

FOLLOW THE KING OR FOLLOW THE SCRIPT?

CURRERE FRAGMENTS ON SCHOOL AND BECOMING

By Lois Akosua Blay
Miami University

Imagine a regimented school life where your days are structured so completely that even your sense of self begins to feel scripted. Imagine living within a system where discipline is praised as excellence, routine becomes identity, and obedience quietly shapes the kind of person you are expected to become. Now imagine returning to that same institution years later, only to realize that, although the technologies of control have changed, the script itself remains. This is where my experience at School A comes in.

School A is one of the most prestigious and widely known girls' senior high schools in Ghana. Founded by the Methodist Church in the early nineteenth century, the school carries a deep history that is inseparable from the colonial history of the Gold Coast and from the long project of shaping girls' education through Christian discipline, British ideals, and institutional order (Odei-Tettey et al., 2023). That history matters because the school I personally experienced was never just a place of learning.

It was also a place where how we walked, spoke, and aspired were arranged according to a script, under the guise of holistic education. This analysis is a *currere* meditation on that experience. It draws from three fragments: a regressive fragment that returns to a day-in-the-life memory of my experience at School A, a progressive fragment that imagines a dystopian future in which I teach in the same scripted system, and an analytic synthesis that makes sense of the two. *Currere*, as Pinar (1994, 2019) frames it, is not simply autobiography. It is a method for understanding curriculum as lived experience, historical force, and even future possibility (Baszile, 2015; Poetter, 2025). In that spirit, I ask what kind of person a scripted school makes—what it asks of girls and what it leaves behind.

I use “scripted” here in both a narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense, I’m referring to a tightly structured curriculum and standardized testing, where teachers and students are pressured to move through predetermined content and measure learning through uniform outcomes (Golann, 2021). In the broader sense, scripting is a way of organizing school life so that bodies, emotions, expectations, and identities are made manageable for the institution. Fitz and Nikolaidis (2020) describe scripted curriculum as pre-structured and highly controlling, and they argue that it limits the intellectual participation of teachers and students. At this institution, that logic extended beyond lessons. It was woven into the everyday life of the school.

The scripting at this school operated on several levels at once. It existed in the formal curriculum, in test-driven academic expectations, and in the everyday regulation of school life (Pinar et al., 2002). It also existed in older missionary and colonial traditions that shaped how young girls were taught to walk, speak, sit, pray, and imagine their futures (Fenuku & Akpaku, 2024; Odei-Tettey et al., 2023). Standardization can certainly create order, but it can also become a system of containment when it narrows teacher judgment (Vaughn et al., 2021) and student freedom (Timberlake et al., 2017). In School A’s case, the curriculum trained us not only to succeed, but to conform. In this article, I highlight how the scripted curriculum operates as a

continuation of colonial and missionary logics, structuring not only academic outcomes but the identities, behaviors, and aspirations of its students.

COLONIAL INHERITANCE

To understand the makings of School A, one must begin with the Methodist missionary project in Ghana. Odei-Tettey et al. (2023) argue that Ghanaian education predates European influence and once reflected indigenous values, social organization, and moral formation. The Methodist Church entered a pre-colonial world that already had its own forms of education, socialization, and moral training. Indigenous systems taught responsibility, honesty, respect, labor, and communal belonging long before European missionaries arrived (Odei-Tettey et al., 2023). Yet, missionary schooling often positioned those indigenous systems as incomplete or inferior. In their place, schools like this promoted Christianity, English literacy, vocational skills, discipline, and maintaining order as markers of civilization. Colonial schooling redirected the curriculum toward imported epistemologies and global pressures rather than local cultural needs. The point was not simply to teach girls reading and writing, but to make them into a certain kind of social subject. That is the historical backdrop of my schooling. The practices I experienced were not accidental. They were inherited.

