From Cultural Wealth to Wholeness
Rethinking Holistic Education Through Yosso's Framework

Sabrina Kabir and Nikki Bissonnette

E-mail: iyo18@txstate.edu, nikky.bissonnette@txstate.edu

Received March 2026
Accepted for publication July 2026
Published November 2026

Abstract

This conceptual article argues that Yosso's (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) framework provides a practical lens for operationalizing holistic education in school leadership and design. CCW identifies the cultural resources students use to navigate institutions, including linguistic, familial, social, aspirational, navigational, and resistance capital. This analysis examines how educational leaders can structure school environments that affirm identity, strengthen family–school relationships, and cultivate relational networks that support belonging and wellbeing. By synthesizing holistic education with Community Cultural Wealth, this article proposes a framework that connects humanistic educational philosophy with culturally responsive and equity-focused practice.

Keywords: *Holistic education, Community Cultural Wealth, educational leadership, cultural capital, student belonging, equity in education*

Education reform in recent decades has increasingly emphasized educating the "whole child," highlighting wellbeing, belonging, and social-emotional development alongside academic achievement. Holistic education, grounded in the humanistic traditions of Dewey, Maslow, and Rogers, frames learning as an integrative process connecting intellectual, emotional, social, and ethical development. Schools and leadership preparation programs therefore encourage supportive climates, relationship-centered practices, and attention to student identity (Miller, 2019; Moore et al., 2017). Yet implementation remains inconsistent. Schools often adopt the language of holistic education while maintaining institutional structures that marginalize students' cultural knowledge, home languages, and community experiences.

This tension reveals a limitation within holistic education literature. Although holistic frameworks emphasize belonging and personal growth, they rarely account for how race, language, and power shape educational experience. As a result, holistic education frequently assumes a universal learner and cannot fully explain why students from historically marginalized communities continue to experience exclusion even in supportive environments. Without an equity-oriented framework, holistic education risks functioning as an aspirational philosophy rather than an enacted practice.

Yosso's (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) framework offers a way to address this limitation. CCW identifies six forms of cultural capital—aspirational, linguistic, familial, social, navigational, and resistance—that students draw upon to navigate institutions not originally designed for them. Rather than locating problems within students, the framework recognizes cultural knowledge, relationships, and community networks as assets supporting persistence and identity development.

This article argues that CCW operationalizes holistic education. Whereas holistic education provides the philosophical vision of whole-child development, CCW offers educational leaders a framework for recognizing and legitimizing the cultural resources students bring into schools. Through this synthesis, holistic education can move from abstract ideal to leadership practice grounded in institutional recognition and relational school design.

The purpose of this conceptual analysis is to reconceptualize holistic education through selected dimensions of Community Cultural Wealth—linguistic, familial, and social capital—and to examine how educational leaders can structure school environments that support wellbeing, belonging, and growth. The remaining capitals further illuminate how students sustain hope, navigate institutions, and challenge inequities within educational systems.

Yosso's (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) Lens

Aspirational Capital

Aspirational capital is defined by Yosso (2005) as the hopes and dreams students possess for their future. Rather than viewing students from marginalized communities as lacking motivation, Yosso's framework asserts that their sustained hopes reflect a valuable form of cultural wealth and a deep commitment to possibility, even when systemic structures discourage it. This capital is a critical resource for persistence. Aspirational capital extends beyond mere optimism; it is the active maintenance of hope against structural barriers, such as college admissions processes and institutional sorting mechanisms that were not designed for the benefit of minoritized students. This form of capital aligns directly with the humanistic and spiritual dimensions of holistic education. Holistic education, rooted in the humanistic philosophies of John Dewey, Abraham Maslow, and Carl Rogers, views learning as a process of becoming whole and prioritize concepts such as self-realization, creativity, and democracy (Miller, 2019). By validating this capital, such as through community-based organizations and intentional education outreach, educators support students in moving beyond simply learning to play the game of exclusionary institutions toward actively changing the game. Supporting a student's capacity for self-realization requires an environment where their aspirations can thrive against these barriers (Shapiro, 2018). Supporting a student's capacity for self-realization aligns directly with helping them achieve their hopes and dreams. This comprehensive focus supports the maintenance and growth of broad aspirations by considering every dimension of the student (cognitive, emotional, physical, social, aesthetic, and spiritual).

