. The consequences for students of teachers failing to cover the syllabus were so great that writing associated to content in the syllabus predictably had greater weight. Students who do not succeed at the final examinations are not promoted to the next level. Therefore, teachers could not continue teaching Writing through the process approach. This clearly suggests that curriculum planners need to work towards consistency of objectives, activities and assessment if the intention to implement innovation is genuine.
The findings from the semi-structured interviews suggested that a single workshop orienting teachers to this innovation was not sufficient to change their instructional beliefs and classroom behaviour. Although most of the principals interviewed were keen to implement the approach, only those who received longer and more appropriate training appeared to have gained understanding and confidence. The findings also suggested that involving different groups of people in writing the curriculum documents created ambiguity and confusion as different groups seem to have exerted focus on areas of what they think are important. Curriculum writers need to develop proper coordination among diverse group to maintain consistent links between curriculum components.

The subsequent classroom observations revealed partial implementation and tensions between the Process Writing Approach and the culture of Bhutan. The cultural tensions mainly occurred in regard to contrasts between collectivist cultural views of mutual support and criticism of friends and the more individualist view of self-development and personal goal orientation that is characteristic of Process Writing. This suggests that curriculum planners need to consider cross-cultural differences at the planning stage and while conducting training for bridging the two cultures.
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Appendix A. Human Research Ethics Approval

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

Notification of Expedited Approval

To Chief Investigator or Project **Doctor John O'Toole**
Supervisor:
Cc Co-investigators / Research Students: **Doctor Rachel Burke**
**Ms Dechen Zangmo**
Re Protocol: **The Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan**
Date: **14-Nov-2011**
Reference No: **H-2011-0304**
Date of Initial Approval: **11-Nov-2011**

Thank you for your **Response to Conditional Approval** submission to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) seeking approval in relation to the above protocol.

Your submission was considered under **Expedited** review by the Chair/Deputy Chair.

I am pleased to advise that the decision on your submission is **Approved** effective **11-Nov-2011**.

In approving this protocol, the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) is of the opinion that the project complies with the provisions contained in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, 2007, and the requirements within this University relating to human research.

Approval will remain valid subject to the submission, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. **If the approval of an External HREC has been "noted" the approval period is as determined by that HREC.**

The full Committee will be asked to ratify this decision at its next scheduled meeting. A formal **Certificate of Approval** will be available upon request. Your approval number is **H-2011-0304**.
If the research requires the use of an Information Statement, ensure this number is inserted at the relevant point in the Complaints paragraph prior to distribution to potential participants. You may then proceed with the research.

Conditions of Approval

This approval has been granted subject to you complying with the requirements for Monitoring of Progress, Reporting of Adverse Events, and Variations to the Approved Protocol as detailed below.

PLEASE NOTE:
In the case where the HREC has "noted" the approval of an External HREC, progress reports and reports of adverse events are to be submitted to the External HREC only. In the case of Variations to the approved protocol, or a Renewal of approval, you will apply to the External HREC for approval in the first instance and then Register that approval with the University's HREC.

- Monitoring of Progress

Other than above, the University is obliged to monitor the progress of research projects involving human participants to ensure that they are conducted according to the protocol as approved by the HREC. A progress report is required on an annual basis. Continuation of your HREC approval for this project is conditional upon receipt, and satisfactory assessment, of annual progress reports. You will be advised when a report is due.

- Reporting of Adverse Events

1. It is the responsibility of the person first named on this Approval Advice to report adverse events.
2. Adverse events, however minor, must be recorded by the investigator as observed by the investigator or as volunteered by a participant in the research. Full details are to be documented, whether or not the investigators, or his/her deputies, consider the event to be related to the research substance or procedure.
3. Serious or unforeseen adverse events that occur during the research or within six (6) months of completion of the research must be reported by the person first named on the Approval Advice to the (HREC) by way of the Adverse Event Report form within 72 hours of the occurrence of the event or the investigator receiving advice of the event.
4. Serious adverse events are defined as:
   o Causing death, life threatening or serious disability.
Causing or prolonging hospitalisation.

Overdoses, cancers, congenital abnormalities, tissue damage, whether or not they are judged to be caused by the investigational agent or procedure.

Causing psycho-social and/or financial harm. This covers everything from perceived invasion of privacy, breach of confidentiality, or the diminution of social reputation, to the creation of psychological fears and trauma.

Any other event which might affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

5. Reports of adverse events must include:

Participant's study identification number;

date of birth;

date of entry into the study;

treatment arm (if applicable);

date of event;

details of event;

the investigator's opinion as to whether the event is related to the research procedures; and

action taken in response to the event.

6. Adverse events which do not fall within the definition of serious or unexpected, including those reported from other sites involved in the research, are to be reported in detail at the time of the annual progress report to the HREC.

**Variations to approved protocol**

If you wish to change, or deviate from, the approved protocol, you will need to submit an *Application for Variation to Approved Human Research*. Variations may include, but are not limited to, changes or additions to investigators, study design, study population, number of participants, methods of recruitment, or participant information/consent documentation. **Variations must be approved by the (HREC) before they are implemented** except when Registering an approval of a variation from an external HREC which has been designated the lead HREC, in which case you may proceed as soon as you receive an acknowledgement of your Registration.

**Linkage of ethics approval to a new Grant**

HREC approvals cannot be assigned to a new grant or award (ie those that were not identified on the application for ethics approval) without confirmation of the approval from the Human Research Ethics Officer on behalf of the HREC.
Best wishes for a successful project.

Professor Alison Ferguson
Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee

For communications and enquiries:
Human Research Ethics Administration

Research Services
Research Integrity Unit
HA148, Hunter Building
The University of Newcastle
Callaghan NSW 2308

T +61 2 492 18999 +61 2 492 18999 FREE
F +61 2 492 17164
Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au
Appendix B. Information Statement to Workshop Coordinator

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Permission Request Letter for the Workshop Coordinator

The Research Project:
Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan


Dear Coordinator,

Year 7 and 8 English teachers from the workshops are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Out of the five schools three will be selected for the study. Ms. Zangmo is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. Mitch O’Toole and Dr. Rachel Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?

The 2006 English curriculum in Bhutan proposed implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers experienced this implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA). The investigation will begin with an analysis of the documents setting out the 2006 curriculum change. Then teacher experiences in implementing PWA in Bhutanese classroom over a five year period will be investigated and reported. The investigation will provide teachers in Bhutan with an opportunity to speak directly and suggest reasons for enacting the curricular intentions in the ways that they do. Many researchers agree that it is vital that teachers’ voices be heard as they play a key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1989). The time lag allows the curriculum to settle as the teachers become familiar with the
documents, form their opinions, and shape their classroom practices. There have been no previous studies done in this particular area in Bhutan.

Participating in this study will help to examine the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular, how its foreign nature plays out in Bhutanese classrooms. The study also aims to understand what cultural values, ideas, and experiences lay beneath observed practices of participating Bhutanese teachers. It will also explore the alignment or misalignment of the intentions of Process Writing Approach in the English Curriculum Framework to the stated activities for teachers of the English Curriculum Guide for year VII & VIII. Possible explanations will be sought for why teachers are implementing or not implementing the PWA as stated in the 2006 English curriculum.

Insights into this issue is likely to provide long term benefits with significant impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. The study will help to understand better why Bhutan has the present rate of repeaters and school dropouts and provide appropriate intervention to reduce it by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. Students may benefit with writing progress and academic outcomes.

**Who can participate in the research?**

English teachers of year 7 will be involved in the study from which 3 teachers’ writing instructions for teaching writing will be observed and videotaped. The observed teachers will be also asked to explain their actions as captured by the video as to why they are doing what they are doing while giving writing instructions. 3 more teachers would be involved in viewing the taped lessons and commenting on the typicality of the lessons. If what is observed on the tape is a typical lesson or what is done differently in their classes. (The number of lessons to be observed will be determined by the problems as identified by the initial interview). All these discussions will be audio taped.

**What choice do you have?**

Agreeing to workshop participants participate in this research is entirely your choice. Only those teachers who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to allow your workshop participants participate, your decision will not disadvantage you any way. If you do allow the participants to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason.

