

LIVING THE SCRIPT

IMPACT OF SCRIPTED CURRICULUM IN SHAPING IDENTITY, AND ADAPTATION ACROSS EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

By Rashmika Lekamge
Miami University

To have a clear understanding of the education system of Sri Lanka, one must peer into its colonial past. The country was under colonial rule for nearly 450 years, from 1505 to 1948, first by the Portuguese and Dutch and later by the British. Among these, British rule had the strongest and most lasting impact on education. According to Batatota (2025), during the nineteenth century, the British expanded formal schooling mainly to train local people for administrative roles and maintain social order. This education was not designed only to share knowledge but to produce disciplined and manageable citizens who would be obedient to the British rulers. Because these systems were used for centuries, many of their features continue today. Therefore, it is important to critically examine how these colonial foundations continue to control thinking, behavior, and social structures in modern Sri Lanka, which is a burden that we cannot unlearn. This unavoidable colonial pressure within the Sri Lankan education system can be metaphorically described as an “albatross of racial hegemony” (Ladson-Billings, 2000, p. 264).

Colonial influences are still clearly visible in current schooling practices. For example, national examinations such as the Ordinary Level (O/L) and Advanced Level (A/L) closely follow British models. They place heavy emphasis on standardized testing rather than creativity or critical thinking (Proweller, 1998). In classrooms, teaching methods often rely on memorization, strict discipline, and teacher authority. Students are expected to follow instructions rather than question ideas. While many Western education systems, including the British education system, have now moved toward more flexible and student-centered learning, Sri Lankan schools largely continue to maintain the hierarchical structures continuing since British colonization. This can also be seen in school environments. For example, colonial style buildings, strict daily routines, and activities like cadeting, scouting, and drills all promote order and uniformity (Batatota, 2025). Together, these elements show that education functions not only as academic training but also as a system that shapes behavior through control. It often creates rigid ways of thinking that are strongly binary, such as ideas of superiority versus inferiority, order versus disorder, etc., which can limit students’ broader personal development. Another emerging reality is suppression and control over the fluid identities of gender. Although anthropological evolution has proven and accepted fluid identities within society, Sri Lanka, including its school systems, tries to control those identities and frame them into the dominant gender ideologies, either male or female.

One clear example of this control is seen in gender separation within elite cluster schools. In many cases, schools do not bring students together but instead reinforce social divisions. In early 21st century Sri Lanka, social expectations still encourage girls to follow traditional roles such as maintaining chastity, getting married, and becoming mothers (Proweller, 1998). At the same time, boys and girls, especially in the upper middle class, in gender-segregated schools have very limited interaction with each other, except through family relationships like siblings or cousins (Albrecht, 2022, p. 4). This lack of interaction can affect students’ ability to develop social and communication skills. It also raises an important question, “Why do such strict separations

continue?” These concerns can basically be categorized as hidden curricula. According to reproduction theory, “it is part of the bureaucratic and managerial ‘press’ of the school—the combined forces by which students are induced to comply with the dominant ideologies and social practices related to authority, behavior and morality” (Pinar et al., 2002, p. 244).

At the same time, the education system of Sri Lanka has made important progress in expanding access. Compared to many other South Asian countries, it has achieved relatively high levels of literacy and school participation (Letchamanan & Dhar, 2018). Policies such as the 1997 education reforms introduced free textbooks, uniforms, and transport, making education more accessible to a wider population (Proweller, 1998). However, access alone does not guarantee equality. There are still major differences between schools. Urban elite schools have better facilities, more resources, and higher social status, while rural schools often struggle with limited infrastructure and support (Letchamanan & Dhar, 2018). Although all students follow the same curriculum and sit for the same exams, their actual learning experiences are very different. This is partly due to what is known as the “hidden curriculum,” (Jackson, 1968, as cited in Rossouw & Frick, 2023), the unspoken rules about behavior, identity, and belonging within schools. These differences show that true educational equality requires more than just access; it also requires fairness in experience and opportunity.

