

Inquiry Based Learning Pedagogy in Indigenous Learning Spaces

Aditi Mitra, Hamar Chinhari Welfare Society, India

The Paris Conference on Education 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to explore, encourage and put to practice an inquiry-based learning methodology, in the rural and indigenous contexts of two villages in Chhattisgarh, in central India. Here, I, along with young women from the indigenous community work with young children in Open Learning Centers called “Srijan Shala” (translated as Abode of Creativity). The idea of birthing these mixed-age group learning spaces *within* the village was to place students in the womb of community “know-how.” However, the traditional and largely outdated methodology of delivering knowledge in a didactic form, has compromised the capacity to question and ask questions. Learning is still largely outcome driven and measured with the yardsticks of exams, assessments and marks. The child’s ability of constructing her own know-how and moves from sensory motor stage to concrete operational stage in a community-context – which has a rich repository of non-textualized know-how, to which the young of the community are active participants – is largely left out of the school context. As the rural schools in India, seek to replace this inherent inquiry based and cooperative know-how sharing in community-contexts with rote learning, memorization and overload of information, the urban elite schools are reverting to the pedagogy of inquiry. This necessitated us to reimagine the teaching learning methodology at Hamar Srijan Shala where curiosity and inquiry replace the predetermined content, shifting learning to the learners themselves. This paper attempts to bring forward a pedagogy where questions guide the imagination of what shall we learn today?

Keywords: decolonization, indigenous curriculum, Hamar Srijan Shala, inquiry-based learning pedagogy, community schools, indigenous life world

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

The highest education is that which does not merely give us information but makes our life in harmony with all existence. But we find that this education of sympathy is not only systematically ignored in schools, but it is severely repressed. (Das Gupta, 2009, p. 126)

Education and learning have been at the core of many discourses among educationists, policy makers, teachers and parents. Where do they amalgamate and where do they diverge? Where do they overlap one another for knowledge creation and where do they remain separated like the two parallel tracks of rail, which never meet. There are many ideas and thoughts, varied philosophies, to the question of *what* education and learning *is* and thereby what knowledge is. Knowledge is also viewed differently, depending on where we look from.

Education as “a journey for learning to be fully human” has been at the core of “American Indian indigenous philosophy” (Cajete, 1994, p. 42) and perhaps that of other indigenous life worlds as well. It cannot be taught, given or assessed but derived, learnt, experienced and curated. Shaped and formed by the multiple *terroir* of human beings – historical, geographic, cultural, social, political and religious. Though teaching learning pedagogy has molded and adapted to the changing times, this change is not visible in all contexts.

This paper endeavours to imagine a curriculum which does not merely educate but attempts to create a space where the learners themselves are *active participants* in curating their own learning; which is learning about themselves as well as the world around them. In the two villages of Dokal and Mardapoti in Chhattisgarh India, community-based learning spaces called “Hamar Srijan Shala” work on the idea of an inquiry-based learning practice.

The learners who come to Srijan Shala are in the age group of 3 to 9. The learners who come to this space are sometimes older too, from the age group of 9 to 14. They come with prior knowledge, difficulties in schoolwork and in search of a place for conversations. The mixed age group of the learners creates a perfect space to attempt query, inquiry and investigation.

This discussion unfolds through two questions and one ongoing journey.

- 1) To understand the idea of inquiry-based learning as a form of pedagogy and its relevance and role in shaping the idea of education.
 - 2) To understand the context of the rural schools which lie deeply embedded within the indigenous communities and their teaching learning practices therein.
- The journey – tries to bring to dialogue Freire’s “critical consciousness” and Krishnamurthi’s idea – “to understand a child, one has to understand oneself” – through an inquiry-based pedagogy where it is not just an inquiry about the world but also an inquiry into “the inner world” (Kakar, 2012). The paper thus brings to dialogue *critical theory* (on education) and *self-transformation* (in education).

