Sāhitya
Journal of the Comparative Literature Association of India
Volume 13 (December 2025)

Which language is it? Whose language is it? Ethically responsible language studies

RAHI SOREN[1] and INDRANIL DUTTA[2]

1. Academic Social Responsibility (ASR) What it is, what it isn't and what it could be in language studies:

A widely accepted theme of value creation and sustainable development in corporate organizations had triggered the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Similarly, in academics, the term - Academic

[1] Assistant Professor at the School of Oceanographic Studies, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, West Bengal.

[2] Professor at the School of Languages and Linguistics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, West Bengal.

Social Responsibility (ASR) has been coined for a concept already practiced to some extent in academia. The idea is to build an equitable space, encourage diversity and practice plurality in a responsible and ethical manner. Globally, this is also in alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a means to achieve goals ethically with regards to respective societies.

Languages are inexorably linked to the social being of an individual and a community. It therefore behooves language researchers to already exhibit awareness of the consequences of the outcomes of knowledge production. Regardless of the arcane, scientific goals of linguists' engagement with language and linguistic communities, the direct beneficiaries should continue to be individuals and linguistic communities. This latter perspective, granted, can be vastly complicated but also a challenge for theorising around languages. Modern notions of linguistics as a science, or more exactly a social science were also

contradistinctive to linguistics as a central approach to humanities. This distinction in methods and approaches led to wrestling languages from peoples and communities and made them as objects of analytical exploration that were couched in empiricism. Here, we would like to bring attention to a well-practiced notion within the scientific study of languages - that is to posit that the mechanisms that underlie languages are not transparent to 'naïve' speakers and hearers. Positing that the speaker/hearer, while being 'competent' in their language was not capable of being 'aware' of the inner workings of language. This making of the naïve subject was not entirely an analytic prerequisite, but presumptive for all modern scientific theories of languages. The discoveries around language notwithstanding, these approaches did ultimately have to contend with social processes that seemingly got interwoven into what the scientific practice would define as a patently linguistic-scientific discovery. An influential turn in this perspective was sought by Hymes (1972) by way of

somewhat placing the speaker and hearer back into the scheme of objective scientific practice, but transposing communication as an ability that the speaker and hearer possess, Hymes' intervention didn't yet quite take away from the inert and almost 'biological imperative for humans to communicate' style of reasoning. So, the infusion of the social, albeit communication for Hymes here, was an objective goal-directed understanding of language as a system of signs.

2. Language as an extracorporeal object of inquiry:

Throughout the history of human engagement with language, language has been studied more as a skill that our species acquired as an evolutionary outcome and less as a social imperative. The structuralist intervention tries to steer language studies out of social darwinism and sees language as a part of a larger system of signs. However, the study of language as an extracorporeal object of scientific inquiry continues, somewhat

removed from the social context without which even the evolutionary bearings of language couldn't be explained(Schwartz, 2004). The functionalist import of language as a system of signs notwithstanding, in the context of studies of lesser-known, under-studied, moribund, and endangered languages too, the linguists' imperative has more been archival, focussed on preservation of languages as a system of structurally connected signs, objects, and elements of conveying meaning. Language documentation as a field of linguistics, therefore, has been centered around conservation of language, yet again, somewhat removed from the contexts that brought about the obsolescence in the first place. This socially disengaged resuscitative perspective has had a definitive impact; in that today, archivally, we do have materials on several hundred languages that will inevitably be lost as the last speakers disappear in the mist of time. The role of linguists as technical chroniclers of linguistic processes, commendable as it may be, does warrant several

questions(Blommaert, 2012). Which languages are we studying? This question is inextricably related to questions around indigeneity, decolonization, and dominant languages. Whose language are we studying? The latter question is related to questions of dominance and therefore also related to questions around decolonizing peoples from language/s. The conspicuous absence of peoples from how language studies have situated themselves within the modern engagement of 'science is not art', is neither surprising nor without intent. Linguists' obsession with form makes the removal of the human from language an inexorable exercise of scientific veracity. Some of these questions have been answered by way of community based linguists who have prioritized the community needs over the scientific imperative to poke and prod into the bare structure of a language. This is not to diminish the relevance of grammatical descriptions towards building pedagogical materials, but it is to reinvigorate language studies with a sharp socially relevant goal.