Research on Values Pedagogy emphasizes the "double helix" connection between wellbeing and achievement (Lovat, 2020). By integrating emotional, moral, and social development and fostering a positive school climate, these holistic practices create an environment where students' aspirations can thrive. Schools implementing the formal "Whole Child" model reported higher levels of student engagement (Rodriguez & Brown, 2019), which is critical for the persistent pursuit of long-term goals and aspirations.

To honor aspirational capital, educators must cultivate learning spaces that genuinely facilitate self-realization and purposeful growth. This involves creating an education that connects students' hopes and dreams to their learning, affirming that their personal purpose is central to their intellectual and emotional growth.

Linguistic Capital

Language serves as a primary medium through which students construct identity, belonging, and meaning within school environments. Yosso's (2005) concept of linguistic capital recognizes the cultural knowledge embedded in multilingual communication practices, including storytelling, translation, and the ability to navigate multiple linguistic contexts. From a holistic perspective, communication is not merely a technical academic skill but a social, emotional, and relational process through which learners understand themselves and connect with others.

Holistic education emphasizes integration across intellectual, emotional, and social domains of development. Linguistic capital contributes directly to this integration by linking expression with identity formation. When multilingual practices are recognized, students' voices become legitimate forms of knowledge within the learning environment. Conversely, when only dominant language practices are valued, students may experience disconnection between their school and home identities. Yosso's framework therefore challenges English-only norms by reframing multilingualism as an educational resource rather than a deficit.

Existing research supports this interpretation. Benzehaf (2023) demonstrates that multilingual learners develop flexible identities as they move across linguistic and cultural contexts, reflecting holistic education's emphasis on adaptability and integration. Similarly, Carbonara and Scibetta (2022) show that translanguaging practices allow students to challenge linguistic hierarchies and strengthen belonging within classroom communities. Together, these studies indicate that linguistic capital does not simply support academic learning; it supports identity coherence and emotional security, both central to holistic development.

However, the recognition of linguistic capital is not solely a matter of classroom practice. It depends on leadership decisions that shape institutional norms. School policies related to language use, assessment, family communication, and curriculum adoption determine whether multilingualism functions as a resource or a barrier within the educational environment (Carbonara & Scibetta, 2022; Lo Bianco, 2024). In many schools, implicit expectations of monolingual participation position multilingual students as needing remediation rather than recognition. Under these conditions, holistic education cannot be fully realized because students' cultural identities remain institutionally marginalized.

Educational leaders operationalize holistic education when they legitimize multilingual practices within school structures. This includes supporting translanguaging instructional approaches, providing multilingual communication with families, selecting culturally and linguistically responsive materials, and establishing professional learning that prepares teachers to work with multilingual students. When leaders normalize multilingual visibility—through signage, family engagement practices, and inclusive communication—language becomes a shared community resource rather than an individual accommodation.

From a holistic wellness perspective, linguistic capital is closely tied to students' sense of belonging and self-worth. When students are able

to speak, write, and think using their full linguistic repertoires, they experience affirmation rather than erasure (Carbonara & Scibetta, 2022; Benzehaf, 2023). Leadership recognition of linguistic capital therefore transforms holistic education from a philosophical commitment into an institutional practice. By legitimizing students' languages within school culture, leaders create conditions in which intellectual growth, emotional safety, and identity development can occur simultaneously.

Familial Capital

While linguistic capital highlights expression and identity within school spaces, familial capital directs attention to the home as the first site of learning. Yosso (2005) defines familial capital as cultural knowledge, values, and relational resources nurtured through kinship networks and intergenerational relationships. Families transmit moral guidance, collective responsibility, and cultural memory—resources that shape how students interpret schooling and position themselves within it. From a holistic perspective, these relational foundations support emotional development, identity formation, and a sense of purpose.