Idea of Inquiry-Based Learning as a Form of Pedagogy

Idea of Education

Illich points out that “our present idea of ‘childhood’ developed only recently, and the school system is a modern phenomenon, as also the childhood it produces” (Illich, 2021, p. 30). The idea of education, learning, knowledge and thereby schools as institutions that impart

knowledge have significantly shifted across the globe in the age of industrialization and post-industrialization. There is a specific type of value added to education received and imparted. The rise of the modern school is but a reflection of this insight of making students “job ready.” The role of schools has shifted from being a space of creating knowledge to a space of dissemination of information. Weighed by the often-used yardsticks of exams, tests and assignments, abilities and capacities of children are honed to be either quite specific or at best, bound into strict silos. Needless to reiterate, this is in contradiction to the philosophy of education in indigenous life worlds, which is largely a “journey for learning to be fully human” (see Cajete, 1994 above) and also not in terms of Tagore-ian humanness or Freire-ian critical inquiry. Schooling as a concept has been under much criticism and is often described as unnatural and deliberate. The use of “improved techniques” to restore the disrupted “natural balance” which necessitated the emergence of schools. “Formal schooling has no intrinsic value but becomes necessary when humanity creates a condition in which one must become ‘educated’ to get along” (Fukuoka, 2025, p. 16).

Amidst the mushrooming of schools offering a smorgasbord of content, programs, pedagogy, philosophy and environment, the business of education has a lot to offer the young. However, *what* children learn is also guided by *how* they learn. The content, context and praxis shape the educational journey of the young learner, right from her pre-school years. This does not happen in isolation within the walls of an institution. It happens everyday in every possible way. It is embedded in every experience that a child has. Experiences and interactions with oneself, one’s immediate family, the community at large, the social and natural environment, the food that is consumed and the games that are played. Nature and proximity to nature provides a bed for unique irreplaceable learnings which in turn becomes a rich repository of empathy and cognitive abilities, used for the unpredictable vagaries of life.

For Tagore, the natural world and constant contact with it is essential for balanced human growth. The basis of his “decolonization of pedagogy” is respect and love for the child’s spirit; a spirit that is adventurous and cautious, affectionate, free, robust, curious, eager to learn, and at the same time vulnerable. He called his schools “poems in a medium other than words” (Mukherjee, 2021, p. 3).

Learning thus cannot be completely pre-conceived and pre-planned. Incidental learning and the context of the learners play a significant role here as that would largely determine what is needed and valued and hence included in the teaching learning practices. “The life of a child is immersed in social milieus” (Halbwachs, 2014, p. 68). Communities in which children live and learn as members of the group, equally lending their intellect, energy, labour and imagination are thereby the spaces from where they glean skills of living in this world. Education, outside the periphery of the learner’s world often becomes routine, structured, and reinforced. The “one size fits all” kind of education bound by the walls of a classroom and the scriptures of the curriculum, finds itself deficient in two aspects – (a) imagination and (b) freedom of inquiry.

Phenomenology of Inquiry

The content of learning or curriculum, in educational institutions, is completely determined by the policies, framework, requirements set aside and developed by a specific group of people with a certain data or sample in perspective. The context of the child, their life worlds, dispositions, interests, searches and exploration are left for projects and extra-curricular activities. They are easily *othered* in the collective of the topics, subjects and concepts that are deemed to be higher in the hierarchy of learning. An inquiry-based learning pedagogy would

perhaps enable us to rethink the epistemology of the teaching learning processes for young learners in schools today.

Can knowledge be developed in a controlled environment which is largely determined by rules, discipline and utility? This is a question that has been at the forefront of many discussions by educationists over time.

Gijubhai Bhadeka in his work *Divaswapan (A Daydream)*, writes about the controlled milieu of a school where facts and information are given out to students without an inkling towards their emotional disposition. Teachers working under the strict supervision of the principal who is bound by the curriculum, planned and regulated by the education department. The room to improvise or reimagine is subjected to the year end exams and the specific way they are conducted as well. Gijubhai took up the initiative to introduce novel perspectives in the established school scenarios and working culture. Incremental changes and patience finally enabled him to establish his idea that there are multiple ways to educate (See *Divaswapan*, Gijubhai Bhadeka <https://archive.org/details/Divaswapna-English/page/n111/mode/2up>). Written in 1931, *Divaswapan* still resonates deeply within the practices of many educational institutions, especially in the rural indigenous spaces. Multiple factors contribute to a pedagogy which is entrenched in rote learning and memorization.