A fundamental inequality that typically arises in the relationship between the investigator (researcher) and the informants (participants) in a research setting is that the research often establishes or deepens an uneven power dynamic where authority and control primarily rest with the investigator(Reyhner, 2024). Thus, the overall research process tends to benefit the investigator significantly more than it benefits the informants. It is to ponder upon why does this inequality exist? What are the assumptions and practices within social science research that contribute to this imbalance? Also, if this dynamic is inevitable, can one explore ways of new assumptions and procedures that could be adopted to create a more equitable and plural understanding in social science research. Social scientists have often regarded language as a neutral medium, a window on social reality. However, as many social theorists are of the opinion that most of the time, this view is oversimplified and runs the risk of a homogenous representation which is further removed from 'reality'. It

is often recognized in contemporary times that language is a social construct and not a neutral medium. Therefore, as suggested by Cameron et al. (1993), social researchers need to take language *qua* language seriously. In this sense – and whether or not it is made explicit – virtually all social research involves researching language.

3. Endangered languages:

In the life of languages, change is the rule rather than an exception. Pervasive variation occurs within any given speech community, and speakers in each generation use their language or languages slightly differently from their predecessors, in both unconscious and conscious ways (Stross, 1975). Through these processes, languages keep responding and adapting to their users' communication needs (Kay 1977), serving as dynamic bridges between the past and the future and as vehicles for the continued, and continuously innovative,

transmission of a community's knowledges, beliefs, values and practices (Maffi, 2001).

Roughly a third of languages are now endangered (3,193 languages are endangered today, Ethnologue, 2025: https://www.ethnologue.com/insights/how-many-languages-endangered/), often with less than 1,000 speakers remaining. Meanwhile, just 23 languages account for more than half the world's population. On the face of things, it is remarkable that the two fields of inquiry so seemingly different as biology and linguistics should have followed such similar paths toward the same fundamental tenet.

Charles Darwin's Origin of species, published in 1859, crystallized the concept of evolution and elaborated it with the theory of natural selection. In so doing, he managed to consolidate the strains of evolutionary thought, then current in such fields as geology, paleontology, and biology itself. The relevance of Darwin's insights was grasped immediately by the

German linguist August Schleicher. Four years after the publication of Origin, Schleicher published a pamphlet called Darwinism tested by the science language. Darwin himself recognized the basic affinities between evolutionary biology and historical linguistics. He drew the parallel in his 1871 publication, The descent of man, he declared that, if we could properly classify all the languages of the world, both living and extinct, along with 'all intermediate and slowly changing dialects', we would arrive at 'a perfect pedigree of mankind'. Subsequently, a counter-reaction set in the 1900's which would not accept language as parallel to the concept of the species. It was debated that languages change by cultural selection, whereas, species by natural selection. Schleicher observed in his book, 'Language as it evolves' and he states "No biologist would ever equate a language with an individual member of a species, for the simple reason that humans can choose which language or languages to use, whereas volition does not play a role in determining which species an organism belongs to."

A more pointed criticism comes from the linguist Johana Nichols' book 'Linguistic diversity in space and time', published in 1992 where she states and I quote, "No evidence of anything like speciation has been found in this or any other typological work. Although linguistics has no analogy to the biological notion of species, it is safe to say, informally speaking, that languages and linguistic lineages are related to each other as individuals or kin groups of a biological species are, not as species in a genus".

Presently, many linguists have remarked on the similarities between the critical situation facing the world's biodiversity and its linguistic diversity. The analogy between the destruction of natural habitat, for species and the traditional social setting, for languages are remarkably similar. Both species and languages have evolved over hundreds or thousands of years to adapt to very specific contexts. If those contexts undergo unprecedented rapid change—as the world's environment and culture are now doing—many species

and languages will likely lack the resiliency to adapt to the new conditions. Presumably, endemic species and endemic languages are among the most vulnerable to extinction, precisely because they have historically adapted to local conditions only. Conversely, certain species and languages show a great capacity to invade the habitat and social settings of others.