**What would you be asked to do?**

If you consent to workshop participants participating in the study, you are requested to make an announcement at the morning assembly giving full details of the research and seeking the teachers’ participation.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

There are no risks involved. A summary of the findings will be sent to you via email within six months of completion of the research for long term benefits on Bhutanese education system in specific.
**How will your privacy be protected?**
All data, recordings, and transcripts will be stored in password protected electronic form and kept for five years before being destroyed. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project will have access to the data during that time.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The information from this project will be reported in a doctoral thesis to be submitted for Dechen’s PhD degree. It may also be reported in conference papers and academic publications. No individual can be identified from the reports of the project.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent your schools to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dori_thinley@pce.edu.bt

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Your participation would be greatly valued.

Co-supervisor
Dr. Rachel Burke

Ph.D Candidate
Dechen Zangmo

**Chief Supervisor**
Dr. Mitch O’Toole

**Complaints about this research**
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application ].

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact:

Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dori_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix C. Information Statements to the Participants at the Workshop

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822  

mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700  /  +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Participation Information Statement for the Initial Interview  
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan  
Document Version 2 Dated 1/11/2011

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Ms. Dechen is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?

The 2006 English curriculum in Bhutan proposed implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers experienced this implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA). The investigation will begin with an analysis of the documents setting out the 2006 curriculum change. Then teacher experiences in implementing PWA in Bhutanese classroom over a five year period will be investigated and reported. The investigation will provide teachers in Bhutan with an opportunity to speak directly and suggest reasons for enacting the curricular intentions in the ways that they do. Many researchers agree that it is vital that teachers’ voices be heard as they play a key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1989). The time lag allows the curriculum to settle as the teachers become familiar with the documents, form their opinions, and shape their classroom practices. There have been no previous studies done in this particular area in Bhutan.

Participating in this study will help to examine the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular, how its foreign nature plays out in Bhutanese classrooms. The study also aims to understand what cultural
values, ideas, and experiences lay beneath observed practices of participating Bhutanese teachers. It will also explore the alignment or misalignment of the intentions of Process Writing Approach in the English Curriculum Framework to the stated activities for teachers of the English Curriculum Guide for year VII & VIII. Possible explanations will be sought for why teachers are implementing or not implementing the PWA as stated in the 2006 English curriculum.

Insights into this issue is likely to provide long term benefits with significant impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. The study will help to understand better why Bhutan has the present rate of repeaters and school dropouts and provide appropriate intervention to reduce it by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. Students may benefit with writing progress and academic outcomes.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking for a sample of eight Lower Secondary English teachers who have in the past or currently been involved in teaching the existing English curriculum to year 7 & 8. Two teachers from each zone of the four zones into which Bhutan is divided can participate.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those who volunteer and give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you. If there are more volunteers than needed, it may not be possible to interview all those who volunteer within the time for this project. If you are not contacted for interview, we thank you for your interest, and invite you to contact the researchers if you would like to receive a summary of the research findings.

What would you be asked to do?

If you agree to participate, you will be interviewed regarding
(i) the issues emerging from the documentary analysis
(ii) your understanding of the Process Writing Approach,
(iii) your experience of matches and mismatches between PWA and the culture of Bhutanese classrooms

How much time will it take?

The interview will be conducted for 45 minutes.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

We cannot provide you with any direct benefits but a summary of the findings will be sent to you via email within six months of completion of the research. Anybody who wishes to receive a summary of the findings can give an address to the researcher.
How will your privacy be protected?
The researcher will transcribe the interview and the transcripts will be stored in password protected electronic form and kept for five years before being destroyed. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project will have access to the data during that time. Anonymity of the teachers will be maintained throughout the study and also while reporting about the findings in the final product.

How will the information collected be used?
The information from this project will be reported in a doctoral thesis to be submitted for Dechen’s PhD degree. It may also be reported in conference papers and academic publications. No individual can be identified from the reports of the project.

What do you need to do to participate?
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. If you would like to participate, please complete the attached consent form, and sign to indicate you will participate. Then put it in the locked box hung in the corridor within 24 hours.

Further information
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Your participation would be greatly valued.

Chief Supervisor Co-supervisor Ph.D Candidate
Dr. Mitch O’Toole Dr. Rachel Burke Dechen Zangmo

Complaints about this research
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application ].

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact:

Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix D. Consent Forms for the Workshop Coordinator

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822/Fax: +61 2 4921 7887  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700  /   +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Workshop Coordinator’s Consent Form for the Research Project:  
Process Writing Approach in Bhutan  
Conducted by Dechen Zangmo under the supervision of Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke


I agree participants in the Master’s Programme to participate in the above research project and I give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained. I understand the participants can withdraw from the project at any time and does not have to give any reasons for withdrawing.

I understand that the personal information of the principals will remain confidential to the researchers.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Date: ______________________________
Appendix E. Consent Forms for the Participants at the Workshop

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822/ Fax: +61 2 4921 7887  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au  
Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

The Initial Interviewees Consent Form  
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach in Bhutan  
Conducted by Dechen Zangmo under the supervision of Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke  
from the School of Education, Faculty of Education and Arts

Document Version 2 Dated 1/11/2011

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely. I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained. I understand I can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I consent to be interviewed by the researcher. I understand that personal information will remain confidential to the researchers.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: ____________________________________________

Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________
Appendix F. Permission Letter to the Director

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts
University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Permission Request Letter for the Director of Education
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan
Dear Director,

Five schools under your Ministry are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Out of the five schools three will be selected for the study. Ms. Zangmo is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. Mitch O’Toole and Dr. Rachel Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?
The 2006 English curriculum in Bhutan proposed implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers experienced this implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA). The investigation will begin with an analysis of the documents setting out the 2006 curriculum change. Then teacher experiences in implementing PWA in Bhutanese classroom over a five year period will be investigated and reported. The investigation will provide teachers in Bhutan with an opportunity to speak directly and suggest reasons for enacting the curricular intentions in the ways that they do. Many researchers agree that it is vital that teachers’ voices be heard as they play a key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1989). The time lag allows the curriculum to settle as the teachers become familiar with the documents, form their opinions, and shape their classroom practices. There have been no previous studies done in this particular area in Bhutan.
Participating in this study will help to examine the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular, how its foreign nature plays out in Bhutanese classrooms. The study also aims to understand what cultural values, ideas, and experiences lay beneath observed practices of participating Bhutanese teachers. It will also explore the alignment or misalignment of the intentions of Process Writing Approach in the English Curriculum Framework to the stated activities for teachers of the English Curriculum Guide for year VII &VIII. Possible explanations will be sought for why teachers are implementing or not implementing the PWA as stated in the 2006 English curriculum.

Insights into this issue is likely to provide long term benefits with significant impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. The study will help to understand better why Bhutan has the present rate of repeaters and school dropouts and provide appropriate intervention to reduce it by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. Students may benefit with writing progress and academic outcomes.

**Who can participate in the research?**

English teachers of year 7 will be involved in the study from which 3 teachers’ writing instructions for teaching writing will be observed and videotaped. The observed teachers will be also asked to explain their actions as captured by the video as to why they are doing what they are doing while giving writing instructions. 3 more teachers would be involved in viewing the taped lessons and commenting on the typicality of the lessons. If what is observed on the tape is a typical lesson or what is done differently in their classes. (The number of lessons to be observed will be determined by the problems as identified by the initial interview). All these discussions will be audio taped.

**What choice do you have?**

Agreeing to let your schools participate in this research is entirely your choice. Only those teachers who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to allow your schools to participate, your decision will not disadvantage teachers or the schools in any way. If you do allow the schools to participate, you may withdraw one school or all schools from the project at any time without giving a reason.

**What would you be asked to do?**

If you consent to your schools participating in the study, you are asked to sign the consent form allowing the selected schools to participate in the study.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

There are no risks involved. A summary of the findings will be sent to you via email within six months of completion of the research for long term benefits on Bhutanese education system in specific.

**How will your privacy be protected?**
All data, recordings, and transcripts will be stored in password protected electronic form and kept for five years before being destroyed. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project will have access to the data during that time.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The information from this project will be reported in a doctoral thesis to be submitted for Dechen’s PhD degree. It may also be reported in conference papers and academic publications. No individual can be identified from the reports of the project.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent your schools to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Your participation would be greatly valued.