“Education is the exploratory and creative use of skills, and cannot rely on drills. It relies on the relationship between the partners” (Illich, 2021, p. 30). Interconnection between the learners and the educators can be a single most decisive factor to optimize learning. Spaces where the teachers and learners learn together breaks the hierarchical role of the teacher and the student. Knowledge then becomes more organic and intuitive. The teacher is no more the giver and the learner is no more the mere recipient of the information.

Tagore in his imagination of school lays emphasis on the connectivity with nature. “I believe that children should be surrounded with things of nature that have their own educational value. Their minds should be allowed to stumble on and be surprised at everything that happens before them in the life of today” he writes in a letter to William Rothstein, in 1921 (Das Gupta, 2009, p. 126). The schools today are buildings of concrete, state of art spaces where technology meets the world of cognitive thinking. They are segmented, structured, focused and performative. The connection with nature is relegated to the potted plants, curated gardens and occasional field trips which are guided by objectives, purposes and methodology. The hierarchical role of the teacher and learners determines the temper of a classroom which is assessed by the outcome of the examinations.

Inquiry revokes, as Illich says, “the idea that one person’s judgement should determine what and when another person must learn.” In the rural indigenous contexts, it is also determined by who it is meant for? The “who” is the rural, indigenous, marginalized child. Guided by inquiry, the learner takes the responsibility of learning thereby shifting the hierarchical roles of learner and teacher, rearranging the structure of curriculum wherever necessary. There are schools which have reimaged their teaching learning practices, adapting and adopting different ideas and analytical approaches. However, these schools in India are confined to the urban contexts, where the earlier practices of learning by rote and memorization have been replaced by the concept of inquiry. “In most traditional systems of education including ours, the skills of analyzing and interpreting unfamiliar texts, constructing convincing arguments and developing approaches to problems are generally reserved for higher classes” (Jalaluddin, 2022, p. 226). Though largely practiced between the framework of curriculum and completing of the syllabus,

the need to develop inquiry or questioning is acknowledged. This places ‘curriculum, pedagogy and valuation in a continuum’ (Jalaluddin, 2022, p. 226) and not in isolated compartments. This perhaps also brings us to the constructivist approach to learning where “teaching and practice of learning is not isolated” but lies in the “process of meaning making” (Jalaluddin, 2022, p. 230).

How do we curate and initiate the process of inquiry especially among the learners from rural indigenous spaces where they are grappling with additional and perhaps systemic drawbacks. How do we then shift the focus from teaching to learning?

The Context of the Rural Schools and the Teaching Learning Practices

Schools in Rural Indigenous Spaces

Content of learning and context of the learners has perhaps nowhere been subjected to a deeper chasm than those in the rural indigenous spaces in India. The content of learning is imagined and developed not with “this” child in mind. The stories that she hears, the festivals that are celebrated, the culture that is prioritized, the hegemonic narrative of the dominant shadows the entirety of the teaching learning experiences. The child not only feels alienated but is also unable to participate actively. The schools in these contexts believe and practice the methods of rote learning, learning through memorization, copying and relentless writing as pathways for academic success and knowledge acquisition. The child is very much considered as the deposition ground of information rather than an equal participant in the process of learning. However, “learning for humans is instinctual, continuous, and the most complex of our natural traits. Learning is also a key to our ability to survive in the environments that we create and that create us” (Cajete, 1994, p. 24).