Gender separation becomes even more visible in elite schools, where it often combines with divisions based on ethnicity and religion. While many government schools are mixed, top schools are usually divided into boys’ and girls’ institutions. In addition, some schools are closely associated with specific religious or ethnic groups, such as Buddhist, Tamil, Catholic, or Muslim (Albrecht, 2022, p. 4). In these environments, religion is not just a subject but a central part of daily life and identity. This can strengthen group identity, but it can also deepen divisions in a multi-ethnic society. As Albrecht (2022) points out, students in these schools experience religion as a core framework that shapes their worldview (p. 4). This raises a critical concern: Instead of promoting unity, the education system may unintentionally reinforce social and cultural separation.

Elite schools also play a powerful role in shaping social status, identity, and future opportunities. This influence is particularly strong for girls, as these schools often promote specific ideas about femininity and proper behavior. According to Albrecht (2022), these institutions shape students during their most formative years, making their impact long lasting. Some elite schools even position themselves as historically important institutions, often supported by state recognition, which further increases their prestige (Albrecht, 2022, p. 6). Admission to these schools is highly competitive. Students often need strong social connections, such as links through parent-teacher associations or alumni networks or must perform exceptionally well in key exams like the Grade 5 scholarship or O/Ls (Albrecht, 2022). This creates a system where privilege is concentrated among a small group, limiting equal opportunities for others and reducing social mobility.

Buddhist girls’ schools, specifically, actively shape students’ identities around traditional Sinhalese Buddhist values. From a very early stage, such as Grade 1, school mottos, visions, and missions introduce and reinforce these cultural and religious ideals. The goal is to guide each student toward becoming an “ideal Sinhala Buddhist lady.” School activities, lessons, and daily practices are all designed to support this goal. While this can help build cultural pride and a sense of belonging, it may also limit individuality by encouraging students to fit into a fixed model and to a fetish mentality that internally inculcates that they are superior to the other schools (De Mel, 2001).

Thus, the education system of Sri Lanka continues to reflect its colonial roots, especially through its focus on discipline, memorization, and control. Elite schools further strengthen this structure by promoting fixed ideas about gender and cultural identity, particularly the ideal of the “Sinhala Buddhist lady.” Over time, students internalize these expectations through daily routines, strict rules, and exam pressures. While this system can produce academic success and preserve cultural values, it can also restrict creativity, independence, and personal growth. As a result, many students who were injected to this pipeline may find it difficult to adapt to more open and flexible environments later in life (Golann, 2021). This highlights an important challenge: The education system of Sri Lanka must find a balance between discipline and adaptability in order to develop more confident, independent, and well-rounded individuals.

HOW I INCORPORATE MY OWN BACKGROUND IN DEVELOPING THE ARGUMENT

My own educational experience is not separate from the system I analyze, rather, it is deeply embedded within it. Growing up in Sri Lanka, my schooling pathway was largely predetermined long before I fully understood its implications. From an early age, it was assumed that I would attend a prestigious girls’ school where both my mother and elder sister had studied. Similarly, my brother was expected to attend a corresponding boys’ school aligned with my father’s educational background. At the time, this felt natural, even inevitable. However, when examined more critically, this pattern reflects how access to elite schooling is structured through intergenerational continuity, where family history, social networks, and cultural capital shape educational trajectories (Albrecht, 2022).

While systems such as the Grade 5 Scholarship and O-Level examinations are often presented as meritocratic pathways that enable upward mobility, my experience suggests a more complex reality. These examinations do allow academically strong students, including those from rural or less privileged backgrounds, to enter elite schools. However, they also function as mechanisms of intellectual filtering. In this sense, access is controlled rather than fully democratized. Elite schools are, thus, able to maintain both exclusivity and high academic performance, reinforcing their status within national hierarchies. Reflecting on this, I now understand my own position within this system not simply as an individual achievement but as part of a broader structure that privileges certain forms of knowledge, behavior, and background.