Co-supervisor
Dr. Rachel Burke

Ph.D Candidate
Dechen Zangmo

**Complaints about this research**
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application ].

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact:

Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix G. Approval Letter

ROYAL GOVERNMENT OF BHUTAN
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION
THIMPHU, BHUTAN

Ref: MoE/DSE/G1/2011/1/96
17th Feb, 2012

To Whom it May Concern

Mrs. Dachen Zangmo, PhD candidate from University of New Castle in Australia is undertaking a research on the topic: “Process Writing Approach in Bhutan.” This research is conducted as a partial fulfillment for her Doctor of Philosophy degree at University of New Castle in Australia and it requires the involvement of Principals, teachers and students under Chhukha Dzongkha.

Therefore, all the concerned school heads and teachers are requested to facilitate Mrs. Dachen’s work as deemed appropriate.
Appendix H. Information Statement to the Principals in Schools

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Permission Request Letter for the School Principals  
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan  
Document Version 1 Dated 1/11/2011  
Dear Principal,

Your school is invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Ms. Zangmo is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. Mitch O’Toole and Dr. Rachel Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?  
The 2006 English curriculum in Bhutan proposed implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers experienced this implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA). The investigation will begin with an analysis of the documents setting out the 2006 curriculum change. Then teacher experiences in implementing PWA in Bhutanese classroom over a five year period will be investigated and reported. The investigation will provide teachers in Bhutan with an opportunity to speak directly and suggest reasons for enacting the curricular intentions in the ways that they do. Many researchers agree that it is vital that teachers’ voices be heard as they play a key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1989). The time lag allows the curriculum to settle as the teachers become familiar with the documents, form their opinions, and shape their classroom practices. There have been no previous studies done in this particular area in Bhutan.
Participating in this study will help to examine the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular, how its foreign nature plays out in Bhutanese classrooms. The study also aims to understand what cultural values, ideas, and experiences lay beneath observed practices of participating Bhutanese teachers. It will also explore the alignment or misalignment of the intentions of Process Writing Approach in the English Curriculum Framework to the stated activities for teachers of the English Curriculum Guide for year VII & VIII. Possible explanations will be sought for why teachers are implementing or not implementing the PWA as stated in the 2006 English curriculum.

Insights into this issue is likely to provide long term benefits with significant impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. The study will help to understand better why Bhutan has the present rate of repeaters and school dropouts and provide appropriate intervention to reduce it by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. Students may benefit with writing progress and academic outcomes.

**Who can participate in the research?**

English teachers of year 7 will be involved in the study from which 1 teacher’s writing instructions for teaching writing will be observed and videotaped. The observed teacher will be also asked to explain his/her actions as captured by the video as to why he/she is doing what he/she is doing while giving writing instructions. 1 more teacher would be involved in viewing a taped lesson from a different school for commenting on the typicality of the lessons. If what is observed on the tape is a typical lesson or what is done differently in his/her classes. (The number of lessons to be observed will be determined by the problems as identified by the initial interview). All these discussions will be audio taped.

**What choice do you have?**

Agreeing to let your schools participate in this research is entirely your choice. Only those teachers who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to allow your schools to participate, your decision will not disadvantage teachers or the schools in any way. If you do allow the schools to participate, you may withdraw your school from the project at any time without giving a reason.

**What would you be asked to do?**

If you consent to your schools participating in the study, you are asked to sign the consent form allowing your teachers to participate in the study.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

There are no risks involved. A summary of the findings will be sent to you via email within six months of completion of the research for long term benefits on Bhutanese education system in specific.

**How will your privacy be protected?**
Anonymity of the teachers and schools will be maintained throughout the study and also while reporting about the findings in the final product. It will be made clear to the teachers who view the video-tapes of teachers’ lessons that the main focus of the study is on the typicality of the lessons and the cultural matches and mismatches of Process Writing Approach in the Bhutanese classroom not for evaluating the teaching. Confidentiality of the material that they view will be encouraged both verbally and also by getting them sign the consent form.

All data, recordings, and transcripts will be stored in researcher’s office cabinet locked and all the electronic form password protected and kept for five years before being destroyed. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project will have access to the data during that time.

**How will the information collected be used?**
The information from this project will be reported in a doctoral thesis to be submitted for Dechen’s PhD degree. It may also be reported in conference papers and academic publications. No individual can be identified from the reports of the project.

**What do you need to do to participate?**
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent your schools to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. It may not be possible to select all those who volunteer, within the time for this project. If you are not contacted, we thank you for your interest, and invite you to contact the researchers if you would like to receive a summary of the research findings.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Your participation would be greatly valued.

Co-supervisor
Dr. Rachel Burke

Ph.D Candidate
Dechen Zangmo

**Chief Supervisor**
Dr. Mitch O’Toole

**Complaints about this research**
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application ].
Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact:
Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix I. Information Statement to the Teachers in the Schools

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Participation Information Statement for Bhutanese English Teachers for Classroom Videoing and Reviewing recorded lessons.  
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan

You are invited to participate in the research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Ms. Dechen is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?

The 2006 English curriculum in Bhutan proposed implementation of the process approach for teaching writing. The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers experienced this implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA). The investigation will begin with an analysis of the documents setting out the 2006 curriculum change. Then teacher experiences in implementing PWA in Bhutanese classroom over a five year period will be investigated and reported. The investigation will provide teachers in Bhutan with an opportunity to speak directly and suggest reasons for enacting the curricular intentions in the ways that they do. Many researchers agree that it is vital that teachers’ voices be heard as they play a key role in the success or failure of curriculum implementation (Careless, 2001; Markee, 1997; Nunan, 1989). The time lag allows the curriculum to settle as the teachers become familiar with the documents, form their opinions, and shape their classroom practices. There have been no previous studies done in this particular area in Bhutan.
Participating in this study will help to examine the implementation of the PWA within the local educational and cultural context of Bhutan; in particular, how its foreign nature plays out in Bhutanese classrooms. The study also aims to understand what cultural values, ideas, and experiences lay beneath observed practices of participating Bhutanese teachers. It will also explore the alignment or misalignment of the intentions of Process Writing Approach in the English Curriculum Framework to the stated activities for teachers of the English Curriculum Guide for year VII &VIII. Possible explanations will be sought for why teachers are implementing or not implementing the PWA as stated in the 2006 English curriculum.

Insights into this issue is likely to provide long term benefits with significant impact on Bhutanese education in assisting curriculum planners in their approach to curriculum development. The study will help to understand better why Bhutan has the present rate of repeaters and school dropouts and provide appropriate intervention to reduce it by providing appropriate training to the teachers during the process of curriculum development. Students may benefit with writing progress and academic outcomes.

**Who can participate in the research?**

We are seeking for Year 7 teachers who are directly involved in teaching the present English curriculum. The teachers will be recruited from the schools of particular areas where the interview data suggest as areas having prominent issues in implementing PWA.

**What choice do you have?**

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those who volunteer and give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you. If there are more volunteers than needed, it may not be possible to interview all those who volunteer within the time for this project. If you are not contacted for interview, we thank you for your interest, and invite you to contact the researchers if you would like to receive a summary of the research findings.

**What would you be asked to do?**

In the first part of the study, your lessons on writing instructions will be videotaped. All of the lesson observations and video-taping is entirely for the purpose of assessing the cultural matches and mismatches between PWA and the Bhutanese classroom. This research project is neither intended to evaluate teaching quality nor to assess teacher competence. You will also be asked to view your own taped lessons twice. During the first viewing, the lesson recordings will be edited to focus on issues that emerged from the initial interviews and also to ensure that the recording captured your normal classroom practice. During the second viewing, you will be asked to watch the edited versions of your lesson and make a running commentary to explain your actions. The researcher will make audio recordings of your comments regarding the typicality of your lessons, your reasons for the actions and all surrounding discussions.
In the second part, you will be asked to view recorded lessons on writing instructions and comment in what ways the taped videos are typical or atypical of Bhutanese teaching practice five years after the implementation of PWA. You will be asked to tell what is usual or unusual in the way writing instructions were given in the video. The researcher will make audio recordings of these discussions.