Inquiry being at the core of human existence is completely overlooked in the imagination of schools, in the rural indigenous contexts. A child from a rural indigenous context is born with the same instinct of curiosity. She has the similar “innate capacity or readiness to adapt to any culture into which (s)he may be received” (Kakar, 2012, p. 11). As she explores her surroundings through her sensory-motor abilities, the small step to the inner courtyard, the rise at the foot of the door frame, the clucking of the hens and the wetness of the ground near the handpump becomes familiar. She thereby adjusts her movements, constructing her knowledge, independently. Like any other toddler, she observes, assesses, reflects and comes to a learning. Taking ownership of what she has garnered and using it for future instances. Missing them often and yet forming layers of cognition and meaning-making quite independently. However, when this same child goes to school, she is bombarded with memorization of letters and numbers (not *how* or *where* to use them). Worse still, she is left at the periphery, abandoned and ignored in the many practices of the classroom. As she grows older, she is taught to follow the rules of her community, her tribe, her religion, her role in the household largely determined by her gender. In school, she is instructed to “listen to the teacher” and “copy” from the blackboard. School work and homework is largely filled with relentless copying from board to book and from books to notebooks. Little attention is given to the “understanding” of them and even less to how and where to use the letters and numbers thus learnt. Teaching is done from a podium where the teacher sits with the tools of memorization, practice and exams.

Interaction with the young learners at Hamar Srijan Shala, brings out this dichotomy between the idea of teaching and understanding of learning starkly. As a mixed age group open learning space, where the teachers and the learners are from within the community, Hamar Srijan Shala,

gives an opportunity to witness the present and the past. The possibilities and the impossible hurdles, the interest and enthusiasm and the aloofness and unaccountability (Mitra, 2026).

However, it will perhaps be incorrect to say that it is only in the context of the school that a rural child is not encouraged to question. The societal milieu of the rural indigenous and the marginalization by the dominant communities and urban spaces, inhibits the nurturing of the aspect of “questioning.” “Self-depreciation is another characteristic” leading to “internalization of the opinion of the oppressor” (Freire, 1993, p. 37), renders the act of questioning a challenge difficult to overcome by mere acts of encouragement.

Urgency in the adult to “instruct” and “mold” the child was alien to Tagore for whom a child was never the “unproductive brute” obligated to a “process of intensive instruction” (Ghosh, 2017, p. 42). This idea of instructions pertains to learning spaces and social spaces. Questioning the norms, societal, cultural, filial, is still seen with a questioning glance, especially for the girl child. She has the relentless task of proving herself at every step of her journey until not questioning becomes the normalized behavior of the “dutiful daughter.” Both the school and the larger community inhibit developing her questioning reflective self.

How do we then imagine a curriculum and pedagogy where questions, especially questions from the “indigenous life worlds and related worldviews” (Dhar, 2022) is evoked among a group of learners who are alienated from the content they are being introduced to and yet form a significant body of learners in India?

Journeying With Questions

“[Education is about] ... establishing connections between knowledge in many directions” (Jalaluddin, 2022, p. 230).

Hamar Srijan Shala was envisioned to be that space for building connections – with self, with each other, the community and with the environment that surrounds us. These connections could not have been built without questions leading to their understanding. The need for curating a space that was different from the existing schools however needed the cooperation and collaboration of the community itself (Mitra, 2026). Conversation, discussions and readings with the members from the community laid the groundwork to delve into an alternative definition of education which reflected an “understanding of oneself” (Krishnamurthi, 2001, p. 14).

It was easier said than done as conventional schools – run by government and private operators were mushrooming in the nearby areas. The tag of private English medium school was too provocative to be ignored. Though the age-old, obsolete pedagogical practices still permeated every aspect, the occasional songs and rhymes (memorized) have their own magical allure. Moreover, a pedagogy of inquiry was an idea completely novel as it shifted the focus from teaching to learning. Our primary tasks were therefore:

- a) an attempt to address the *hesitation to question* and
- b) build a space for learning, where “*how to question*” was taught, encouraged, developed and nurtured.