This colonial inheritance matters because it helped develop the institutional culture that followed. School A's prestige was not only academic; it was historical. It was one of those places where legacy became tradition, and tradition became authority. The school's old traditions were not simply preserved because they were old but because they were understood as signs of quality and prestige. Practices persisted because they were understood as part of what made the school excellent. Yet what they often preserved was a colonial logic of order, hierarchy, and moral regulation (Odei-Tettey et al., 2023). The school's greatness, in other words, was built in part through forms of scripting that made the institution appear stable while narrowing the range of student becoming. The legacy of missionary education was visible in the school's emphasis on discipline, respectability, and the formation of girls into particular kinds of women.

This is why the school's rituals felt bigger than any one classroom. They shaped how we conducted ourselves, how we studied, and how we understood ourselves. At School A, the script was not only instructional but institutional. It regulated the body as much as the mind. It taught us how to take up space, how to be seen, and how to be trained. Some of those practices may have once served a particular purpose in a colonial and missionary era. Yet by the time I attended the school over 185 years later, many of them no longer fit the world we inhabited. Still, they remained.

FRAGMENT 1 – BECOMING THROUGH ROUTINE

Afiba wakes up with a jolt. For a moment, her face is burning from the chemicals in the mosquito net she aired out earlier that afternoon, but there is no time to dwell on discomfort. She glances at the clock hanging to her left in the dorm. It's 4:50 a.m. She sighs, knowing the chaotic cycle is about to repeat itself. Ten minutes later, the loud megaphone siren cuts through the dormitory, pulling her out of her drowsy state. Around her, beds creak, girls groan, and voices rise, urging everyone to hurry. "Form One sisters, hurry up!" The day has already started.

She quickly changes into a pair of khaki shorts and a house jersey and joins the rush to complete her assigned duties. Her task is to clean the second-floor staircase, a job that must be done well and on time. But like many mornings, there is a problem: the taps are dry. She and the others run to the closest borehole about a mile away, buckets in hand, knowing that any delay could lead to punishment. Time feels tight, always moving faster than she can keep up with. By the time she returns to finish her work, she is already thinking about what comes next.

After quickly bathing, dressing, and making her bed to the expected standard, Afiba joins the other girls for morning assembly. They move in straight lines, carefully arranged, their movements controlled and watched. It is a known and well-kept tradition of walking in lines of two on campus or anywhere in public to ensure orderliness. She holds her Bible and Methodist hymn book firmly, aware that forgetting them could single her out. Morning assembly is less a moment of reflection and more another step in a tightly structured routine.

Classes begin immediately after. There is no easing into the day ... only instructions, questions, and tasks. A surprise quiz greets them in their first lesson, setting the tone for what follows. Most of her time is spent copying notes, trying to keep up, and making sure she does not fall behind. Learning feels less like understanding and more like endurance. Breakfast comes and goes quickly. The smell of rice porridge and *bofrot* (a sweet, round, fried flour pastry also known as puff-puff) fills the dining hall, but there is little time to enjoy it. The older students eat first, and Afiba takes what remains, eating quickly before being hurried along again. Even moments that should feel comforting are shaped by time and order. The rest of the morning passes in a blur of lessons, a short break, and even more writing. Her wrist begins to ache from all the notes-copying, but she keeps going. There is no space to slow down. By the time the academic day ends, she is already tired, yet the schedule continues without pause.

After lunch, she looks forward to a compulsory hour of uninterrupted napping, hoping for relief. But even then, her mind stays active, thinking about everything still ahead. The quiet does not fully feel like rest; it feels like waiting. Soon, the siren sounds again, and the day moves into the next phase. Afiba joins her extracurricular activity—choir practice, not simply out of interest but because participation is expected. Even these moments are part of the larger structure, guided by responsibility rather than choice.

In the evening, she returns to her desk for *prep*. This is supposed to be study time, but it feels more like a routine of memorization. She reads and repeats, trying to hold onto information just long enough to use it. “Chew and pour,” everybody calls it: memorize, reproduce, and forget about it. In that moment, she begins to question what learning really means in this place. When the final siren sounds at night signaling lights out, Afiba finally lies down. The day replays in her mind—the rushing, the rules, the constant pressure to stay in line. From morning to night, every part of her day has been planned and controlled.