How much time will it take?

Videotaping lessons on writing instructions will be approximately 45 minutes. The number of taped observation will be defined by the problem areas identified from the initial interview. The first viewing of the recorded lesson and interview will approximately take 60 minutes. The second viewing of the edited lesson along with running commentary of the teacher will approximately take 30 minutes.

For the second part, each teacher will be asked to view one or two edited lessons of approximately 15-20 minutes and comment on its typicality for another 15-20 minutes.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

We can provide you summary of the findings via email within six months of completion of the research. Anybody who wishes to receive a summary of the findings can give an address to the researcher.

Some of you may have discomfort when your recorded lessons are viewed by other teachers. To reduce such discomfort, you will be consulted regarding the editing of the recorded lessons prior to viewing by any other people and your lessons will not be viewed at your own school. This should reduce the likelihood of later discussion about the quality of particular teaching.

The reviewers’ comments will be recorded and later transcribed by the researcher.

How will your privacy be protected?

The Reviewers will sign in undertaking to respect privacy and confidentiality of the material they view. Anonymity of the teachers will be maintained throughout the study and also while reporting about the findings in the final product. All data, recordings, and transcripts will be stored in researcher’s office cabinet locked and the electronic form password protected and kept for five years before being destroyed. Only the researcher and supervisors involved in the project will have access to the data during that time.

How will the information collected be used?

The information from this project will be reported in a doctoral thesis to be submitted for Dechen’s PhD degree. It may also be reported in conference papers and academic publications. No individual can be identified from the reports of the project.

What do you need to do to participate?
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher.

If you would like to participate, please complete the attached consent form and sign the appropriate boxes to indicate which part of the study you will participate. Then put it in the locked box hung in the corridor within 24 hours.

**Further information**
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt

**Thank you for considering this invitation.**
**Your participation would be greatly valued.**

Co-supervisor
Dr. Rachel Burke

Ph.D Candidate
Dechen Zangmo

**Chief Supervisor**
Dr. Mitch O’Toole

**Complaints about this research**
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application].

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact: Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix J. Consent Form for Teachers

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts
University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822/ Fax: +61 2 4921 7887
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Consent Form for Teachers for Classroom Videoing and Teacher for Reviewing Lessons.
The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan
Conducted by Dechen Zangmo under the supervision of Dr. O’ Toole
from the School of Education, Faculty of Education and Arts

Document Version 3 Dated 1/11/2011
I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.
I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement,
a copy of which I have retained. I understand I can withdraw from the project at any time
and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing. The boxes ticked below indicate my
willingness to participate in the study.
☐ I consent to observation and video recording of my classroom and later to
participate in discussion of the lessons observed and recorded. I understand that the
edited extracts of the lessons will be viewed by other teachers. I also understand my
personal information will remain confidential to the researcher.
☐ I consent to watch other teachers’ taped lessons classroom and make comments on
the typicality of the lessons viewed. I also understand that viewing the taped
material should remain confidential and not discussed for any other purpose other
than what the researcher asks.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.
Print Name: ____________________________ Name of school____________________

Signature: __________ Date: ________

Received any training for teaching Writing by the Process Approach: YES/NO
(Please circle answer)
Appendix K. Information Statement to the Parents/Warden/Students

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts
University of Newcastle
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au

Dr. Rachel Burke
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Participation Information Statement for Parents and Students

The Research Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan

Document Version 3 Dated 1/11/2011

Dear Parents/Students

The research project identified above which is being conducted by Dechen Zangmo from the School of Education at the University of Newcastle. Ms. Dechen is conducting the research as part of her Doctor of Philosophy degree under the supervision of Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education, and Arts.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the study is to investigate possible problems and factors that influenced how secondary English language teachers in Bhutan have experienced implementation of the Process Writing Approach (PWA) in their classroom.

Who can participate in the research?

The lessons on writing instructions given by the teachers will be videotaped. The main focus of all of the lesson observations and video-taping is on the teacher and no images of students will be captured. The students can just participate in the usual class. If students get filmed by chance, the identity of the student will be concealed by blurring or masking the face.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

There are no risks or benefits involved.
How will your privacy be protected?
No images of students will be captured; the identity of the student will be concealed by blurring or masking the face if accidentally recorded.

What do you need to do to participate?
Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher.

If you would like to participate, please complete the attached consent form then put it in the locked box hung in the classroom.

Further information
If you would like further information please contact Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole, on the address given above, or Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt

Thank you for considering this invitation.
Your participation would be greatly valued.

Chief Supervisor
Dr. Mitch O’Toole

Co-supervisor
Dr. Rachel Burke

Ph.D Candidate
Dechen Zangmo

Complaints about this research
This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H- [insert the protocol reference number which will be identified in the written acknowledgement of your application ].

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au. Or the following local contact:
Dr. Dorji Thinley, Director Research and External Relation at Royal University of Bhutan, Thimphu. Telephone +975 2 336455, dorji_thinley@pce.edu.bt
Appendix L. Consent Form for Parents and Students

Dr. John Mitchell O’Toole  
School of Education/Faculty of Education and Arts  
University of Newcastle  
University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
Telephone: +61 2 4921 7822/Fax: +61 2 4921 7887  
mitch.otoole@newcastle.edu.au  
dechen.zangmo@uon.edu.au  
Dr. Rachel Burke  
School of Education / Faculty of Education and Arts  
HA 113 Hunter Building, University Drive, Callaghan, NSW 2308  
+61 2 4921 8700 / +61 2 4921 7887  
Rachel.Burke@newcastle.edu.au

Parent/Student Consent Form for the Research Project:  
Process Writing Approach in Bhutan  
Conducted by Dechen Zangmo under the supervision of  
Dr. O’Toole and Dr. Burke from the School of Education, Faculty of Education and Arts  

I agree for my child_________(child’s name) in grade _____ at _________ to remain in the class during the video recording of the classroom. I understand that the main focus of the filming is on the teacher, and no images of children will be captured. I had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction. I understand I can question the researcher at any time if any worries arise during the filming.

Print Name: ______________________________

Signature/Thumb-impression___________Date: __________________________

Consent of child / young person < 18 years:

Print Name: ______________________________

Signature: ______________________________Date: ______________________________
Appendix M. English Teachers Interview Protocol

English Teachers Interview Protocol Copy 4
Project: Process Writing Approach (PWA) in Bhutan
Interview No.:
Time of interview:
Date:
Name of school
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of interviewee:
Questions
Taching & training background
When did you start teaching the current English curriculum?
For teaching the current English curriculum, did you receive any training prior to its implementation or even during the implementation? If “yes,” How do/es the training help you in teaching?
If “no” how do you manage teaching it?

Process Writing Approach

Do you use Process Writing Approach to teach writing? If “yes” how would you define the characteristics of PWA?
If you don’t use PWA, why not?

Teachers’ Guide and other curriculum documents

- How do you use the teachers’ guide book for teaching writing?
- To what extend does the Teachers’ Guide assist you in implementing PWA?
- In the Teachers’ Guide, there are specific writing objectives and activities mentioned, how are these specific objectives and activities aligning with the intentions of teaching process writing?
- The Guide also insists evaluating writing by focussing on both product and process. What is your experience with this?
- How do other curricular documents (Reading &Literature, Language, and Grammar) support in implementing of PWA?

In the Teachers’ Guides (e.g. on pp. 138-140 of grade seven & pp. 167-169 of grade eight) a format for teaching writing workshop to the students who are not familiar with PWA is suggested…what is your experience of carrying out this suggested activity?

Teachers’ experience of PWA

- The approach emphasises writing in English as a process of -planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. What are your experiences with teaching writing using PWA?

Cultural matches and mismatches (cultural and professional adjustment classroom setting, time available)
- Do you face any challenges in using PWA in your classroom? If “yes,” can you talk a bit about it? How do you manage the challenges?
- Are there any other classroom related factors which affect the implementation of PWA? And how do you manage those differences?