Since linguistic and biological diversity are tightly coupled, they face similarly grim futures. International organisations such as UNESCO, have taken on the issue of language endangerment with the publication of an atlas of endangered languages called "Red Books". The publication of "Ethnologue: Languages of the World" by Gary Simons and Charles Fennig paves the way to understand the graveness of the situation. Similarly, biodiversity has been protected globally through the "Red Data Book", Wildlife protected areas, Sanctuaries, Biosphere reserves etc. However, bridging the gap between endangered species and languages, through policies is of utmost importance.

Ethnobiologists and ethnoecologists, suggests that linguistic ecologies and biological ecologies are mutually related through human knowledge, use, and management of the environment and through the languages used to convey this knowledge and practices. Language acts as the main repository of and transmission vehicle for knowledge, particularly through the mediation of traditional ecological knowledge. This two-way relationship needs to be brought out and studied in depth. Small- scale societies with a history of continued and unchallenged occupation tend to develop and maintain detailed and accurate knowledge about their ecological niches.

The underrepresentation and alienation of marginalized and minority communities in academia go hand in hand with the lack of adequate support, solidarity and mechanisms within universities. Categories of race, class, caste, gender and sexuality are increasingly prominent discourses of knowledge production and pedagogies. These multiple identities and

subjectivities resonate in the curricula in no small part due to the presence of scholars from marginalized backgrounds, and thereby intrinsic to decolonial scholarship.

3. Language documentation & revitalization:

Nelson Flores and Jonathan Rosa critique appropriateness-based approaches to language diversity in education. Based on theories of language ideologies and racialization, they offer a perspective from which students classified as long-term English learners, heritage language learners, and Standard English learners can be understood to inhabit a shared racial posi-tioning that frames their linguistic practices as deficient regardless of how closely they follow supposed rules of appropriateness.

They advocate for rethinking language diversity in education, shifting from a focus on appropriateness to a framework that challenges the normalization of

standardized linguistic categories. The authors reference research indicating the benefits of bilingual education that supports, rather than eliminates, the home languages of immigrant children (Cummins, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999). They critique assimilationist language diversity approaches and question subtractive language education, in which language-minoritized students are compelled to abandon their native language in favor of the standardized national language. The notion of appropriateness is portrayed as defining standardized linguistic forms as objective and suitable for academic contexts. The article emphasizes how these appropriateness-based methods reinforce racial normativity, with language-minoritized students expected to emulate white linguistic practices, despite their language use being perceived racially by white listeners.

In the Indian context, Mahapatra and Anderson, 2022 look at the languages for learning through the New Education Policy (NEP, 2020). This seems to be

addressing the challenges of creating a democratic, socially just and progressive education policy for a linguistically diverse and sociopolitically complex India. According to the article, the attempt is 'unambiguous' and a laudable intention to promote multiple languages in education seems to be consistent with Tollefson (2012) which promotes effective 'democratic reform' in educational language policy-making. However, if one analyses the ground realities, there are instances where NEP 2020 is unable to address. Shortage of teachers, lack of congruence between administration and staff, clear policy of implementation are a few which are mentionable. While Biswas (EPW, 2020) opines that the conception and ongoing implementation of reforms in the Indian higher education system are based on ideas that are fundamentally different from the original liberal ideas that fashioned our education system. Based on popular social concerns and external shocks, the focus essentially shifted from encouraging free and critical thinking to forming skills in accordance with the

requirements of the corporate sector. The reforms also include a definite effort towards delinking education from direct human interaction. This, we have argued, will lead to social fragmentation and would thereby reduce possibilities of formation of collective opinions, which are potential problems for social governance, in general, and for governance of Higher Education Institutes, in particular. Endangered and lesser known languages thus face a layered challenge where students have to negotiate between home language, dominant language and the language of instruction in educational institutions. Often, these are twice removed from the reality and scarcely addressed in a formal educational setup and lead to unfathomable knowledge drain and intergenerational knowledge depletion.