Holistic education emphasizes belonging as central to learning, yet schools often conceptualize families as peripheral to academic processes. Familial capital challenges this assumption by recognizing families as active contributors to student development rather than passive recipients of school communication. When families' cultural knowledge is acknowledged, learning is understood as extending beyond the classroom into intergenerational spaces of care, storytelling, and shared responsibility.

Research supports this relational understanding of learning. Ishimaru (2017) argues for equitable collaboration that positions families as co-designers of educational change rather than participants in school-directed involvement activities. Similarly, Shapiro (2018) demonstrates how refugee-background families transmit resilience, responsibility, and perseverance through cultural practices and guidance, serving as emotional anchors for youth navigating unfamiliar institutional environments. These studies suggest that familial capital sustains both academic persistence and psychological wellbeing by grounding students within networks of relational support.

However, the recognition of familial capital depends on leadership practice. Traditional models of family engagement—such as informational meetings, compliance-oriented conferences, or one-directional communication—often position schools as authorities and families as recipients. Such structures unintentionally marginalize families whose communication styles, work schedules, or cultural expectations differ from dominant norms (Ishimaru, 2017; Sheridan & Kim, 2015). Under these conditions, holistic education cannot be fully enacted because students' primary sources of relational support remain disconnected from school life.

Educational leaders operationalize familial capital when they design reciprocal partnerships between schools and families (Ishimaru, 2017; Sheridan & Kim, 2015). This includes establishing two-way communication systems, creating opportunities for shared decision-making, and valuing family knowledge in instructional and organizational planning. Leadership actions such as culturally responsive outreach, home–school dialogue structures, and collaborative problem-solving teams reposition families as contributors to school improvement rather than observers of school processes (Ishimaru, 2017).

Within a holistic framework, familial capital provides the emotional and ethical grounding upon which students engage in educational institutions. When schools recognize families as co-educators, they strengthen trust and relational continuity across home and school environments. This continuity supports student wellbeing, reinforces identity coherence, and enables academic engagement. By embedding family partnership into school structures and leadership routines, leaders transform holistic education from a relational aspiration into a sustained institutional practice.

Social Capital

While familial capital emphasizes relational grounding within the home, social capital expands these connections into the broader school and community context. Yosso (2005) conceptualizes social capital as the networks of support and institutional relationships that help students access resources, information, and opportunities. Within schools, these networks include peers, mentors, educators, and community partners. From a holistic perspective, learning is not an individual process but a relational one; students develop identity, confidence, and agency through sustained interaction with others.

Social capital therefore links holistic education to school culture. Supportive relationships do not emerge spontaneously but are shaped by organizational structures and leadership priorities. Decisions regarding advisory systems, mentorship programs, extracurricular access, and community partnerships determine whether students experience school as an inclusive community or as an impersonal institution. When relational structures are absent, students, particularly those from historically marginalized communities, may encounter schooling as isolating rather than supportive, undermining both engagement and wellbeing.

Research underscores this connection between relational networks and student persistence. Shapiro (2018) demonstrates that refugee-background youth rely on peer communities, mentors, and supportive adults as emotional anchors that enable continued participation in school. Similarly, Zuckerman and Lo (2021) find that students' sense of success is closely tied to relationships and alignment with family and community values. These findings support Yosso's (2005) argument that social capital functions as a bridge through institutions not originally designed for all learners. Importantly, such networks depend on intentional spaces and adult advocacy, indicating that social capital is institutionally produced rather than individually accumulated.

Educational leaders operationalize holistic education when they intentionally design relational school environments. Leadership actions, such as creating advisory periods, establishing mentorship opportunities, supporting collaborative learning structures, and forming community partnerships, embed relationship-building into the daily functioning of the school (Moore et al., 2017). These structures provide consistent access to trusted adults and peers, transforming belonging from an informal experience into a reliable institutional condition.

Within a holistic framework, social capital supports emotional resilience, civic participation, and sustained engagement with learning. When schools cultivate relational networks, students experience schooling as a shared human endeavor rather than a purely evaluative system. Leadership commitment to relational infrastructure therefore allows holistic education to function as practice rather than philosophy. By embedding connection, collaboration, and advocacy into school routines, leaders create environments in which wellbeing, belonging, and academic growth reinforce one another (Moore et al., 2017; Shapiro, 2018).