Once inside this institutional space, I began to recognize that identity formation was not left to chance. Rather, it was carefully structured through everyday practices and expectations. As Proweller (1998) argues, schools are “deeply invested in the transmission of class privilege and exist as a primary socializing agency for reinforcing the aesthetics of middle class family life” (p. 6). This observation strongly resonates with my own experience. From the way we dressed to how we spoke and behaved, every aspect of school life was regulated. Students were expected to embody discipline, order, and respectability at all times.

Looking back, I realize that this process of shaping identity began even before I formally entered school. Some of my earliest memories involve watching my sister prepare for school each morning. Her uniform had to be perfectly arranged, her white shoes polished, and her overall appearance carefully managed. At the time, these seemed like simple routines. However, I now interpret them differently. These daily practices were not merely about neatness or discipline; they were part of a broader process of socialization and a strong indication of how different or prestigious we were when compared with other school girls whom we saw along the way. As

Proweller (1998) further explains, schools produce “representational forms that inscribe and institutionalize class identity on school walls, in classrooms, rituals, and routines” (p. 7). What I witnessed as a child was, in fact, the early internalization of these institutional expectations, where identity is gradually shaped to align with dominant norms.

This process of identity formation is closely connected to broader cultural and historical narratives. In my schooling context, a particular ideal of femininity was consistently promoted, what scholars describe as the “Sinhala-Buddhist lady” (Proweller, 1998). This identity was not imposed in a single moment, rather, it was reinforced continuously through subtle and visible means. School mottos, vision statements, and value systems were displayed prominently in classrooms and assembly halls, serving as constant reminders of who we were expected to become. We were encouraged to be respectful, disciplined, academically successful, and culturally grounded. While these values were often presented as positive and aspirational, I began to see how they also narrowed the range of acceptable identities, especially for girls.

This tension is captured well in Batatota’s (2025) observation that schooling functions as both a vehicle for cultural transmission and a site of contradiction. As she notes,

it symbolizes the institution’s position as a vehicle in which to inculcate national and cultural identity [while also] highlight[ing] the tensions of preserving these values ... while adapting to the modern world. (Batatota, 2025, p. 14)

I found myself negotiating this tension throughout my schooling years. On the one hand, I developed a strong sense of cultural belonging and pride. On the other hand, I increasingly felt the constraints of a system that defined what it meant to be an “ideal” student and, more specifically, becoming an ideal Sinhala-Buddhist-Lady.

The school I attended, established in 1946 during the late colonial period, reflects this layered and hybrid structure. As Kumari Jayawardena (as cited in De Mel, 2001) suggests, a colonized culture is multi-layered and deeply influenced by the coloniser’s culture, where Western values, habits, and modes of thought become embedded within local contexts. This description closely aligns with my experience. My school combined British style discipline, hierarchy, and academic rigor with a strong emphasis on Sinhala Buddhist cultural values. This concept is called “white-Buddhist” (Proweller, 1998). The school was known for producing high achieving students, yet this success was closely tied to colonial, behavioral expectations, particularly those linked to gender concerns of Buddhist-Sinhalese values. The discipline we practiced was not neutral; it was shaped by a specific vision of femininity that emphasized obedience, modesty, and conformity.

Across other elite girls’ schools in Sri Lanka, similar patterns can be observed. Education becomes a space where gendered, cultural, and ethnic identities are not only taught but actively reproduced. Reflecting on this, I began to understand that schooling was shaping not just what I learned but who I was expected to become. As Batatota (2025) notes, education in Sri Lanka plays a central role in structuring identity along lines of language, ethnicity, religion, and class. This was evident in the expectations placed upon us to achieve high academic results, to enter university, to secure stable employment, and to fulfill socially defined gender roles. These expectations were not presented as optional but were embedded within the very fabric of schooling.

Over time, I became aware of the tension between these institutional expectations and my own emerging sense of self. While the system provided clear pathways for success, it also limited the space for alternative ways of thinking and being. In this sense, education functioned as both

enabling and constraining. This dual role can be understood through the concept of cultural capital, where certain forms of knowledge, behavior, and disposition are valued and rewarded within institutional settings (Lareau & Weininger, 2003). I began to see how those who naturally aligned with these expectations were able to succeed more easily, while others had to adapt and negotiate or remain marginalized.