4. Community-based and driven research:

Language as a cultural right and entitlement is enshrined in the Constitution of India under various provisions and

lists in order to include diverse cultural groups into a political whole. India is administratively divided into States/Provinces primarily on a linguistic criteria. The Eighth Schedule of the Constitution and The Official Languages Act gives legal status to 22 languages. They are mostly large languages with speakers numbering in the millions in most cases. Only 2 Indigenous-Adivasi languages have received a place in this official constitutional list, and quite evidently, these are some of the largest Adivasi languages in the country, and the respective groups were able to lobby effectively due to this high population factor and through extended movement based struggles that provided the critical mass to make the State comply. The sad truth with official languages is that it is based on political and economic compulsions rather than social inclusion or the wellbeing of communities as a policy. The Adivasis or Scheduled Tribes (ST) of India number about 8% of the population or more than a 100 million people according to the 2011 Census of India, and speak about 400 indigenous

tongues. In contrast to these Government census reports, The People's Linguistic Survey of India (PLSI) published by the Bhasha Institute/Adivasi Academy reports that there are over 780 living languages in India (only 122 languages have more than 10,000 speakers/group). The importance of being an official language is that state support and resources become accessible to create systems to perpetuate the use of a language. The dismal neglect of Indigenous-Adivasi language becomes clear with the fact that more than 700 communities have been categorised as Scheduled Tribes through Constitutional orders, and merely two languages on the official list. Recognition as Scheduled Tribes largely functions to increase the representation of Tribal communities in public institutions and development schemes with a focus on socio-economic development. State apathy towards tribal cultures and a longstanding policy of coerced assimilation of smaller cultures into the national mainstream has diluted the standing of Indigenous Peoples in India. This is also reflected in the

visions of the Educational policymakers in India as they are also a product of colonial education and Western universities, hence their predisposition toward Western science. To place indigenous knowledge in educational corridors, policymakers and curriculum planners are needed who are capable of blending indigenous knowledge and Western science and transform pedagogies that help students examine important values, assumptions, and information embedded in other cultural perspectives. This has the capacity to foster positive attitudes to the multidimensional and multiperspectival cultural world of science. It has the potential to give both teachers and students an enriched understanding of science and its role in promoting sustainable communities and environments through valuing indigenous health practices, environmental protection, and cultivating medicinal herbs, among other benefits. Some countries have acknowledged these importance and have taken the initiative to incorporate Indigenous Knowledge in School and University Curriculum. In

New Zealand, McKinley,Stewart, and Richards (2004) found that Maori language was used in teaching science activities such as *hangi* (a form of cooking), *kowhaiwhai* and *taniko* (Maori patterns), Papatuanuku (Mother Earth), and names of native plants. For nearly two decades, the University of Alaska Fairbanks, in cooperation with the Cultural Heritage and Education Institute of the village of Minto, has been offering an opportunity for university students in selected summer courses to spend a week at the Old Minto Cultural Camp on the Tanana River under the tutelage of local Athabascan elders and their families. Similar efforts have been initiated in India in recent years which promotes indigenous led education and knowledge production through bridging the inter-generational gap for knowledge production. Nandani Sundar argues the case of adivasi children in central India, their transformation through formal schooling and the way in which new kinds of knowledge comes to replace or co-exist with older forms (2010).

5.1 Case I: School education in Ghosaldanga, West Bengal, India:

This paper looks into a specific case and history of formation through community engagement, an alternative way of facilitating Indigenous led school education in Ghosaldanga, West Bengal, India. The case study pertinent to the enquire looks at the Ghosaldanga Adibasi Seva Sangha (GASS), a registered society founded in 1987 continues to work with the community towards developing a decolonizing framework for creating equitable spaces for young students through its non-formal tribal day school, Rolf Schoembs Vidyashram (RSV), situated between the two Santal villages Ghosaldanga and Bishnubati. Santali, an Austro-Asiatic language, belonging to the Munda family of languages, was mostly considered as 'oral' language and was not tied to an alphabetic or syllabic script until the mid-nineteenth century. It is spoken by approximately

7.5 million speakers throughout eastern India and sporadically in Nepal and Bangladesh (Eberhard, Gary and Fennig 2021). It is written in multiple scripts, including modified Roman, Devnagari, Eastern Brahmi, Odiya as well as Ol Chiki script. Since 1996, the RSV school has used mother-tongue (Santali) education to empower tribal students, reducing dropouts by bridging the gap between formal and non-formal education. Recognizing that Santali-speaking children faced alienation in Bengali-medium government schools, RSV developed a unique pedagogy that introduces Bengali through Santali, fostering smoother language transition. Founded by pioneers like Boro Baski and Sona Murmu, the school integrates Santali primers, tribal history, folklore, and music into its curriculum, preserving cultural identity while equipping students for broader education. Former students, now teachers like Padma and Kalidasi Mardi, highlight how RSV helped them overcome language barriers and inferiority complexes. Beyond academics, the school incorporates traditional