Navigational Capital

Navigational capital refers to students' skills and abilities to strategically maneuver and navigate complex "social institutions," including educational spaces (Yosso, 2005). For students from marginalized communities, this capital represents the ability to access support and overcome challenges in systems that were not originally designed for their success.

Holistic education emphasizes growth through experience, interconnectedness, and adaptability. Navigational capital is the practical expression of these principles, demonstrating a student's capacity for adaptability and perseverance in complex settings. It connects directly to the emotional and social development required for wholeness, acknowledging that successful persistence is often a relational endeavor.

Effective institutional support is key to valuing and cultivating navigational capital. The concept of Integrated Student Support (ISS) is directly aimed at helping students navigate barriers within the educational institution and beyond (Moore et al., 2014). Effective ISS requires three essential components that facilitate navigation: a dedicated site coordinator, a thorough needs assessment process, and the strategic coordination of community resources within the school building. This necessary infrastructure, exemplified by organizations like Communities in Schools, provides the structure necessary for students to access support and overcome challenges in navigating their educational path.

Navigational capital is also fostered through Relational Pedagogy and a focus on strong interpersonal skills. A teacher's emotional intelligence can create supportive relationships that model effective social navigation and provide guidance. By establishing this relational trust, educators help students transform the complexity of the institution into an accessible, supportive network, thereby validating and strengthening a student's existing navigational capital.

Resistance Capital

Resistance capital has its foundations in the historical experiences of communities of color in securing equal rights and collective freedom. It is the knowledge and strategic resource developed through a history of challenging systemic oppression and maintaining community autonomy.

This capital is essential for achieving the holistic goal of collective well-being and transformation. Holistic education itself is framed as a transformative paradigm. When paired with culturally relevant practices, the goal of education moves beyond mere compliance toward social change and justice. Resistance capital is the strategic knowledge that fuels this transformation. Building psychological safety through this transformation means students no longer have to leave their cultural identities at the school door in order to be perceived as professional or academic (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). This requires a shift in power dynamics through the devaluation of hierarchies present in school, so the students are empowered to critique and shape the educational settings they are in.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP) are necessary components of a truly holistic approach that activates resistance capital. A core practice identified in CRP is fostering critical consciousness, which involves recognizing and challenging the social and institutional inequities that impede collective freedom, directly aligning with the concept of Resistance Capital (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). The CRP/CSP framework argues that ignoring a student's cultural identity is ignoring a fundamental part of the "whole child." This affirmation of cultural identity connects directly to students' sense of belonging and is vital

for building the collective strength and self-worth that underpins Resistance Capital (Rodriguez & Brown, 2019; Aronson & Laughter, 2016). This affirmation sounds like a shift towards asset-based language and away from the rhetoric of at-risk or underprepared when students have been underserved by systems but are still culturally wealthy. This counter-narrative validates student voice, particularly when it comes to educational decision making. Educational leaders cannot be afraid to name systemic injustices outload. This normalizes sharing the realities of individual experiences and the connection to broader systemic inequality while also removing the burden of students being the only voice of critique.

CRP/CSP practices also include holding high academic expectations and demonstrating cultural competence. When educators affirm identity while simultaneously setting high expectations, they empower students to challenge status quo assumptions about their capabilities and engage in transformative learning, supporting resistance against limiting narratives (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). Resistance capital ensures that holistic learning prepares students to engage their critical consciousness to heal, connect, and transform their world.

Synthesis Across Capitals

Across the six forms of Community Cultural Wealth, a common theme emerges: holistic education is rooted in connection, agency, and purpose. Linguistic capital highlights how students' languages shape identity, expression, and belonging within learning environments. Familial capital emphasizes the cultural knowledge, values, and relational support transmitted through family and kinship networks that ground students emotionally and ethically. Social capital extends these relationships into broader school and community networks, providing mentorship, information, and collaborative support that help students navigate educational pathways.