There were other challenges that surfaced while introducing *inquiry as methodology*. They came in the form of the parents, community and the teachers. “Any given society within its broader epochal unit contains its own limit situations” (Freire, 1993, p. 76). Often these limit

situations are translated as inherent malaise rather than problems to be reflected upon. Problems that can be resolved, which have a solution. “Critical form of thinking about their world” (Freire, 1993, p. 77) is not only ignored but rather discouraged in many rural communities. Over generations this creates a non-questioning people whose mind and body has been conditioned to this state of being instructed. As we encourage young learners to ask questions, they couldn't be limited to those that are comfortable, evident and naturalized. Many adults in the community were however ready with the retort, “don't ask so many questions!” which brought us to reflect on possible ways to initiate this culture in the context of learning spaces. “Human activity consists of action and reflection” (Freire, 1993, p. 98).

The teachers (young women from the community) decided to have community meetings where the methodology of Hamar Srijan Shala, questions and questioning, was introduced and explained. The methodology of exams, as yardsticks of academic success was approached through the pathways of understanding and questioning. They acknowledged the need to ask questions to find out about the world around them. There was a trace of hesitancy as well, “what answers can we give?” The faith in their own capacity was limited simply because the content of the school was alien. “Mary had a little lamb,” in the in primary school rhyme book, drew no semblance to anything familiar. The golden-haired Mary was a child from a distant world and hence alienated as well. The imagery of a child on her father's bicycle, going to school, through the path winding through the farms, would have perhaps encouraged questions and answers regarding weather, distance, nearby villages, farms, crops, and time! “To question” however was another hurdle to cross. Questioning as pedagogy resonated with the women of the community however, for their young daughters largely. Perhaps they perceived it as a window to question age old social practices which weighed down on the women. The teachers, daughters of the community, also explained the ease of “not knowing” the answer to a question. The idea was to attempt and shift the focus from “we do not have (m)any answers” to “we know many things about the world *we* inhabit” and for the parts that we don't, we will find it out together!

Questioning did not come easy to the children but having a mixed age group helped to facilitate it to a certain extent. The older children (age group of 5 to 8) who were attending schools found this space of query, quite novel. Hesitant and inhibited at first, they adapted to the routine of asking questions as an everyday practice. Questions at Hamar Srijan Shala, ranged from “what did you cook for lunch today?” to “when did you wake up?” The younger of the group were included too, in this practice of dialogue. Slowly and consistently, over a period of time, the temper of the questions altered. The children were curious to know where the rain came from? Why do we get mangoes only in the summer? Why do we pick “*mahua*” early in the morning? Why can't we enter the temple when we are menstruating? Why are the boys not helping with the housework? A perceptible shift from “asking questions” to “questioning” was at work. Swarnima Kriti's (2019) efforts at founding *Hamar Chinhari Welfare Society* was premised on the *questioning* of gender roles and the skewed sexual division of labour in the village. We wanted to take the same spirit of questioning to the Srijan Shalas.

Vignettes From the Evening Classes

Our imagination of Hamar Srijan Shala stemmed from the thoughts, ideas, perceptions and questions from within the community itself (Mitra, 2026). Perhaps that was the beginning of “questioning” that our young teachers embarked on. Working with the “teachers,” seeing the disparity between the resources (the government and private schools, where most of the children of the community went) and expectation of performance (board exams, state level

exams, admission to colleges for higher studies) initiated the conversations. It also brought us to the question of what we wanted the learners to be able to do. A constructivist, inquiry-based idea in a mixed age group learning space was envisioned. Hamar Srijan Shala began its journey in January 2025, and we began with the topic of self and the family – ideas to which the learners had a priori knowledge and questions! The questions were dominantly asked by the teacher *didis* to which the young ones gave monosyllabic answers. These interactions, though encouraging, were not leading to an “inquiry.” That is when the realization of the need to teach to ask questions became more evident. Slowly and painstakingly, with the help of games, strategies, role playing, involving members of the community for storytelling, familiar topics, connections and inquiry was established. The idea was not to present a program but “search for this program dialogically with people” (Freire, 1993, p. 97). Content of teaching learning or the curriculum imagined from within the community, opened up possibilities of connections which were unseen in their schools. The young of the group began to ask why and how. How did the cows know when to return home? Why do we go to pick mahua early in the morning?