livelihood skills (agriculture, fishery, vermicompost) and established a Museum of Santal Culture (2007) to showcase tribal heritage through artifacts, music, and handicrafts, educating both students and visitors. This holistic approach ensures Santali youth remain rooted in their culture while gaining mainstream opportunities. Major thrust was given on inter-generational learning and aligned its framework with the Santal community's traditional governance system in a sustainable way. Community involvement was also prioritized so as to ensure continuity of engagement and ownership. To make education culturally relevant, the initiative adapted practices to Santal consciousness, avoiding rigid norms that deterred children. Early orientation and pre-school daycare centers addressed both education and severe poverty and malnutrition by providing nutritious meals (khichuri, vegetables, fruits, eggs) to children and pregnant mothers. Beyond nutrition, the centers focused on cognitive and physical development, using games, songs, and dances to teach letters and numbers. The

organization (GASS) held weekly meetings to discuss health, hygiene, alcoholism, and superstition, fostering community involvement. Parents contributed ideas, and initiatives like kitchen gardens and tree-planting programs strengthened communal ownership. Despite challenges, children from RSV nursery schools performed better in primary school, proving the program's effectiveness. However, difficulties later led to a merger with government schools, highlighting the program's long-term impact on equitable and sustainable education.

5.2 Case II: Jadavpur University-Exeter University project on Decolonizing the Curriculum

Classrooms are not just places of learning and exchange; they are also inherently political spaces in which multiple intersecting inequalities shape and frame the experiences of both learners and educators. Decolonisation of education begins with this realisation,

to which the only ethical response is a personal and professional commitment to fostering awareness and abolishment of power imbalances that undermine education and social equity more generally (Bhambra et al., 2018).

Discourses on knowledge production and pedagogy increasingly emphasize categories like race, class, caste, gender, and sexuality, reflecting intersecting identities in curricula due to contributions from marginalized scholars. However, despite being essential to decolonial scholarship, academic departments remain dominated by white, male, and often upper-caste (even among South Asian scholars in Western academia) individuals. Marginalized communities face underrepresentation, alienation, and a lack of institutional support, solidarity, and mechanisms for social justice in education. Recognizing the complexity of decolonization, the 'Introduction to Decolonisation' course was jointly developed by scholars from Jadavpur University and the University of Exeter. Designed as a

primer for students and adult learners, it encourages reflection on why certain ideas, methods, and people are prioritized in curricula while others are excluded—particularly addressing how British colonialism suppressed local knowledges in India and the Global South.

Some scholars argue that complete decolonization is impossible due to colonialism's deep entrenchment (Bhattacharya, 2018; Pirbhai-Illich et al., 2023), viewing it instead as an ongoing process of re-centering marginalized knowledge systems. This requires acknowledging colonialism's lasting effects and adopting new mentalities to challenge dominant structures. As Freire (1970) notes, oppressed communities must lead this work, as oppressors have little incentive to dismantle systems that uphold their power.

This was made possible by ongoing collaboration (initiated in 2014) between the University of Exeter

(UoE) and Jadavpur University (JU). Both universities have staff with considerable knowledge and experience of the historical and geographical contexts of colonialism, and who have demonstrated sustained commitment to applying decolonial approaches to their teaching and research. Further, each institution has a history of communal political activism advancing decolonial ideas. For instance, at Jadavpur University, staff and students frequently protest against local and national decisions seen to restrict personal freedoms; one prominent example is the 2014 *hokkolorob* ('let there be noise') movement (Chaudhuri, 2019). At the time of the collaboration described here, the University of Exeter was home to the Exeter Decolonising Network, and had just launched a Decolonisation Toolkit. While some may interpret these initiatives as a new form of colonialism, it's undeniable that the Council—despite adopting an internationalist stance—persisted in framing world societies as a hierarchy of national cultures. The resulting resource—a website featuring lesson plans and

expert contributions—aims to equip both educators and students with foundational decolonization theory and practices.