As she drifts toward sleep, she realizes that, beyond the subjects she is taught, she is learning something else entirely. She is learning how to follow, how to endure, and how to fit into a system that leaves little room for her own thoughts or identity. And in that quiet moment, surrounded by others yet alone in her thoughts, she begins to wonder who she is becoming, and whether there is even space for her to become anything else.

FRAGMENT 1 ANALYSIS

In my regressive look at the past, I returned to my days as a young student at School A. Founded by the Methodist Church in the 1800s, this school is very well-known and has a long history that goes back to the colonial era. When the British missionaries ran the school, they brought with them a specific idea of what a “proper lady” should be. This history has been passed down for generations, and it created a system where every tiny detail of our lives was controlled. We had to wake up at 5:00 a.m. every morning. The dull, yet intense sound of a megaphone siren would boom through the air, announcing that our sleep time was over. This siren was the script we lived by—all day every day, across decades and generations, from dawn to dusk. It told us when to wake up, do our chores, pray, study, and even when to eat. We learned how to “survive” the system, but we didn’t always learn how to think for ourselves.

The regression is an excavation of feeling, routine, and pressure (Pinar et al., 2002; Poetter, 2025). It acknowledges the siren, the routines, uniforms, rules, and the fact that time itself seemed to belong to the institution. We were always being trained into the next thing: the next class, the next inspection, the next competition, and the next measure of excellence. The school and the siren made the concept of time visible to everyone. It divided the day into sections that carried meaning and discipline. If one part of the day went badly, the whole routine got messed up. If one house, class, or club failed in a competition, the loss belonged not just to those individuals but to the entire community. In this way, the school produced solidarity, but it also produced constant pressure.

At the same time, the school could feel deeply meaningful. There is something powerful about belonging to a place that is both demanding and celebrated. We wore the prestige of the school like an alternative uniform. To be a student of this school was to be recognized as part of a tradition of excellence, and I must admit, that recognition felt good. But it also made the pressure harder to question. If everyone around you says the system is valuable, then your discomfort can begin to feel like a personal weakness rather than a structural issue.

Still, the regressive fragment is not only a critique. It also captures admiration, belonging, and the emotional power of being part of a school with a celebrated reputation. That tension matters because School A was both formative and constraining. It gave us excellence as an identity, but it also gave us excellence as a demand, and that demand was made to feel natural. That is what scripting does well. It makes its own logic feel natural.

FRAGMENT 2 – TEACHING THE SCRIPT: LIFE BEYOND THE SIREN

Miss B, a facilitator at School A, arrives just before 7:40 a.m., her face and ID scanned at the gate as it opens without question. The campus looks familiar ... neat hedges, clean paths, freshly painted buildings, and tall trees, but there is a quiet shift in how things work now. Her wristband vibrates gently, reminding her of her shift, role, and place in the system. She still finds the title “facilitator” strange. Twenty years ago, teachers stood at the center of learning. Now, the system leads, and she follows alongside it.

As she walks toward the chapel, she passes groups of girls moving in pairs, their uniforms crisp, their steps almost synchronized—a routine so familiar, yet so distant. Their wristbands pulse softly, guiding them along. They greet her warmly, calling her name with excitement. Alumnae like her (referred to as “old girls”) are symbols in this school, almost idolized, proof that one can pass through the system and come out the other side. She smiles back, but her wristband records

even that small interaction. Assembly begins with hymns and prayers, but behind it all a large screen displays daily targets and scores that update in real time. The school no longer needs the loud megaphone siren that once controlled everything. Now, the rhythm of the day lives on each student's wrist—a constant that is impossible to ignore.

In her classroom, everything is already prepared. The students are seated, their tablet screens lit, the lesson loaded. Miss B greets them and begins teaching French, but even as she speaks, the system guides her pace and her next steps. She tries to create small moments of warmth and encouragement, but each time she does so, her wristband pulls her back to the script. Teaching feels less like a conversation and more like following instructions. The students respond quickly and correctly because they know what is expected. When the system prompts them to check in with their emotions, one girl hesitates, unsure of how to answer. Miss B pauses, wanting to respond in a more human way, but she is guided toward a standard response.