This realization also connects with Delpit's (1988) concept of the "silenced dialogue," which highlights how dominant systems of power often limit whose voices are heard and valued (Golann, 2021). Reflecting on my own experience, I recognize that not all students were equally able to express themselves within the structured environment of elite schooling. Certain ways of speaking, thinking, and behaving were encouraged, while others were subtly discouraged or excluded. This raises important analytical questions that continue to shape my research. Whose identities are validated within educational spaces, whose voices remain unheard, and how can education move beyond simply reproducing dominant norms? Through this lens, my personal experience becomes more than a narrative, it becomes a critical entry point into understanding how education in the Sri Lankan education system operates as a system of power. It reveals how identities are carefully constructed, how inequalities are carefully maintained, and how students, including myself, learn to navigate, internalize, and sometimes resist these structures.

The following regressive fragment serves as an example of how my personal experience within this system has actively shaped my identity in ways that align with its institutional expectations. More specifically, it highlights how elite schooling in Sri Lanka operates through a structured process that constructs and reinforces a Buddhist Sinhala nationalistic framework. This framework is not incidental but is produced through the everyday practices, values, and disciplinary structures embedded within these institutions. The fragment, therefore, illustrates not only the depth of this influence but also its subtle and internalized nature. At the same time, it raises a critical uncertainty within my own self that, without this institutional framework, it remains unclear who I might have become or what direction my sense of self might have taken.

REGRESSIVE FRAGMENT

I grew up in Sri Lanka and attended the top cluster Buddhist girls' school in Kurunegala, one of the top state schools in the district. It was the same school my mother attended. My elder sister was already a student there when I entered. In many ways, I felt that my place in that school was already decided long before I walked through its gates in my white uniform for the first time.

From the beginning, the curriculum felt very scripted, not only academically, but socially and culturally. There was a clear way to be a girl from that school. We were told it directly and indirectly.

"There is a way daughters of this school should behave," teachers would remind us at assemblies. "You are continuing a legacy. You must be different."

Everything had a rule. Our uniforms had to be a specific length. Our white socks had to reach a particular height. Our shoes had to be clean and perfectly white. Our hair had to be braided in a certain way. The school tie and badge were compulsory. We had to enter the main gate in an orderly manner (two girls together in a line). We had to enter classrooms properly. We were not supposed to wander in the corridors, even during free periods.

There was also a way to speak to teachers, a way to stand, a way to sit, a way to address elders. Even teachers followed visible codes regarding how they dressed and how they tied their hair. The structure was everywhere.

For me, it did not feel strange. I had heard about these rules since childhood because my sister was already studying there. My parents knew the system well. By the time I entered at age five, I already knew how a student at our school should behave. I adapted naturally. It felt normal. It felt safe.

But I remember clearly when my friend joined our school in Grade 12 for Advanced Level studies. She had come from a rural school. One afternoon during a free period, we were sitting in the classroom. She looked at me and whispered, “How do you live like this? It feels like a prison.” I laughed at first, thinking she was exaggerating. But she continued, “There are too many rules. Even the way we walk is controlled. I’m scared of doing something wrong all the time.”

I remember feeling surprised. I had never seen it that way. To me, these were just habits. But I could see the discomfort in her face. She struggled in the beginning, even to stay still when the teacher was teaching. She was careful about her uniform. She adjusted how she spoke. She watched others closely to learn the “correct” way.

By the end of the first year, she had adapted. She braided her hair the same way. She walked with the same posture. She no longer questioned the routines. Watching her change made me realize how powerful the scripted environment was. For 13 years, I lived inside that structure. I rarely questioned it. I felt proud to belong. The word “Maya Devian” carried weight. There was a sense of identity, discipline, and prestige attached to it.