Details, step to step progress of the project is beyond the scope of this article; the following is a framework that was followed: The project first produced a Google Site[3], featuring 27 expert-led videos grouped into four themes:

1. Introduction to decolonization
2. Decolonization in higher education
3. Decolonization across disciplines

Each theme included key definitions, background information, and case studies, mirroring a syllabus's "core" and "further" readings. Resources were shared via newsletters and workshops at both institutions (Jadavpur

[3](https://sites.google.com/view/introductiontodecolonisation/home)

University and University of Exeter), though formal impact metrics were lacking.

In Phase 2, the team expanded this into a 12-week module on a dedicated website: https://introductiontodecolonisation.com/ , featuring:

Lesson plans & learning outcomes

1. A module guide with recommended readings (including Phase 1 videos)
2. A glossary of decolonization terms
3. Translated video transcripts in 5 Indian languages (Bangla, Hindi, Marathi, Tamil, Telugu) to enhance accessibility and challenge linguistic hierarchies.

While Phase 1 videos were repurposed as a "quick introduction" series, Phase 2 solidified the project's structure, emphasizing practical implementation and inclusivity in decolonizing education.

The team aimed to create a course designed to familiarize learners with decolonisation and encourage them to reconsider their perspectives on—and experiences within—higher education through this lens. We intended for this initiative to draw from diverse viewpoints and lived experiences, integrating, wherever possible, the distinct insights of contributing experts. The goal was for the course to become a core part of our institutions' curricula while also reaching a broader audience beyond our immediate academic community. Additionally, we hoped to establish and strengthen enduring partnerships among the researchers and institutions engaged in this project.

Our research coincided with - and has been followed by - a global rise in nationalist politics across India, the UK, and numerous other nations (Cheeseman et al., 2023). This climate has significantly constrained productive discourse around decolonization and broader social justice issues.

While international collaboration presents crucial opportunities to address complex global challenges (Waddock, 2013), it is to be acknowledged of its potential to replicate imperialist patterns. Our initiative, alongside similar efforts, aims to mitigate this risk. At this critical juncture, educational interventions like ours are essential. They help learners recognize the consequences of prejudice-driven policymaking while developing tools to combat systemic inequities.

6. Language policy & linguistic justice:

For social scientists, it is an inconvenient reality that the world does not consist of neatly segregated monolingual nations. As a result, legal citizenship—formal administrative membership in a state—is a weak proxy for sociolinguistic affiliation, much less for actual language use. The connection between national identity and state-led language policies is even more ambiguous, not least due to the inherently slippery nature of

"identity" itself (Blommaert, Jan, 2005)

A crucial emerging focus in language policy research examines how policies develop through complex interactions between multiple actors - not just national governments but also supranational entities and geopolitical forces. Contrary to conventional assumptions, so-called "national" language policies often originate beyond state borders, either imposed by superstate institutions or crafted to secure international alliances. The European Union exemplifies this dynamic: while promoting an official multilingual identity, its language policies are ultimately implemented through national education systems. Meanwhile, across the Global South, the rapid expansion of English-medium education reflects a monocentric vision of globalization centered on Anglo-American economic and political power. This trend is particularly striking in nations like Congo and Mozambique, where English - once negligible - now receives state promotion as governments strategically align with U.S.-led

financial institutions. These developments fundamentally destabilize traditional conceptions of national identity tied to language, revealing the concept's limitations in an increasingly interconnected world.

Some of the theses articulated in classic studies on nationalism such as Anderson (1983), Gellner (1983), Greenfeld (1992), and Hobsbawm (1990). The concept of language ideologies emerged from Sapir-Whorf linguistic anthropology, referring to culturally situated beliefs about language structure and use (Kroskrity, 2001; Silverstein, 1979; Schieffelin et al., 1998). These ideologies manifest as shared perceptions of linguistic "quality," status, and appropriateness—hierarchies that privilege certain forms over others. Written language, for instance, is typically valorized above spoken varieties; standardized dialects outweigh regional ones; and specialized registers eclipse everyday speech. Bauman and Briggs (2003) locate this ideological framework in Enlightenment thought, particularly in Locke's rationalist vision. Locke championed a deliberately

elitist linguistics—one that severed language from its oral, folkloric roots (dismissed as irrational and chaotic) to construct a "purified," decontextualized medium befitting modernity's detached individualism. This epistemic shift birthed the very notion of standard language: an ostensibly neutral, prestige form that, in practice, institutionalized linguistic inequality.