Throughout the day, everything is measured. Participation, performance, and even small acts of kindness are tracked and recorded. The classroom feels calm, but it is a controlled calm, shaped by constant monitoring. Students adjust themselves before correction comes, their wristbands reminding them before a teacher ever has to.

In the afternoon, during Visual Arts club, the atmosphere softens slightly. The girls bring their artwork forward with excitement, eager to be seen. But even here, the system lingers in the background in the form of an eagle-shaped tracking device. Miss B notices one student quietly drawing on paper instead of using the digital tools provided. The drawing shows a girl standing amongst her peers, without a wristband, free in a way the others are not. The student asks a question that stays with Miss B, "Will we ever stop wearing the wrist bands?" It is a simple question, but not an easy one to answer. Miss B knows she has to be careful. Even her words feel tracked. So, she responds gently, without saying too much and offering something that sounds like hope but feels uncertain even to her.

By the end of the day, as students move across campus guided by their glowing wristbands, Miss B feels the weight of what has changed and what has not. The system is quieter now, more advanced and precise. But its presence is everywhere, shaping how students learn, behave, and even feel.

When her shift ends, she sits alone in her car for a moment before leaving. The campus continues behind her, moving in its steady rhythm. She thinks about her own time as a student, when the siren dictated every part of the day. Now, that same control has taken a different form. And as she drives away, she realizes that, despite all the changes, the lesson remains the same: the system continues to teach students (and now teachers) how to live within it.

FRAGMENT 2 ANALYSIS

The progressive fragment above imagines what it would mean for me to return to School A as a teacher. The future I imagine is dystopian because it reveals what is already embedded in the present, in a somewhat unrealistic way. If students are expected to perform within scripts, then teachers are, too. In the imagined classroom, I am asked to deliver content with precision and measurable results, while my ability to adapt, question, or improvise is treated as suspicious.

I imagine walking into a classroom before school begins. There are lesson plans to follow, records to keep, assessments to prepare, and performance expectations to satisfy. The first question

is not what my students need or what I know about them. It is whether I will cover the required content, keep the pace, or protect the school's reputation.

This dystopian image aligns closely with critiques of scripted curriculum. Fitz and Nikolaidis (2020) argue that scripted curriculum undermines democratic education because it constrains teacher autonomy and student participation. In the imagined future, the teacher is reduced to a technician. Vaughn et al. (2021) also argue that adaptive teaching is essential precisely because restrictive curricula fail to meet the linguistic, cultural, and instructional needs of diverse learners. In an institution like School A, however, the pressure to maintain prestige can easily turn script into orthodoxy.

The teacher version of School A is also emotionally tiring. To teach in such a system would mean constantly balancing what students need against what the institution demands. It would mean knowing that some students require more time, more explanation, more flexibility, or more care, but not always being able to give it. It would mean seeing curiosity appear in the room and having to decide whether the curriculum can afford to pause for it. In a scripted system, even a seemingly good question can feel like a disruption from the norm.

The progressive fragment also exposes the emotional cost of such schooling. Powell et al. (2017) found that teachers in scripted programs can feel trapped in hierarchical systems that harm students and damage teacher well-being. That insight is important here because the teacher in my imagined future does not use her free will to teach human beings; she is asked to preserve the movements of a machine. This is what happens when we “deintellectualize” teaching, turning a creative profession into a mechanical job (Fitz & Nikolaidis, 2020). The result is exhaustion, alienation, and a narrowing of professional identity. The scripted curriculum does not just organize instruction; it reorganizes the self.

In this imagined future, even resistance is risky. A teacher who improvises too much, slows down for a student's question, adds a relatable example, and makes the lesson more responsive can easily be read as unprofessional or insufficiently rigorous. Yet the very students the school says it serves best are often the ones who need such flexibility most. This is one of the most painful contradictions of scripted schooling. It claims to be designed for excellence, but it often leaves no room for the forms of teaching that make learning alive.

While technology changes from the old megaphone *siren* to a glowing wristband, the feeling of being “colonized” and controlled stays exactly the same. This kind of future is *dystopian* because it continues to take away our autonomy ... our ability to make our own choices.