One moment stays very clearly in my memory. Five years after leaving school, after completing my bachelor’s degree, I went to a dental appointment near my old school. I was sitting in the waiting area with my mother, speaking casually. A woman across from me kept looking at me. Finally, she asked, “Which grade are you in?” I smiled and said, “I finished school a few years ago.” She paused and asked, “Were you a student of Maya Devi?” I was surprised. “Yes... how did you know?” She smiled. “I teach there. I can recognize a girl from that school by the way she behaves.” In that moment, I felt a quiet happiness. I felt recognized. I felt proud. Something in my posture, my tone, my manner had revealed my schooling even years later. At that time, I felt it was a compliment.

Looking back at those years, what I experienced was a very static, scripted curriculum, not only in textbooks but in behavior, identity, and daily life. At the time, I mostly felt belonging, discipline, and pride. I learned how to follow structure. I learned how to present myself in a certain way. I learned how to fit into an established legacy.

ANALYTICAL INSIGHTS

I wanted to unpack how scripted and hidden curricula actively shape identity in postcolonial contexts of Sri Lanka. This enabled me to gain a significant vantage point from which to explore my own identity as I moved away from the system within which I had grown since my earliest memories. My understanding of the educational landscape broadened and became clearer as I stepped outside the familiar system and began to examine it from a more unbiased and expansive perspective as an emerging scholar in a foreign country. As Gloria Anzaldúa (in Anzaldúa & Keating, 2015) states, “I discover what I’m trying to say as the writing progresses” (p. 7). Accordingly, I argue that schooling extends far beyond formal instruction, operating through

subtle, normalized, and often unspoken practices that structure how students learn to see themselves and others. Drawing on Jackson's (1968, as cited in Chavanne & Williams, 2024) concept of the hidden curriculum, I demonstrate how elite Buddhist girls' schools reproduce the ideal of the "Sinhala-Buddhist lady" through everyday routines, disciplinary expectations, and cultural performances, even when such ideals are not explicitly articulated. These practices, when viewed through Bourdieu's (1986) notion of cultural capital, reveal how Sinhala-Buddhist norms are institutionalized as markers of legitimacy and refinement, while other ethnic, linguistic, and gendered identities are rendered peripheral (Albrecht, 2022). Further, it emphasized the construction and continuation of "White-Sinhalese" (Proweller, 1998), which means the long-term frame of colonial legacies and Western structural frameworks layered precisely on the ideal of "Sinhala-Buddhist-nationalist" concerns that has continued since colonization.

At the same time, I position these practices within broader scholarship on scripted curricula. Scholars such as Golann (2021) and Timberlake et al. (2017) highlight that scripted pedagogies, while often criticized, can offer structure, consistency, and a form of procedural equity, particularly in under-resourced contexts. In Sri Lanka, where disparities between rural and urban schooling remain significant, such standardization can ensure a baseline of access to knowledge. However, as Valdez (2020) and Powell et al. (2017) argue, these benefits are accompanied by significant constraints. Scripted curricula tend to reduce teacher autonomy, as teachers have to adopt a different personality within the school premises, limit responsiveness to student diversity, as the minority representation within the school context that I am talking about is highly demarcated to Sinhalese-Buddhist cultural norms, and prioritize compliance over critical engagement and "fail to teach all students the codes they need to acquire power" (Golann, 2021, p. 12). In my analysis, I observe how these rigid instructional forms are embedded closely with the hidden curriculum, reinforcing obedience, discipline, and conformity as valued traits. However, another insightful concern Golann (2021) highlights is that those students who experience the rigid scripts within schools for a considerably longer time will not learn how to be at ease with authority, will not learn when it is appropriate to interrupt; a student who is told not to talk back, even if falsely accused, will not learn how to negotiate. "Because culture is complex and situations are difficult to predict, individuals need interpretative skills to read a situation and choose among alternatives-skills that are difficult to transfer through a rigid script" (Golann, 2021, p. 13).

This duality is crucial. Scripted and hidden curricula are not entirely oppressive nor entirely beneficial. Rather, they function as regulatory frameworks that both enable and constrain. For instance, while they can produce disciplined, high-achieving students who succeed within examination-oriented systems, they simultaneously suppress creativity, voice, and alternative ways of knowing. This tension becomes particularly visible when students transition to more flexible educational environments like contemporary Western education systems (USA and UK). Drawing on Fanon (1961/2002), I argue that students internalize these structures, developing a habitus oriented toward compliance. As a result, when placed in contexts that value agency, discussion, and critique, they often experience disorientation and struggle to adapt (Golann, 2021).