**Teacher Guide grade seven Pg.138-140 and grade eight pp 167-169**

**Introducing Writers’ Workshop**

Because many high school students will have not participated in writing workshop classrooms, they will need instruction on their roles and responsibilities during writing class. The following is meant as an introduction to Writers’ Workshop. Once students are familiar with how the workshop operates, it can be used for writing in all genres.

**Introduction**

Talk about the main tenets of writing process: time and choice. Writers need time to write and writers need to find their own topics. For the writing assignments in this curriculum, students will be expected to find their own topics. As well, time will be spent in class writing, sharing and discussing writing with the teacher and peers. Class time will be spent in prewriting activities, drafting, redrafting, editing and publishing. Students will participate in both teacher led and peer conferences. Through this approach a community of writers will be developed.

Teachers who are teaching classes where students are not familiar with writing workshop will find it helpful to use the first ten writing classes to set up a Writers’ Workshop in their classrooms. The following is a suggested format for introducing Writers’ Workshop.

**Day 1**

Teacher will demonstrate listing as a prewriting activity. To get students accustomed to choosing their own topics start out with this activity. The teacher lists five topics she might like to write about on the board. (Try listing topics that are fairly narrow, as many students will start with topics that are too broad to handle in a ten-day workshop.) The teacher asks the students to list five topics they could write about. After about five minutes, the teacher draws the students' attention to her list and talks a bit about each topic on the list and tells why it is there. She then narrows her topics to the one for further development. Students are then asked to select a topic from their lists to develop. Students and teacher begin to write.

After the teacher has written for about ten minutes, she leaves her draft and begins to circulate among the students. Stopping at students’ desks at random, she reads quietly what the student has written and makes a comment on the content. It is important to use phrases from the student’s writing in making the comment. In this way the reader shows that she receives what the writer has written.

The last ten minutes should be dedicated to hearing what each student has written. The teacher asks each student to pick his best sentence and share that sentence with the class. By choosing one sentence, students are beginning to pick out what is strong about the writing. The teacher may choose to make a positive comment after each sentence is read.

**Day 2**

Students continue to work on the drafts started on Day 1. (If students say they are finished their draft, just ask them to choose another topic from the list they started on day 1.) While the students are writing, the teacher begins informal conferences. She asks a student to read what he has written and the teacher comments on what is working well and asks questions about content that is not clear. These conferences should be short,
between three and five minutes. (Initial conferences do not deal with mechanics; this comes in editing conferences.)

Allow ten to fifteen minutes towards the end of class to begin training students on how to respond to writing. The first step in responding to writing is called pointing (1981 Elbow). A volunteer reads what he has written so far in his draft (the drafts do not need to be complete to share) and other students comment on what they hear. To help establish a positive attitude in the workshop, comments at this point must be positive. Each comment must begin with the “I like…” or “I liked…”. After the draft is read, anyone who wishes to comment must raise his hand and the reader calls on his peers to speak. The teacher may raise her hand to give a comment, too. The comments should be specific and where possible use the words of the writer. For example, a comment like, “I liked the part where you said, ‘Dorji’s eyes widened and his knees weakened at the sight in the clearing’ because it showed that he was scared.” is preferred to, “I liked it because it is exciting.”

A second reader volunteers and the same procedure used with the first student is followed. This time, however, you introduce the second step in responding – questioning. After the students have made pointing comments, they can ask a question about any aspect of the content that is not clear. The reader may answer the question if he wishes or simply thank the person for his question. It is a good idea to keep the questions to three or four so the writer can consider these questions when he redrafts. Too many questions will overwhelm the writer. After this is done, the teacher may remind the reader that he may want to consider the questions asked when he redrafts.

Day 3
Similar procedure to Days 1 and 2 are followed – students write, teacher conducts individual conferences. As in day 2, the last ten or fifteen minutes should be allotted to responding and the final two steps in responding are demonstrated and practiced. The third step is summarizing. After a volunteer has read and students have pointed and asked questions, students are encouraged to summarize in a phrase or short sentence what the piece is about. This helps the writer see if his main idea is coming across and if the piece has focus.

The last step in responding is questions from the author. After the volunteer reads, his peers point, ask questions, and summarize. The reader is then given the opportunity to ask questions of the audience. If there is something he is concerned about and no one has commented on him may want to ask some questions. By allowing the writer to have the last word, the teacher puts control back in the hands of the writer.

If the teacher feels that the students have mastered the skills of responding to writing, she can put the students in peer response groups. Peer response groups should contain four students and self-selected groups work best. Before the end of class she may ask the students to choose three other people they would like to work with on their writing for the next few days. If, however, after only two days of practice she feels the students are not ready to work in peer groups, she may choose to do whole group response for another few days.

Day 4
If students are ready, place them in their peer groups and spend the first ten minutes doing peer response. Peer response groups work in a number of ways. The teacher may choose to begin each class with peer response. In this case, one person reads and the other three respond following the procedure used in whole class response. This way each writer gets some response every four days. Another way to handle peer response is to do it once in four days. This approach allows each writer to read and get response at the same time.
and have three days to write and incorporate the changes suggested by his peers. The teacher may wish to try both approaches and adopt the one that works best with her students.

During peer response, the teacher monitors the groups. If things are working well, she may choose to sit in with a group and participate as a member of the group. After peer response time, the students continue to work on their drafts and the teacher continues with individual conferences.

Days 5 – 10
The procedure followed on Day 4 is continued. As the drafts are completed, the emphasis in the peer conference and the teacher conference may change from content to form and mechanics.

During this time the teacher may choose to use part of the time for a mini-lesson. A mini-lesson is a short demonstration or lecture, lasting from five to fifteen minutes, where the teacher introduces a skill or content issue that may be useful to the writers. Often mini-lessons arise from weaknesses the teacher notices during the individual conferences she has with her students. Mini-lessons cover a variety of topics such as leads, how to write conversation, how to use description effectively – any aspect of form or grammar.

The writing workshop ends with publication. Publication may take a variety of forms from reading final drafts to the class, to wall magazines, to school literary magazines, to author
Appendix N. Record for conference T1 used

Record for conference T1 used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Conf</th>
<th>2nd Conf</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weakness</td>
<td>weakness</td>
<td>sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedating</td>
<td>Tedating</td>
<td>spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>format</td>
<td>format</td>
<td>spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwrit</td>
<td>handwrit</td>
<td>written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O. Letter from the Co-ordinator of the writing of the English curriculum

First of all, I was the coordinator of the writing of the English curriculum for the Kingdom of Bhutan, which took place from 2003-2008. This was a project sponsored by CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) and UNB. Most of the writing of the curriculum took place in Bhutan and over the five years I visited your country 11 times, spending from 3-7 weeks during each visit. During that time I visited many areas of your beautiful country and talked with many teachers and worked with many more.

The starting point of the writing of the curriculum was The Silken Knot, a short booklet prepared by Mr. Thakur, your present Minister of Education, and George Haley, a retired professor of Education from UNB. This document was written in 2001, I think.

Our first curriculum workshop took place in Shaba (outside Paro) in July 2003. During that workshop, we spent 3 weeks with a group of teachers from all levels and from many areas of Bhutan. We prepared the draft of the curriculum outcomes for each of the strands (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening, and Grammar) for each of the classes PP-12. This draft was written with the graduation outcomes outlined in The Silken Knot in mind.

The actual writing of the curriculum was done in stages, starting with the writing of the classes 11 and 12 curriculums in September-November 2003. George Haley and I worked with a cohort of Classes 11 and 12 teachers as well as people from the MoE and Sherubtse College to prepare this section of the curriculum. We started with a review of the curriculum outcomes from the Shaba workshop (mentioned above) and refined these. Then we worked together as a group to choose materials and develop activities that would work towards reaching those outcomes.

Of course, different groups were responsible for different strands but all participants had input into the appropriateness of the materials chosen as well as the activities that would accompany these selections. (This was where we had the big argument about whether or not to include Shakespeare in the curriculum. As you know, Shakespeare was removed from the curriculum, which was the right decision for the students of Bhutan.) The activities became the Teacher's Guides for each of the levels. All curriculum writing sessions followed this format, with small changes to accommodate the needs of particular levels.