STANDARDIZATION AND PERFORMANCE

One of the strongest features of School A was its academic rigor. The school consistently produced high-achieving students and strong examination results at the national level, and that success became part of the institution's moral capital. But rigor can become dangerous when it becomes the only story a school tells about itself. Fenuku and Akpaku's (2024) study reveals that standardized teaching in Ghana may improve student performance while also compromising teacher autonomy and culturally responsive instruction. They help explain the double bind of prestigious schools in that they can be effective and limiting at the same time.

Timberlake et al. (2017) make a related argument when they show that scripted curricula often appeal to teachers because they promise fairness, but in practice, they flatten differences and reduce equity to sameness. That pattern is visible in School A's culture of excellence. We were

expected to meet the same standards regardless of our starting points. We were ranked, sorted, pushed, and the idea “that school is a leveler,” that everyone should be treated the same, often obscured the fact that students do bring different histories, resources, and capacities into the classroom.

Standardized testing intensified that logic. At a school like that, performance is not incidental; it is central to institutional identity. But when school life is organized around test results, comparisons, and competition, students can begin to understand themselves as statistics rather than as people. Fenuku and Akpaku (2024) note that standardized systems can bring structure and clarity, yet they also warn that they may limit flexibility and responsiveness. That warning fits the logic of School A exactly. We often memorized huge amounts of information just to pass a test and then forgot it all the next day. This kind of schooling is what scholars call “standardization,” where everyone is expected to be exactly the same (Fitz & Nikolaidis, 2020). At School A, we were part of the “chosen ones” because of our high grades, but the system worked to wipe away our natural curiosity so we could fit into a mold.

This is also why it’s important to highlight the voice of the *old girls*. After seeing the state of the school they left decades after graduation, they often shake their heads in disapproval, saying, “the standards have fallen; they’ve fallen so far below the belt!” They are often referring not only to failing test scores but to a broader sense of decline in discipline, prestige, and institutional identity. Yet that complaint can obscure a deeper question: standards for whom, and to what end? A school can preserve high averages while still maintaining a narrow vision of success. A school can also maintain its status while reproducing a model of education that leaves little room for difference, creativity, or care.

GENDERED FORMATION

The school’s scripting was also deeply gendered. We were not simply being prepared to be educated women; we were being prepared to be particular kinds of women. The repeated lessons about being ladies, wives, mothers, and keepers of the home made clear that academic excellence and domestic femininity were supposed to coexist without contradiction. The contradiction, however, was real. On one hand, the school demanded intellectual rigor. On the other hand, it trained us in a moral script of womanhood tied to religion, service, and domesticity.

This was especially visible in the gendered lessons of the school. International Women’s Day, for example, was often marked by classroom activities that simulated domestic futures: babysitting a make-shift baby made from bundled up cloths (or a baby doll for extra points), cooking without fire, or transforming classrooms into domestic spaces to prepare us for homemaking. These were framed as empowerment or preparation, but they also narrowed womanhood to domestic labor.

The school’s gender ideology felt powerful because it did not present itself as oppressive. It presented itself as practical, moral, and forward-looking. We were told that these lessons would help us become good citizens and respectable women. Yet what counted as “good” was already defined in advance. The school did not ask what kinds of women we might imagine ourselves to be. It told us what kind of women we ought to become, and the training often felt like obedience dressed as care. Love (2018) reminds us that education should not merely train students to survive systems of control; it should cultivate freedom and human dignity.

Love's (2018) work is helpful here because it frames education as a site of freedom, care, and political possibility rather than as merely a site of compliance. A school that teaches girls to obey, to perform, and preserve respectability without also teaching them to question power risks reproducing the very structures that limit them. Valdez (2020) provides a useful counterexample, showing how teachers can interrupt scripted curriculum through ethnic studies inquiry that centers resistance, identity, and decolonial knowledge. Her work suggests that, even within restrictive structures, teachers can make room for more expansive forms of becoming.