Delpit's notion of silenced dialogue further illuminates how classroom spaces restrict open expression, especially for girls from minority ethnic backgrounds who must navigate layered and often invisible power hierarchies (Delpit, 1988). Further, Moran (1981 as cited by Pinar et al, 2002) notes,

If education truly encounters religion ..., education would take on a diversity of forms with qualities I have called rooted and reverent. Education would have roots in the earth, the body, and the family Education can be reconceptualized to include family life, daily work, and contemplative quiet. Education would be centered on how people are living and would be concerned with improving the main forms in which people learn the art of living. (p. 629)

This is another practical insight that I repeatedly observed in my own school context in Sri Lanka. Although my school appeared to promote uniformity and discipline, this often came at the cost of erasing minority identities. The very small percentage of students who were from minority ethnic and religious backgrounds were expected to conform to the same rules and regulations, regardless of their own cultural or religious values. For instance, a Muslim girl in my class was required to strictly adhere to the school's expectations: wearing the prescribed uniform (white knee-length pleated frock), participating in Buddhist religious observances, and engaging in Sinhala cultural festivals. She was not permitted to cover her face or wear long trousers that Muslim girls wear, which are significant aspects of her religious practice. Moreover, she was not given space for weekly Friday prayers, nor was she excused from academic commitments during the fasting season; whereas, in Muslim girls' schools, the fasting month is a vacation. What becomes evident here is that the school's "neutral" rules were not neutral at all, rather, they reflected the dominance of a particular cultural and religious identity. In contrast, if she had been in a Muslim school, her religious practices and cultural needs would have been acknowledged and accommodated. This highlights how schooling, through its everyday practices, subtly enforces assimilation while marginalizing difference, reinforcing a singular ideal of belonging.

Situating this within a postcolonial frame, I argue that Sri Lanka remains deeply entangled in educational structures inherited from British colonial rule. The emphasis on discipline, hierarchy, standardization, and examination mirrors colonial modes of governance that sought to produce compliant, governable subjects rather than critical thinkers. What is particularly striking is the contrast with contemporary shifts in Western educational thought. In many Western contexts, there is a growing movement toward reclaiming "third spaces" (Bhabha, 1994), hybrid, dialogic, and culturally responsive forms of learning that challenge rigid binaries and dominant epistemologies. Ironically, while such spaces were historically suppressed under colonialism, they are now being reimagined and valued in the West; whereas, postcolonial systems like Sri Lanka continue to operate within the very structures that marginalized their own indigenous knowledge systems, which were closely aligned with wellness concerns and spirituality. However, my current research concerns in a foreign land are now inching towards embedding mind-body-spirit wellness in education systems. This reveals a persistent epistemic dependency of Sri Lanka, where colonial logics remain embedded in institutional practices despite political independence, while the Western world is re-exploring what they once tried to erase.

Building on these insights, I highlight several implications for policy and practice. I argue that education systems in Sri Lanka, and more broadly in South Asia, must critically re-evaluate their reliance on rigid and scripted pedagogies. While such approaches may offer short term efficiency and standardization, they ultimately limit students' ability to think critically and engage meaningfully with knowledge. I suggest a shift toward more flexible and dialogic pedagogies that create space for questioning, reflection, and multiplicity. For example, classrooms can be reimagined as participatory spaces where students are encouraged to challenge dominant cultural narratives, including the idealized "Sinhala-Buddhist lady." This aligns with broader discussions

on epistemic justice, which emphasize the importance of recognizing diverse voices and ways of knowing in the construction of knowledge (Conner et al., 2024).