Ethically responsible language studies could thus be developed through decolonial approaches (as discussed in this article) to foster equitable and plural understanding in social science research. These frameworks would effectively contribute to a more comprehensive understanding and implementation of ASR. It would hence integrate and encourage ethical governance, sustainable development, and community-based research. This practice would give new paradigms towards co-creation of diverse knowledge systems and actively move towards inclusive practices, the core essence of ASR.

Works Cited:

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge UP, 2003.

Biswas, Debashis. "Neo-liberal Reforms in Higher Education Accelerated by the Pandemic." Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 55, no. 39, 26 Sep. 2020.

Blommaert, Jan. "Language policy and national identity." *An introduction to language policy*. . Blackwell, 2005. 238–254.

Blommaert, Jan. "Chronicles of complexity: Ethnography, superdiversity, and linguistic landscapes (Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies 29)." Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg

University (2012).

Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, Ben Rampton, and Kay Richardson. "Ethics, advocacy and empowerment: Issues of method in researching language." *Language Communication* 13 (1993): 81–94.

Cummins, Jim. *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Multilingual Matters, 2000.

Cheeseman, N., Alderman, P., Cianetti, L., Gehrke, M., & Haughton, T. *The rise of authoritarianism is misunderstood – and it matters.* The University of Birmingham. 13 (2023).

Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, editors. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. 24th ed., SIL International, 2021, www.ethnologue.com.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism.* Cornell UP,

1983.

Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Harvard UP, 1992.

Flores, Nelson, and Jonathan Rosa. "Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education."*Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 85, no. 2, Summer 2015, pp. 149-71.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

Hymes, Dell. "On Communicative Competence."*Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*, edited by J. B. Pride and J. Holmes, Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 269-293.

Kay, Paul. "Language Evolution and Speech Style."*Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*, edited by Ben Blount and Mary

Sanches, Academic Press, 1977, pp. 21-33.

Kroskrity, Paul V. "Language ideologies".*Handbook of pragmatics,* edited by J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman, J. Blommaert and C. Bulcaen, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001, pp. 1-17.

Maffi, Luisa, editor. "On Biocultural Diversity: Linking Language, Knowledge, and the Environment". Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001.

Mahapatra, Santosh, and Jason Anderson. "Languages for Learning vs. Medium of Instruction: Multilingual Education in India's National Education Policy 2020."*Current Issues in Language Planning*, 24(1), 44-69, 2023.

McKinley, Elizabeth, Georgina Stewart, and Philippa Richards. *Māori Students in Science and Mathematics: Junior Programmes in Secondary Schools*. Ministry of Education, 2004.Schieffelin, Bambi B., et al., editors. Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.

Oxford UP, 1998.

Reyhner, Jon, Louise Lockard, and Joseph Martin. "Revitalizing Indigenous Languages Challenges and Opportunities." *Honoring OurIndigenous Languages and Cultures*, Northern Arizona University, 2024, pp 1-15.

Schieffelin, Bambi B., et al., editors. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford UP, 1998.

Schwartz, Reneé S., Norman G. Lederman, and Barbara A. Crawford. "Developing views of nature of science in an authentic context: An explicit approach to bridging the gap between nature of science and scientific inquiry." *Science Education,* vol. 88 no. 4, 2004, pp. 610-645.

Silverstein, Michael. "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology."*The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by Paul R. Clyne et al., Chicago Linguistic Society, 1979,

pp. 193-247.

Stross, Brian. "Linguistic Creativity in Children's Argot."*Language in Society*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1975, pp. 305-12.

Sundar, Nandini. "Social and Political Exclusion, Religious Inclusion: The Adivasi Question in Education."*Journal of Indian Education*, vol. 36, no. 2, Aug. 2010, pp. 5–24.

Tollefson, J.W. editor. *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Routledge, 2012.

Waddock, S. "The wicked problems of global sustainability need wicked (good) leaders and wicked (good) collaborative solutions." *Journal of Management for Global Sustainability*, vol 1, 2013, pp. 91-111.

Valenzuela, Angela. *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. State University of New York Press, 1999.