The next writing stage was done the following spring (2004), when we wrote the curriculum for classes 9 and 10. We followed the same format as we did for the classes 11 and 12 curriculums. In writing the higher level sections we divided the curriculum into strands (Reading, Writing, etc.)

During the summer break of 2004, I returned to Thimphu to do the first training workshop with the teachers of the Classes 11 and 12 curriculums. Because there were only about 75 teachers teaching English at this level, the writing team was able to give the in-service training to all of the teachers. I coordinated this workshop but my Bhutanese colleagues assisted and led many of the sessions.

The writing of the Classes 5-8 curriculum came next but the curriculum was written based on themes rather than on strands. This section of the curriculum was done in Paro. Philip Sexsmith and I worked with a group of teachers to redraft the curriculum outcomes.
at this level, to identify materials to be used and activities to go along with the materials chosen. At each level we developed student texts and teacher guides.

During the winter break of 2005, I think, we did the in-service session for the Classes 11 and 12 teachers. We had over 100 English teachers of classes 9 and 10 attend the in-service session. George Haley and I led the group of writers in doing the workshops for teachers.

In December of that year Philip Sexsmith and I returned to Bhutan to do a Train the Trainer workshop for the teachers at the Classes 5-8 levels. Because there are just too many teachers at the level, we could not train them all in the time we had. We brought in the writers of this section of the curriculum as well as a number of other teachers at this level and trained them in leading workshops for other teachers at this level in their schools and dzongkags. Each leader was given a Train the Trainer manual which outlines the philosophy of the curriculum as well as actual activities teachers can do to implement this curriculum.

In the spring of 2006, I returned to Bhutan with two retired elementary teachers from Canada, Sharon Hill and Shirley-Dale Easley to complete the curriculum writing. This time we did Classes PP - 4. Again we worked with many Bhutanese educators and personnel from the MoE to write this curriculum. We followed a theme approach for this section of the curriculum, similar to how the middle level curriculum is organized.

Sharon Hill and I returned in December to do a Train the Trainer workshop with a group of teachers from all over the country. This was similar to what we did with the Classes 5-8 teachers.

Amber Rai was present at all of the writing workshops and is now the coordinator of English at CAPSD. He is very knowledgeable about all aspects of the curriculum as well as how it is being implemented and you may find it useful to contact him.

I hope this is helpful and if you have more questions or need clarification feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
Appendix P. Interview Coding

**Interview coding category**

Teacher training and experience  
Orientation to the new curriculum  
Writers’ Workshop  
No training  
Others  
Teachers’ reflection on the trainings  
2.1.1. Positive  
2.1.2. Negative  
2.1.3. Suggestions  
2.2. Teaching Experience  
2.2.1. No of years  
2.2.2. English class taught  
2.2.3. Other subjects  
3. Teachers’ understandings of the innovation  
3.1. Clear concept  
3.2. Not clear  
3.1.1. Teaching the new curriculum  
3.2.2. Action taken  
3.2.3. Current feelings  
3.2.4 Teachers’ existing beliefs  
4. *Reflection of Teachers’ experience of PWA*  
4.1. Positive  
4.2. Negative  
5. *Challenges of implementing PWA*  
5.1. Cultural related  
5.1.1 Matches  
5.1.2 Mismatches  
5.2. *School physical location*  
5.2.1. Urban  
5.2.2. Rural  
5.3. *Parents’ background*  
5.3.1. Literate  
5.3.2. Illiterate  
5.4. *Students’ background*  
5.4.1. Prior knowledge  
5.4.2. Level  
5.5. *Classroom related*  
5.5.1. No of students  
5.5.2. Time available  
6. Working with the Curriculum Guide  
6.1 Use it for teaching PWA  
6.2 Use for other strands  
6.3. Do not use it at all  
7. *Teachers’ experience*
7.1 positive
7.2. negative
8. Alignment of objectives and activities
8.1. yes
8.2. to some extend
8.4. Not sure
9. Reading & literature support PWA
9.1. Yes
9.2. No
10. Teachers adapt curriculum to suit the
10.1. the classrooms
10.2. the students,
10.3. Time
10.4. Others
11. Evaluation
11.1. Product
11.2. Process
12. Writers’ Workshop
12.1. Positive
12.2. Negative
13. Intentions and stated activities
13.1. match
13.2. mismatch
13.3. not sure
14. Teachers’ understanding of PWA
14.1. Clear
14.2. Not sure
Appendix Q. Educational Development

The first King, Ugyen Wangchuk, had a mobile court school that moved with him around the country. Clever young men were selected by His Majesty and were given experience in dealing with money, solving local problems, directing villagers to take responsibility in improving the surroundings of villages.

The second King, Jigme Dorji, set up 7 to 10 Hindi Medium schools…This was the beginning of our present Bhutanese Education System.

The third King, Ugyen Dorji Wangchuk, decided to go in for English Medium Schools. (Mackey, 2002)

Together with the traditional monastic education, King Ugyen Wangchuk, the first king opened two schools introducing Bhutan to the formal secular education during his reign in (1907-26) (Driem, 1994). The number of schools increased to five during the succeeding second king, King Jigme Wangchuk in (1926-52) and nationwide during the third king, King Jigme Dorji Wangchuk(1952-72).

Table – Periods of educational development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Formal monastic education began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language: Chhoe Ked, the classical Tibetan language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Focus: on art of liturgy, rituals and reciting holy scriptures from memory (J. Dorji, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907-1964</td>
<td>Formal Secular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium of instruction: Hindi (second language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum: Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language: Hindi, Choke, learning through Indian style old fashioned didactic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Driem, 1994; Mackey, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Initiated programmes to modify and codify Dzongkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Still taught Choke in the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dzongkha Division Department of Education was established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produced Instructional materials in Dzongkha medium such as textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new Dzongkha Handbook: A careful study of the differences between liturgical language choses and modern written Dzongkha was written (Driem, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Indigenous/ Bhutanising education system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium of instruction: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of the New Approach to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Education (NAPE) emphasizing child-centred, activity-based learning focusing on the local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major changes initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social studies curriculum-classes 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inclusion of Bhutanese history and geogyphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other changes followed (Gyamthso, Dorji,)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R. The Four Harmonious Friends (*thuenpa puenshi*)
Appendix S. The Twenty Districts
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Appendix T. The Twelve Recommendations by Ministry of Education for English Curriculum Reform

To conclude this introduction, this document presents the revisions, which the Ministry of Education is recommending at this time to keep the English curriculum up to date. They are as follows:

Revision 1: The curriculum has been Organised so that classroom practice is informed by the set of Standards presented by CERD in *The Silkent Knot: Standards for English for Schools in Bhutan* for each of the four Strands, or modes of discourse, namely Reading & Literature, Listening and Speaking, Writing, and Language. These set out in global terms what students can be expected to be able to do and to know in English, following graduation at the end of Class XII.

Revision 2: The Standards are elaborated by a set of detailed Learning Objectives for each Class level, PP.-XII, which integrate the work in English across the curriculum. The Objectives serve to indicate to students, teachers and parents, the details of what students need to learn at each class level in order to make progress towards the attainment of the Standards. The Objectives are set out for each of the four Strands and are cumulative, sequenced developmentally, Pre-Primary-XII, and arranged so that they can be dealt with separately or integrated at each class level.

Revision 3: The curriculum marks a change in thinking about English studies, especially the English studies for Classes VII – XII. To date, the emphasis has been on learning the content of the literature
in the syllabus. Little time has been given to the use of the literature to aid in the development of the language skills presented in the four strands in this programme. The literature materials recommended here have been selected to help students develop reading skills and to aid as a resource for assistance with the development, and practice, of the skills of Writing, Listening, and Speaking, and Language. The content of the literature is important, and to that end, care has been taken to choose excellent literature; however, the English Curriculum Review Committee is persuaded that content must play a secondary role to the advancement of the skills necessary for proficiency in English.

Revision 4: The curriculum calls for a shift in teaching and learning practices to student-centred learning and the establishment of learner-centred classrooms.

Revision 5: Students will read both fiction and non-fiction in the Reading and Literature strand for each class. This curriculum sets out to achieve a balance in the kinds of literature which students are expected to learn how to read.

Revision 6: The document calls for the direct teaching of reading strategies in each class, PrePrimary – XII.