Aspirational capital reflects the hopes and dreams students maintain for their futures despite structural barriers, aligning with holistic education's emphasis on purpose, self-realization, and personal growth. Navigational capital represents students' capacity to move strategically through institutions not originally designed for them, showing resilience, adaptability, and relational problem-solving. Resistance capital further strengthens this process by fostering critical consciousness, enabling students to challenge inequities and transform limiting narratives within educational systems.

Together, these forms of capital reflect holistic education's foundational understanding that learning is relational, contextual, and inseparable from students lived experiences. Wholeness emerges not only through connection but also through agency and critical awareness, as students draw upon cultural knowledge, relationships, and aspirations to engage in educational environments. Viewed through this lens, holistic education becomes a practice of recognizing and strengthening the cultural and relational ecosystems that support identity development, belonging, and transformative learning.

Integrative Conclusion

Bringing holistic education and Yosso's (2005) Community Cultural Wealth (CCW) framework together offers a powerful way to reimagine what it means to support the whole learner. Although these traditions emerge from different educational conversations—one grounded in humanistic philosophy and the other in critical race theory—they converge on a shared belief: students are already whole, already knowledgeable, and already connected to

communities that sustain their learning. CCW makes this wholeness visible by naming the cultural, emotional, and relational resources that students draw upon every day, whether schools acknowledge them or not.

Across the six forms of capital, a central insight becomes clear: students thrive when the knowledge they carry from home and community is recognized as essential to their development. Aspirational capital reflects purpose and hope; linguistic capital affirms identity and expression; familial and social capital sustain belonging and relational strength; navigational capital supports persistence in unfamiliar systems; and resistance capital empowers students to challenge inequity. These capitals mirror holistic education's longstanding understanding that learning is relational, contextual, and deeply connected to lived experience.

Viewed through a holistic lens, the capitals do not function independently—they operate as an interconnected system of support. Hope is strengthened through language; family shapes social networks; navigation depends on trust; and resistance draws upon all aspects of cultural wealth to nurture courage and critical consciousness. A truly holistic approach must therefore center not only connection and belonging, but also the capacities for navigation, resistance, and aspiration. By honoring these forms of capital, educators empower students to persist, challenge injustice, and pursue their self-realization. Holistic education helps us see this interdependence, while CCW gives us the framework to understand how cultural strengths make such development possible.

Ultimately, educators cannot claim to support the "whole child" if they overlook the cultural wealth that shapes a child's wholeness. CCW grounds holistic ideals in the realities of students' lives, ensuring that humanistic commitments to belonging, identity, and growth translate into equitable and culturally responsive practice. For educational and community leaders, this synthesis calls for leadership approaches that intentionally design policies, partnerships, and learning environments that recognize cultural wealth as a central driver of equity, wellbeing, and transformation, while also opening avenues for future research that examines how these frameworks are enacted across diverse school and community contexts. Together, holistic education and CCW call educators to design learning spaces where students are not simply instructed but are seen, valued, and empowered; where their cultural wealth becomes the foundation for learning, healing, belonging and transformation. In such environments, resistance is understood not merely as opposition to inequity, but as a relational process through which students and communities reclaim dignity, strengthen connection, and collectively shape just educational futures.

Implications for Educational Practice

Recognizing students' cultural wealth through a holistic lens requires more than instructional adjustment; it requires organizational change. The analysis of linguistic, familial, and social capital suggests that holistic education becomes viable only when school leaders design environments that institutionalize recognition, partnership, and relational connection. Without leadership support, holistic practices remain dependent on individual teachers and therefore inconsistent and unsustainable.

First, leaders play a central role in legitimizing linguistic capital. Policies governing communication, assessment, and curriculum signal which forms of knowledge are valued within the school. When multilingual practices are restricted to remediation contexts, students' languages remain peripheral to learning. Leaders

can instead normalize multilingualism by supporting inclusive language policies, providing multilingual family communication, and incorporating culturally and linguistically responsive materials into schoolwide practices (Carbonara & Scibetta, 2022; Benzehaf, 2023). Such actions position students' linguistic identities as legitimate forms of participation in the school community rather than barriers to academic success.