The hot summer months had just begun in India when the story of “The Thirsty Crow” was read. It was a familiar story with an all too familiar setting of dried-up land and water scarcity looming on the horizon. It was discussed in the class as a part of the summer season, changes in the landscape and the difficulties faced during these months of intense heat. One of the students however had a different question, “why did the crow pick up pebbles, why not soil? Or sand perhaps?” This query led to finding it out for themselves over the next few days, what would be a suitable substitute for pebbles. Water was poured into the transparent cup, and children took turns to place the pebbles, sand and soil. The water inching up, was an excitement to behold. After experimenting with the materials, the verdict was in favor of pebbles. It did the job faster! However, there was another question, from the group to reckon with, “what would happen if both pebbles and sand were there? What will the crow put first and why?” The realm of questions also included “why does the soil in only some parts of the village have cracks in summer?” It was an opportune moment to introduce conversations on the environment and the rapid deforestation in many parts of the state. The role of the teacher as a facilitator, was to focus on the process rather than the outcome of answers.

The intense heat of summer does see the occasional thunderstorms. One such evening of pouring rain and absent children birthed entirely new activities, evoked from the sudden inclement weather. Once the children had returned, replete with the stories of rain and puddles, they also brought a question. “Where does the rain come from?” The obvious answer of “clouds” was challenged yet again with, “how does the water reach the clouds?” A barrage of imaginative answers, like “the trees send the water to the clouds,” “maybe there is a pipe somewhere,” “it’s the rain God” provoked much laughter and counter suggestions! Putting aside heavenly intervention and mechanical ministrations for the time being, a big bowl of hot water and a stainless-steel plate was brought in to explore and understand evaporation! Rain brought in the exploration of materials to make an umbrella too.

There are times at Hamar Srijan Shala, when the learners are separated into those of primary school and middle school age group, to facilitate, encourage and develop reading and reflection on texts that were read. It was during such a reading session with the young girls of the middle school, when a Hindi translation of the book “The Hidden Lives of Trees” by Peter Wohlleben was read. The book was read by the girls, slowly and haltingly. The relentless reading, writing and copying in school had surprisingly not given them the ease of language. As they worked slowly towards understanding the forest as a community of trees, helping, supporting and nurturing each other, they shared instances of their experiences in the forests as well (this is an

agricultural community who are also dependent on the forest). They drew similarity between the forest and the group of girls, bound in friendship. Separate but inseparable, at least for the time being. They wanted to reflect what friendship was, what held them together, binding them to each other, what was it that they cherished and what was it they were critical about. The process of this activity though began with the learners from the middle school elicited responses from the rest of the group in later subsequent days to come. The very young ones displayed their understanding of friendship with hugs for whom they loved. The varied methods and mannerisms of reflection and answers not only opened up the idea of questions of cognition, but also a new space for conversations pertaining to self-reflection and inquiry within.

It was another evening at Hamar Srijan Shala. The children were gathered for a story as an introduction for a lesson about seasonal vegetables grown in most of the houses. The teachers took the path taken by the “hare and the tortoise,” of the very popular fable that emphasizes staying on the task (the idea was to go to see the different vegetables grown in the *baadi*). As the teacher completed her story, there was a sense of unease among some of the learners in the group. They had a simple query. “Why didn't the tortoise wait?” The class was encouraged to suggest a different ending for the story and the collective ideas of *waiting*, *sharing*, *waking up the hare* as well, were suggested. *Friendship* was evoked and self-reflection came in with ease. One of the learners, around the age of 11 years, mentioned tortoises as their totem and hence an animal of veneration. They look after each other. The human and the animal, entwined in the bond of kinship and care. Questions around totems were, however, significantly absent. Many stories of their tribes are lost to the younger generation in the community, loss of language, displacement and altered worldview of development have pushed the significance of spiritual practices into the realms of ritualistic habits, that too of the dominant.