Revision 7: Care has been taken to select materials that are gender sensitive and age/class appropriate.

Revision 8: Care has been taken to select texts which engage students in a discussion of the cultural values of Bhutan and introduce them to the notable writers of Bhutan and of other cultures.

Revision 9: Care has been taken to introduce texts that are written in contemporary English.

Revision 10: The curriculum calls for the teaching of English grammar, pronunciation and syntax in a consistent, thorough and interactive manner, Classes IV – XII.

Revision 11: Timelines are set out to ensure that each of the strands gets its share of the time allocated to English studies. The Timeline is different for each class level to permit teachers to make provision for a balanced programme that meets the changing needs of the students but still requires teachers to set aside time for work in each strand.

Revision 12: The curriculum presents changes in the Modes of Assessment in examination test items which will permit students to show that they have learned the skills and content presented in each strand.

Finally, the Ministry of Education wants to compliment the educators of Bhutan on the excellent work, which has produced graduates who have a capacity in English second to none in those countries that use English as a second language.

The plans put forward in this curriculum to provide for time to develop the skills in each mode, or strand, of Listening and Speaking, Language, Writing, and Reading & Literature are in keeping with this thinking about language learning. The goal is an English speaker who can integrate the modes or strands so that he can communicate with eloquence and receive the communication of others with respect and clarity.

It is the wish of the Ministry to build on the extraordinary capacities of both teachers and students to learn English and offer a revised programme, which will graduate students with the level of fluency in English needed at this time.
## Standards for Writing

1. Graduates communicate in coherent and grammatically correct writing in a wide range of forms – personal, transactional, poetic.

2. Graduates use writing as a way of learning, taking time to explore, clarify and reflect on their thoughts, feelings, experiences and relationships.

3. Graduates use writing to develop critical thinking skills – review, analysis, hypothesis, recollection, summary, evaluation.

4. Graduates plan, draft, redraft and edit their own work (the writing process).

5. Graduates have studied examples of excellent writing both from the literature that they are studying and other sources to use them as models for their own writing.

6. Graduates are able to take notes from meetings, their reading, and other sources and use their notes to construct an accurate report of proceedings or research findings.

7. Graduates respond clearly in writing to test items in school and other examinations.

8. Graduates have produced a portfolio of their own writing containing samples of their best work:
   - personal (letters to friends, diaries, autobiography, wishes, dreams...)
   - transactional (information, explanation, argument, narration, report, descriptions, persuasion, biographies,...)
   - poetic (plays, skits, short stories, novels, poems...).

   *Note: good writers explore alternative and imaginative possibilities, review options and develop a personally acceptable range of styles and writing procedures.*
Appendix V. The Eight Standards and Elaborated Objectives (2006)

Standards for Writing

1. Graduates communicate in coherent and grammatically correct writing in a wide range of forms - personal, transactional, poetic.
2. Graduates use writing as a way of learning, taking time to explore, clarify and reflect on their thoughts, feelings, experiences and relationships.
3. Graduates use writing to develop critical thinking skills - review, analysis, hypothesis, recollection, and summary, evaluation.
4. Graduates use the writing process to plan, draft, redraft, edit and publish their own work.
5. Graduates have studied examples of excellent writing both from the literature that they are studying and other sources to use them as models for their own writing.
6. Graduates are able to take notes from meetings, their reading, and other sources and use their notes to construct an accurate report of proceedings or research findings.
7. Graduates respond clearly in writing to test items on school and national examinations.
8. Graduates have produced a portfolio of their own writing containing samples of their best work:
   • Personal (letters to friends, diaries, autobiography, wishes, dreams...)
   • Transactional (information, explanation, argument, narration, report, descriptions, persuasion, biographies...)
   • Poetic (plays, skits, short stories, novels, poems...)

N.B. Good writers explore alternative and imaginative possibilities, review options and develop a personally acceptable range of styles and writing procedures.

Class VII students will demonstrate that they can:
1. Use the writing strategies developed in earlier classes.
2. Spell correctly the words they are using.
3. Use punctuation marks introduced in earlier classes including exclamation marks.
4. Use the dictionary to learn the meaning of words and how to spell them correctly.
5. Use the thesaurus to find more precise vocabulary.
6. Write coherent paragraphs using simple, compound and complex sentences.
7. Take notes to prepare reports and summaries, and complete information transfer.
8. Write poems using figurative language – simile, metaphor, onomatopoeia, and personification – to enhance their effectiveness.
9. Write for a range of purposes and audiences using a variety of forms encountered in their reading including, explanations, summaries, resume, reports and fantasy.
10. Use writing as a way of thinking and learning.
11. Add at least 5 pieces to their portfolio making choices based on the elements of good writing.
12. Respond in writing to examination questions and homework assignments at an acceptable level.
13. Distinguish the best pieces of their writing and add them to their portfolio.
14. Enjoy writing by participating in a community of writers.
Appendix W. The Eight Standards and Elaborated Objectives (Recent Edition)

Standards for Writing
1. Graduates communicate in coherent and grammatically correct writing in a wide range of forms - personal, transactional, poetic.
2. Graduates use writing as a way of learning, taking time to explore, clarify and reflect on their thoughts, feelings, experiences and relationships.
3. Graduates use writing to develop critical thinking skills - review, analysis, hypothesis, recollection, and summary, evaluation.
4. Graduates use the writing process to plan, draft, redraft, edit and publish their own work.
5. Graduates have studied examples of excellent writing both from the literature that they are studying and other sources to use them as models for their own writing.
6. Graduates are able to take notes from meetings, their reading, and other sources and use their notes to construct an accurate report of proceedings or research findings.
7. Graduates respond clearly in writing to test items on school and national examinations.
8. Graduates have produced a portfolio of their own writing containing samples of their best work:
   • Personal (letters to friends, diaries, autobiography, wishes, dreams…)
   • Transactional (information, explanation, argument, narration, report, descriptions, persuasion, biographies…)
   • Poetic (plays, skits, short stories, novels, poems…)
N.B. Good writers explore alternative and imaginative possibilities, review options and develop a personally acceptable range of styles and writing procedures.

Class VII students will demonstrate that they can:
1. Use the writing strategies developed in earlier classes.
2. Spell correctly the words they are using.
3. Use punctuation marks introduced in earlier classes including exclamation marks.
4. Use the dictionary to learn the meaning of words and how to spell them correctly.
5. Use the thesaurus to find more precise vocabulary.
6. Write coherent paragraphs using simple, compound and complex sentences.
7. Take notes to prepare reports and summaries, and complete information transfer.
8. Write poems using figurative language – simile, metaphor, onomatopoeia, and personification – to enhance their effectiveness.
9. Write for a range of purposes and audiences using a variety of forms encountered in their reading including, explanations, summaries, resume, reports and fantasy.
10. Use writing as a way of thinking and learning.
11. Add at least 5 pieces to their portfolio making choices based on the elements of good writing.
12. Respond in writing to examination questions and homework assignments at an acceptable level.
13. Distinguish the best pieces of their writing and add them to their portfolio.
14. Enjoy writing by participating in a community of writers.
Appendix G: Working With Words

Students receive daily explicit, systematic instruction in one or more of the following as appropriate:

- phonemic awareness, students are taught the sounds of the language;
- phonics instruction, students receive instruction in letter/sound matching;
- blending and segmenting sounds, and decoding;
- graphophonic instruction, students learn to use letter/sound correspondence to write;
- syntactic, students learn word patterns and spelling, prefixes, suffixes, root words, etymologies; and
- vocabulary, students learn word meanings, analogies, usage, and cognates.

Vocabulary Knowledge

Overview

All readers encounter words they do not know; strong readers have strategies for figuring out what to do with them; they use any or all of the following strategies when they encounter an unknown word:

- Skip it and read on
- Re-read
- Think about what they are reading
- Sound it out to see if it is a word they know
- Look at the headings and subheadings of the text
- Guess at what type of word would go there, such as a noun or an adjective
- Associate the parts of the word (prefixes, root words, suffixes) with words they know

Contextual Redefinition is a strategy that helps students acquire the ability to use context and structural analysis to figure out the meanings of unknown words. One important element in this strategy is the teacher modelling or thinking out loud about how to figure out the meaning of the word. This can be done by sharing the associations that come to mind when using structural analysis.