Second, recognizing familial capital requires rethinking traditional models of family engagement. Conventional approaches often rely on one-directional communication in which schools disseminate information, and families respond. A holistic framework calls for reciprocal relationships in which families contribute knowledge to educational decision-making (Ishimaru, 2017). Leaders can establish structures for two-way communication, collaborative problem-solving, and shared planning processes that incorporate family perspectives into school improvement efforts. When families are positioned as partners rather than recipients, trust increases and students experience continuity between home and school environments.

Third, social capital highlights the leader's responsibility to cultivate relational school cultures. Belonging is not solely a personal feeling, but an institutional condition produced by consistent access to supportive relationships (Shapiro, 2018; Zuckerman & Lo, 2021). Leadership decisions regarding advisory systems, mentorship opportunities, and community partnerships determine whether students encounter school as a network of support or as an anonymous organization. By embedding relationship-building into daily routines and school structures, leaders create reliable connections with peers and trusted adults, supporting both wellbeing and engagement.

Fourth, leaders must operationalize resistance to ensure holistic learning prepares students to engage their critical consciousness to heal, connect, and transform their world. A truly holistic approach requires understanding what resistance, in tandem with healing and worldly transformation, through creative noncompliance and radical care. When minoritized students face disproportionate disciplinary actions or justice system involvement, holistic leadership resists default punitive compliance, often driven by our own fears of surveillance oversight and scrutiny, by instead scaffolding support and seeking to understand the root of the student's challenges. This refusal to rely on exclusionary practices acts as a mechanism for institutional healing. Institutional healing happens when children and families see schools as places where their identities, experiences, and voices are routinely validated rather than questioned or silenced. Such methods can help restore trust between schools and communities, reinforce students' feeling of belonging and establish relationships based on mutual respect and shared responsibility over time. It is through these relational processes that resistance becomes more than resistance to injustice; it becomes a bridge toward collective healing and transformative educational change. When state mandates introduce biased or Western-centric curricula, educational leaders can partner with community advocacy groups as an activation of community proxies, to facilitate public testimony and parental education. This amplifies community review to challenge systemic erasure while strategically buffering the direct political risk placed on administrators and educators. Students' stories deserve the same platform as standardized metrics to counter dehumanizing "educational triage" systems that use categorical data to label certain students as "unreachable." This can only be done through the dismantling and flattening of hierarchical power structures. By empowering parents, students, and

community members as co-creators of school policy rather than passive recipients of education, leaders validate the immense cultural wealth of the community. This shift cultivates a sense of collective belonging and agency, ensuring the school environment is one where students feel safe, connected, and equipped to transform.

Taken together, these practices suggest that holistic education should be understood as an organizational approach rather than a curricular initiative. Educational leadership and policy must therefore move beyond adopting the language of the "whole child" and toward designing systems that recognize students' identities, connect families to school decision-making, and establish relational infrastructures that support belonging. When schools institutionalize these practices, academic development, emotional wellbeing, and community connection reinforce one another.

Conclusion

This article sets out to reconsider how holistic education can be meaningfully enacted within schools. While holistic education emphasizes the development of the whole learner, its implementation often remains aspirational because schools lack a framework for recognizing the cultural experiences students bring with them. By examining linguistic, familial, and social capital through Yosso's (2005) Community Cultural Wealth framework, this conceptual analysis demonstrates that holistic education becomes operational when educational leaders intentionally recognize and institutionalize students' cultural resources.

Holistic education is not primarily a pedagogical initiative but a leadership responsibility. Linguistic capital requires leaders to legitimize multilingual identities within school communication and learning practices. Familial capital calls for reciprocal partnerships in which families contribute to school decision-making and organizational learning. Social capital depends on leaders designing relational infrastructures that provide students with consistent access to supportive adults and peer networks. Across these dimensions, holistic development emerges not from isolated classroom practices but from coordinated institutional conditions.

This synthesis contributes to educational leadership scholarship by proposing Community Cultural Wealth as an operational framework for holistic schooling. Rather than viewing belonging, wellbeing, and identity development as individual or classroom-level outcomes, the framework highlights them as organizational conditions shaped by policy, culture, and leadership practice. Holistic education requires leaders to move beyond adopting supportive language toward redesigning school structures that legitimize students' identities and relationships.