This is precisely the kind of opening School A rarely allowed. It often seemed to treat order as a moral achievement in itself. Yet, order alone does not educate. Order can prepare students for systems, but it does not necessarily prepare them for freedom. That distinction matters. When schools overvalue order, they may produce students who know how to comply but not how to question. They may produce girls who know how to represent the institution but not how to imagine beyond it.

ANALYTIC SYNTHESIS

The analytic fragment is where we make our strongest claim: School A did not simply use structure; it depended on scripting as a way of shaping identity. Pinar's *currere* treats educational experience as historical and subjective at once (Pinar, 2019). Through that lens, my story is not just personal. It is also about curriculum as a political and cultural force in history.

Mohammed (2023) argues that curriculum theory in Ghana is inseparable from questions of politics and power. That is why School A cannot be understood outside the history of missionary schooling, colonial education, and postcolonial prestige. Odei-Tettey et al. (2023) similarly argue that Ghana's curriculum debates often privilege external models over indigenous priorities. In that light, the school's traditions look less like neutral tradition and more like inherited ideology.

This also explains why the language of "standards" is so powerful. Standards seem objective, but they always hide judgments about whose knowledge matters and whose behavior counts as proper. Timberlake et al. (2017) show how "holding everyone to the same [high] level" can become a simplified notion of equity that ignores structural barriers (p. 49). At School A, high standards were a badge of honor, but they could also become a way of normalizing pressure, punishing differences, and rewarding those already closest to the institution's ideal.

The same dynamic shows up in the broader Ghanaian curriculum conversation. Mordzheh-Ekpampo et al. (2025) show that teachers' perceptions of the Standards-Based Curriculum in Ghana are shaped not just by the curriculum's design but by training, resources, class size, and implementation support. They argue that curriculum reform is never just about policy documents, but about conditions as well. A curriculum may sound progressive, but if teachers are underprepared and under-resourced, the curriculum becomes another burden placed on them from above. That insight connects directly to School A, where expectations often seemed to arrive fully formed without matching space for teacher or student adaptation.

My analysis, therefore, makes a larger argument: schooling should not be reduced to compliance, performance, or prestige. If the curriculum is only a script, then students become actors reciting lines written elsewhere. If the curriculum is understood as lived, political, and relational, then students can enter it as thinkers, makers, and questioners (Pinar, 1994).

It is also important to remember that script and resistance coexist. Even in highly controlled settings, people choose to improvise. Teachers alter their lessons; students ask unexpected

questions. Communities reinterpret inherited systems. That is why valency in the curriculum matters. A school can have structure without suffocation, but only if the structure remains open to revision. School A in my experience, often wanted structure without interruption. That is where the danger lies.

RESISTANCE VS. POSSIBILITY

One of the most important things literature shows is that teachers and students do resist scripted systems, even when the resistance is small. Powell et al. (2017) found that teachers in scripted settings supplemented, adapted, and sometimes refused the program in order to meet student need. Vaughn et al. (2021) likewise argue that adaptive teaching can counter restrictive curricula by giving teachers room to respond to students in real time. These studies matter because they remind us that agency survives even inside systems designed to suppress it. The script is never total.

This is the part of the argument that matters most for the future. Resistance does not always look dramatic. Sometimes it looks like adding a relatable example to a lesson, slowing down to answer a student's question, or choosing not to let a curriculum dictate the whole meaning of the classroom. These small acts preserve the human side of teaching, insisting that students are not simply recipients of a script.

Valdez's (2020) work makes that agency visible in the classroom by showing how teachers can use inquiry to disrupt colonial narratives and build more meaningful learning. That possibility is important for Ghana as well. The challenge is not to reject structure altogether but to refuse structures that erase human judgment, local knowledge, and cultural responsiveness.

Fenuku and Akpaku's (2024) study acknowledges that standardization may support achievement but only if it does not silence the teacher or flatten the learner's experience. The same is true for girls' schooling. A strong school does not have to be a rigid school, and excellence does not have to mean control. Neither does discipline have to mean dehumanization. If School A taught me anything, it is that institutions can make themselves feel permanent even though they are made by people and can, therefore, be changed by people. That realization is part of what this paper is trying to hold open.