That was a day when the roles of the learner and the teacher were reversed; when we learnt about the inherent and innate teachings of sharing and waiting from the youngest in our groups. Our perception of competitiveness, victory and defeat were questioned. Our ideas of success and failure were challenged. Questions and inquiry were not limited to cognition alone but challenged the very lens through which the world was seen.

Conclusion

Encouraging inquiry is not pertaining to information, facts or knowledge of the *outside* world alone. Inquiry is also an inquiry *within*. It is also about the *inner world*. It is a point of intersection between critical consciousness and self-reflective thinking; as also self-transformative processes. It is a process that questions the dominant practices, hegemonic narratives, the conditions and naturalizations of behavior and dispositions. As children are taught to question, reflect, observe, analyze, listen and understand, they also develop their imagination of other ways, other people, other knowledge systems, other worlds. Inquiry is not compartmentalized within academic extractive knowledge but can build an alternative mindset and world. It would perhaps develop “education in empathy” or as Tagore puts it, “bodher shadhona” (meditation of reflective consciousness; or meditative knowing). Constructing our own learning through connections necessitated decolonizing the way the rural indigenous are looked at. An inquiry-based pedagogy, an engaged classroom and active learners necessitate connections with the very life world the young are a part of, to be viewed in a continuum, not in isolation.

Imagination and inculcation of the practice of inquiry into the teaching learning experiences in the everyday life of the learner would lead to development of self-knowledge and knowledge about the world they inhabit. Learning not to view the world through the narrow scope of difference, profit and value, not mere acquisition of knowledge for benefit or extraction. Inquiry is perhaps the pathway leading to learning that is more engaged in the process. More entwined in praxis, on reflection, on community and conversations with the community, on learning from each other and with each other, on taking ownership of one's own learning guided by curiosity and questions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Renuka Yadav, Keshbati Netam, Pooja Yadav, Yogita, Hema Dhruv, Hema Suryavanshi, Kavita Yadav, Swarnima Kriti, Sumit Verma and Anup Dhar of Hamar Chinhari Welfare Society for having contributed in known and unknown ways to the writing of this paper. Neither the imagination of Hamar Srijan Shala and the creation of inquiry-based teaching learning practices would have been possible without them.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

The author declares that no AI or AI -assisted technologies have been used to generate, refine, or correct the content in the manuscript. The ideas, procedures, findings, analyses, and discussion are originally written and derived from careful and systemic conduct of the research.

References

- Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the Mountains – An ecology of Indigenous Education*. Kivaki Press. P42.
- Das Gupta, U. (Ed). (2009). *Tagore Selected Writings on Education and Nationalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Dhar, A. (2022). The Prop Roots of Postdevelopment Praxis: From Practical Philosophy to Transformative Philosophy. In F. U. Ahamed & M. S. Islam(Eds.), *Rethinking Development: Approaches and Practices in South Asia*. Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin Books.
- Fukuoka, M. (2025). *One Straw Revolution*. Riverbank Dev Publishers.
- Ghosh, R. (2017). *Aesthetics Politics Pedagogy and Tagore*. Springer.
- Halbwachs, M. (2014). *The Collective Memory*.
<https://archive.org/details/collectivememory00halb/mode/1up>
- Illich, I. (2021). *Deschooling Society*. Aakar Books.
- Jalaluddin, A. K. (2022). *From mindless to Mindful Classrooms*. Bodh Siksha Samiti.
- Kakar, S. (2012). *The Inner World*. Oxford India.
- Krishnamurthi, J. (2001). *What are you doing with your life?* Penguin Random House.
- Kriti, S. (2019). Deconstructing Theory-Practice: Re-Thinking Methodology. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 20(3), 62–73. <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol20/iss3/7>
- Mitra, A. (2026). Decolonising Education: Rethinking Early Childhood Education in Indigenous Spaces. *The Asian Conference on Education 2025: Official Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1565–1575). <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2186-5892.2026.119>
- Mukherjee, H. B. (2021). *Education for Fullness*. Routledge.

Contact email: aditimitra.am@gmail.com