Future research can extend this conceptual work by examining how leaders implement these practices in diverse school contexts and how students experience changes in belonging, engagement, and wellbeing when cultural wealth is institutionally recognized. By grounding holistic education in leadership action, schools can move closer to environments where students are not only academically supported but also culturally affirmed and socially connected. In this way, holistic education and Community Cultural Wealth together offer a pathway toward educational environments that support learning, belonging, and human development simultaneously.

References

Arias, M. B. (2022). Turning toward asset-based pedagogies: Teacher education for linguistically and culturally diverse students. *Schools: Studies in Education, 19*(1), 24–46.

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(1), 163–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066

Benzehaf, B. (2023). Multilingualism and its role in identity construction: a study of English students' perceptions. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(3), 1145-1163. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.2003369

Carbonara, V., & Scibetta, A. (2022). Integrating translanguaging pedagogy into Italian primary schools: implications for language practices and children's empowerment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(3), 1049-1069. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1742648

Ishimaru, A. M. (2017). From family engagement to equitable collaboration. *Educational Policy*, *33*(2), 350-385. https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048176918

Lo Bianco, J. (2024). Multilingualism, language policy and community languages. In K. Cruickshank, J. Lo Bianco, & M. Wahlin (Eds.), *Community and heritage languages schools transforming education*. Routledge.

Lovat, T. (2020). The two-sided coin of values pedagogy. *Fogli*, *41*(1), 68–74.

Miller, J. P. (2019). *The holistic curriculum* (3rd ed.). University of Toronto Press.

Moore, K. A., Caal, S., Carney, R., Lippman, L., Li, W., Muenks, K., Murphey, D., Princiotta, D., Ramirez, A., Rojas, A., Ryberg, R., Schmitz, H., Stratford, B., & Terzian, M. (2014). *Making the grade: Assessing the evidence for integrated student supports* (Publication No. 2014-07). Child Trends.

Moore, K. A., Lantos, H., Jones, R., Schindler, A., Belford, J., & Sacks, V. (2017). *Making the grade: A progress report and next steps for integrated student supports*. Publication# 2017-53. Child Trends.

Pomerantz, E. M., & Monti, J. D. (2015). *Measuring parents' involvement in children's education*. In S. M. Sheridan & E. M. Kim (Eds.), *Foundational aspects of family-school partnership research* (pp. 55–76). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13838-1_4

Reyes, I., Da Silva Iddings, A. C., & Feller, N. (2015). Building Relationships with diverse students and families: A funds of Knowledge Perspective. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *16*(1), 8-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798415584692

Rodriguez, L. F., & Brown, T. M. (2019). Toward transformative practices in teacher development: Lessons from research with youth of color. In T. E. Hodges & A. C. Baum (Eds.), *Handbook of research on field-based teacher education*. Information Age Publishing.

Shapiro, S. (2018). Familial Capital, Narratives of Agency, and the College Transition Process for Refugee-Background Youth. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *51*(3–4), 332–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2018.1546151

Sheridan, S. M., & Kim, E. M. (2015). Foundational aspects of family–school partnerships. In S. M. Sheridan & E. M. Kim (Eds.), *Foundational aspects of family–school partnerships* (pp. 1–12). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13838-1_1

Zuckerman, B., & Lo, J. (2021). Transfer student experiences and identity navigation in STEM: Overlapping figured worlds of success. *Journal of College Student Retention, 23*(4), 741–764. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.20-06-0121

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

Author Bios

Nikky Bissonnette is Director of Texas State University's TRIO Talent Search Seguin program and a doctoral student in the Educational and Community Leadership program at Texas State University. Her work and research are driven by a deep-seated belief in the transformative power of education and a commitment to fostering equitable opportunities for the next generation of students.

Sabrina Kabir is a doctoral student in Educational and Community Leadership at Texas State University. Her research interests include international student experiences, heritage language maintenance, multilingualism, educational leadership, and educational equity. She explores, through qualitative and conceptual lenses, the role of language, identity, involvement, and belonging in educational experiences across many cultural contexts.