Structural or morphemic analysis simply means using the prefixes, root words, and suffixes to associate with other meaningful word parts. Putting context together with structural analysis is a very powerful strategy for figuring out the meanings of unknown words.
Appendix Y. Writing Memoir (Recent Edition)

Appendix G: Memoir

Autobiographical Genres

auto + bio + graph = self + life + writing (from the Greek)

A genre is a literary form. There are many genres that are autobiographical in nature. In other words, the writer writes about his or her own life. Here are some of the various genres that are considered to be autobiographical.

autobiography, confessional, credo, diary, journal, letter, log, memoir, personal essay

All of these would generally be considered to be nonfiction. However, there is sometimes a fine line between autobiography and fiction. For example, a book called The Autobiography of Miss Jane Pittman is actually a fascinating work of historical fiction that follows the life of a slave through her freedom and eventually to the end of her life. It depicts actual historical events, but it is written as fiction, despite the title. Sandra Cisneros’ book, The House on Mango Street, presents a similar situation. The story is Cisneros’ personal story of her own life, but it is told through a fictional character.

Definition of Memoir

A memoir is a piece of autobiographical writing, usually shorter in nature than a comprehensive autobiography. The memoir, especially as it is being used in publishing today, often tries to capture certain highlights or meaningful moments in one’s past, often including a contemplation of the meaning of that event at the time of the writing of the memoir. The memoir may be more emotional and concerned with capturing particular scenes, or a series of events, rather than documenting every fact of a person’s life.

Characteristics of the Memoir Form

... Focus on a brief period of time or series of related events
... Narrative structure, including many of the usual elements of storytelling such as setting, plot development, imagery, conflict, characterization, foreshadowing and flashback, and irony and symbolism
... The writer’s contemplation of the meaning of these events in retrospective
... A fictional quality even though the story is true
... Higher emotional level
... More personal reconstruction of the events and their impact
... Therapeutic experience for the memoirist, especially when the memoir is of the crisis or survival type of memoir

Here’s another definition written by Dr. Beth Barsh, a professor of education at Binghamton University. It is from her book, Writing For Your Portfolio (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999).
Appendix Z. Introducing Writers’ Workshop

Because many high school students will have not participated in writing workshop classrooms, they will need instruction on their roles and responsibilities during writing class. The following is meant as an introduction to Writers’ Workshop. Once students are familiar with how the workshop operates, it can be used for writing in all genres.

Introduction

Talk about the main tenets of writing process: time and choice. Writers need time to write and writers need to find their own topics. For the writing assignments in this curriculum, students will be expected to find their own topics. As well, time will be spent in class writing, sharing and discussing writing with the teacher and peers. Class time will be spent in prewriting activities, drafting, redrafting, editing and publishing. Students will participate in both teacher led and peer conferences. Through this approach a community of writers will be developed.

Teachers who are teaching classes where students are not familiar with writing workshop will find it helpful to use the first ten writing classes to set up a Writers’ Workshop in their classrooms. The following is a suggested format for introducing Writers’ Workshop.

Day 1

Teacher will demonstrate listing as a prewriting activity. To get students accustomed to choosing their own topics start out with this activity. The teacher lists five topics she might like to write about on the board. (Try listing topics that are fairly narrow, as many students will start with topics that are too broad to handle in a ten-day workshop.) The teacher asks the students to list five topics they could write about. After about five minutes, the teacher draws the students’ attention to her list and talks a bit about each topic on the list and tells why it is there. She then narrows her topics to the one for further development. Students are then asked to select a topic from their lists to develop.

Students and teacher begin to write.

After the teacher has written for about ten minutes, she leaves her draft and begins to circulate among the students. Stopping at students’ desks at random, she reads quietly what the student has written and makes a comment on the content. It is important to use phrases from the student’s writing in making the comment. In this way the reader shows that she receives what the writer has written.

The last ten minutes should be dedicated to hearing what each student has written. The teacher asks each student to pick his best sentence and share that sentence with the class. By choosing one sentence, students are beginning to pick out what is strong about the writing. The teacher may choose to make a positive comment after each sentence is read.

Day 2

Students continue to work on the drafts started on Day 1. (If students say they are finished their draft, just ask them to choose another topic from the list they started on day 1.) While the students are writing, the teacher begins informal conferences. She asks a student to read what he has written and the teacher comments on what is working well and asks questions about content that is not clear. These conferences should be short, between three and five minutes. (Initial conferences do not deal with mechanics; this comes in editing conferences.)

Allow ten to fifteen minutes towards the end of class to begin training students on how to respond to writing. The first step in responding to writing is called pointing (1981 Elbow). A volunteer reads what he has written so far in his draft (the drafts do not need to be complete to share) and other students comment on what they hear. To help establish a positive attitude in the workshop, comments at this point must be positive. Each comment
must begin with the “I like…” or “I liked…”. After the draft is read, anyone who wishes to comment must raise his hand and the reader calls on his peers to speak. The teacher may raise her hand to give a comment, too. The comments should be specific and where possible use the words of the writer. For example, a comment like, “I liked the part where you said, ‘Dorji’s eyes widened and his knees weakened at the sight in the clearing’ because it showed that he was scared.” is preferred to, “I liked it because it is exciting.”

A second reader volunteers and the same procedure used with the first student is followed. This time, however, you introduce the second step in responding – questioning. After the students have made pointing comments, they can ask a question about any aspect of the content that is not clear. The reader may answer the question if he wishes or simply thank the person for his question. It is a good idea to keep the questions to three or four so the writer can consider these questions when he redrafts. Too many questions will overwhelm the writer. After this is done, the teacher may remind the reader that he may want to consider the questions asked when he redrafts.

Day 3
Similar procedure to Days 1 and 2 are followed – students write, teacher conducts individual conferences. As in day 2, the last ten or fifteen minutes should be allotted to responding and the final two steps in responding are demonstrated and practiced. The third step is summarizing. After a volunteer has read and students have pointed and asked questions, students are encouraged to summarize in a phrase or short sentence what the piece is about. This helps the writer see if his main idea is coming across and if the piece has focus.

The last step in responding is questions from the author. After the volunteer reads, his peers point, ask questions, and summarize. The reader is then given the opportunity to ask questions of the audience. If there is something he is concerned about and no one has commented on him may want to ask some questions. By allowing the writer to have the last word, the teacher puts control back in the hands of the writer.

If the teacher feels that the students have mastered the skills of responding to writing, she can put the students in peer response groups. Peer response groups should contain four students and self-selected groups work best. Before the end of class she may ask the students to choose three other people they would like to work with on their writing for the next few days. If, however, after only two days of practice she feels the students are not ready to work in peer groups, she may choose to do whole group response for another few days.

Day 4
If students are ready, place them in their peer groups and spend the first ten minutes doing peer response. Peer response groups work in a number of ways. The teacher may choose to begin each class with peer response. In this case, one person reads and the other three respond following the procedure used in whole class response. This way each writer gets some response every four days. Another way to handle peer response is to do it once in four days. This approach allows each writer to read and get response at the same time and have three days to write and incorporate the changes suggested by his peers. The teacher may wish to try both approaches and adopt the one that works best with her students.

During peer response, the teacher monitors the groups. If things are working well, she may choose to sit in with a group and participate as a member of the group.
After peer response time, the students continue to work on their drafts and the teacher continues with individual conferences.

Days 5 – 10
The procedure followed on Day 4 is continued. As the drafts are completed, the emphasis in the peer conference and the teacher conference may change from content to form and mechanics.

During this time the teacher may choose to use part of the time for a mini-lesson. A mini lesson is a short demonstration or lecture, lasting from five to fifteen minutes, where the teacher introduces a skill or content issue that may be useful to the writers. Often mini lessons arise from weaknesses the teacher notices during the individual conferences she has with her students. Mini-lessons cover a variety of topics such as leads, how to write conversation, how to use description effectively – any aspect of form or grammar.

The writing workshop ends with publication. Publication may take a variety of forms from reading final drafts to the class, to wall magazines, to school literary magazines, to author