However, I also remain cautious about the challenges of reform. In Sri Lanka, past educational reforms have often faltered due to weak implementation and insufficient teacher preparation. Therefore, meaningful change must include sustained professional development that enables teachers to recognize and challenge hidden biases embedded in everyday practices. Drawing again on Delpit, I argue that fostering genuine dialogue in classrooms requires not only structural change but also a shift in teacher beliefs and pedagogical orientations.

The implications of these dynamics extend beyond the classroom. I show how hidden curricula reinforce ethnic hierarchies by normalizing Sinhala-Buddhist dominance, thereby marginalizing Tamil and Muslim students both materially and symbolically within the Buddhist school contexts. On the other hand, the same thing happens the other way around if we look into a Muslim or Tamil-dominant school. Gender norms are similarly regulated, with girls' behavior and self-expression tightly controlled in ways that reinforce heteronormative and patriarchal expectations. These processes have long term consequences for social mobility. Students from marginalized backgrounds are more likely to be positioned as lacking or deviant, which limits their opportunities and perpetuates cycles of inequality. Bourdieu's framework is particularly useful here in explaining how schools convert dominant cultural norms into social advantage while delegitimizing alternative forms of knowledge and identity.

Yet, I also see potential for transformation. If these hidden and scripted structures are made visible and critically engaged, education can become a site for reimagining identity and fostering inclusion. Further, it will reduce the standardized exam-oriented nature of the whole country. By creating space for diverse cultural expressions and encouraging critical engagement, schools can support more equitable forms of identity formation and contribute to broader social cohesion.

Finally, my reflections point toward several directions for future research. There is a need for studies that examine how students' identities evolve over time, particularly as they move across different educational and cultural contexts. Comparative research across South Asian countries could further illuminate how similar colonial legacies manifest in diverse ways. I also identify teacher agency as a critical area for exploration, particularly in understanding how educators navigate, reproduce, or resist dominant norms in their daily practices. Additionally, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate sociological and psychological perspectives would provide deeper insight into the emotional and cognitive dimensions of identity formation, especially for students negotiating multiple and often conflicting cultural expectations. Through these reflections, I aim to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how scripted and hidden curricula operate not merely as educational tools but as powerful forces that shape identity, reproduce inequality, and, potentially, open pathways for transformation in a globalized yet uneven world.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, J. A. (2022). The coloniality of girls' education in Sri Lanka. Agency, transformation and adaptation. *Entremons: UPF Journal of World History*, 4–30.
<http://www.raco.cat/index.php/Entremons/article/view/405513>
- Anzaldúa, G., & Keating, A. (2015). *Light in the dark =: Luz en lo oscuro: rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. Duke University Press.

- Batatota, L. S. (2025). *Becoming good women: Schooling, aspirations and imagining the future among female students in Sri Lanka*. Berghahn Books.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson, (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Chavanne, H., & Williams, E. (2024, April 5). *Navigating the hidden curriculum*. Notre Dame Learning. <https://learning.nd.edu/news/navigating-the-hidden-curriculum/>
- Conner, J., Mitra, D. L., Holquist, S. E., Rosado, E., Wilson, C., & Wright, N. L. (2024). The pedagogical foundations of student voice practices: The role of relationships, differentiation, and choice in supporting student voice practices in high school classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 142, Article 104540. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104540>
- De Mel, N. (2001). *Women and the nation's narrative*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280–298. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.58.3.c43481778r528qw4>
- Fanon, F. (2002). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press. (Original work published 1961)
- Golann, J. (2021). *Scripting the moves: Culture and control in a “no excuses” charter school*. Princeton University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 257–278). Sage.
- Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: A critical assessment. *Theory and Society*, 32, 567–606. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RYSO.00000004951.04408.b0>
- Letchamanan, H., & Dhar, D. (2018). *Education in South Asia and the Indian Ocean Islands*. Bloomsbury.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (2002). *Understanding curriculum*. Peter Lang.
- 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>
- Proweller, A. (1998). *Constructing female identities: Meaning making in an upper middle class youth culture*. State Univ. of New York Press.
- Rossouw, N., & Frick, L. (2023). A conceptual framework for uncovering the hidden curriculum in private higher education. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), Article 2191409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2191409>
- 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>