CONCLUSION

What emerges from these fragments is a theory of scripted schooling as a form of becoming. At School A, the script was influenced by Christian missionary intervention and was colonial, gendered, and academic all at once (Fenuku & Akpaku, 2024; Odei-Tettey et al., 2023; Timberlake et al., 2017). It produced excellence, but it also produced conformity. It taught discipline, but it also narrowed imagination. It offered prestige, but it also trained us to fit into a system whose priorities were inherited long before we entered its gates.

The deeper lesson is not simply that the school was harsh or that it was old-fashioned. It is that the curriculum is never neutral. It carries histories, values, and assumptions about what kind of people schools should produce. In a place like School A, those assumptions were tied to colonial mission, gender ideology, and standardized testing culture. They were also tied to the belief that

structure itself is a virtue. But a structure without flexibility becomes a cage. Rigor without care becomes coercion. Tradition without reflection becomes repetition.

Currere gives me a way to tell that story without flattening it. It lets me hold memory, critique, longing, and analysis together. More importantly, it allows me to say that the school did not finish me. It shaped me, but it did not end me. The school system felt like a scripted machine, yes, but it was also the place where I began to understand that scripts can be questioned, revised, and refused (Pinar, 1994, 2019; Vaughn et al., 2021).

If I now imagine a better curriculum, it is not one without structure. It is one that leaves room for context, responsiveness, and humanity. It is one that treats teachers as thinkers and students as more than outcomes. It is one that recognizes that education should not merely maintain a system as if those involved were mere components of a machine. It should help people become more fully alive within and beyond it.

REFERENCES

- Bazile, D. T. (2015). Critical race feminist *currere*. In M. F. He, B. D. Schultz, & W. H. Schubert (Eds.), *The SAGE Guide to curriculum in education* (pp. 119–126). Sage.
- Fenuku, S. D., & Akpaku, E. (2024). The impact of standardized teaching methodologies on student learning and teacher autonomy in Ghanaian schools. *Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching (JLLLT)*, 3(2), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.37249/jlllt.v3i2.774>
- Fitz, J. A., & Nikolaidis, A. C. (2020). A democratic critique of scripted curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 52(2), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1661524>
- Golann, J. (2021). *Scripting the moves: Culture and control in a “no excuses” charter school*. Princeton University Press.
- Love, B. (2018). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.
- Mohammed, A. A. (2023). Curriculum theories and their politics in Ghana’s pretertiary education system. *Journal of Digital Learning and Education*, 3(3), 185–194. <https://dx.doi.org/10.52562/jdle.v3i3.771>
- Mordzeh-Ekpampo, I. M., Aapengkuu, E. D., Holu, E. M., & Kadiri, M. (2025). Teachers’ perception towards the Basic (1–6) Standards-Based Curriculum in Ghana: A study at North Gonja District. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(9), 7029–7037. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0520>
- Odei-Tetty K., Lambon F.Y., Sam R. (2023). ‘Shooting’ where the ducks are? A tale of cultural promiscuity and ideological dissonance associated with Ghana’s curriculum policy making. *British Journal of Education*, 11(4), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bje.2013>
- Pinar, W. (1994). *Autobiography, politics, and sexuality: Essays in curriculum theory, 1972–1992*. Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. (2019). *What is curriculum theory?* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Pinar, W. (2019). *What is curriculum theory?* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (2002). *Understanding curriculum*. Peter Lang.
- Poetter, T. (2025). *Curriculum fragments: A currere journey through life processes*. Routledge.



- Powell, R., Cantrell, S. C., & Correll, P. (2017). Power and agency in a high poverty elementary school: How teachers experienced a scripted reading program. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 13(1), 93–124. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141492>
- Timberlake, M. T., Burns Thomas, A., & Barrett, B. (2017). The allure of simplicity: Scripted curricula and equity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.017>
- Valdez, C. (2020). Flippin' the scripted curriculum: Ethnic studies inquiry in elementary education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 23(4), 581–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1497959>
- Vaughn, M., Parsons, S. A., & Gallagher, M. A. (2022). Challenging scripted curricula with adaptive teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 51(3), 186–196. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211065752>