

From Cultural Capital to Curricular Liberation: Centering Minoritized Students' Knowledge, Identity, and Communities

Caroline Chance

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, , United States of America (USA)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800962>

Received: 1 September 2026; Accepted: 9 September 2026; Published: 23 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This manuscript examines how minoritized students, including Black, Latinx, Indigenous, and immigrant students, serve as active producers of cultural knowledge that enriches the broader educational community [2, 3, 4, 5]. Drawing on scholarship on abolitionist teaching, funds of knowledge, community cultural wealth, community-based education, reality pedagogy, Indigenous educational theory, and teacher learning [1–8, 12, 13], this paper argues that when curriculum is responsive to community life rather than treated as fixed and culturally neutral, schools can become sites of agency, belonging, and liberation [1, 6, 13]. The analysis considers how students' identities and histories can be represented in the curriculum, how such representation can broaden the worldviews of all learners, and how educators must engage in continual reflection and professional learning [8, 12, 13]. It also considers culturally responsive practices that schools can cultivate students' sense of belonging, which is linked to positive academic, social and emotional, behavioral, and health effects [9–11, 14].

Introduction: The School as a Site of Liberation

Traditional educational models often position minoritized students through deficit frameworks and treat a Eurocentric curriculum as universal. In contrast, abolitionist teaching, as articulated by Bettina Love, emphasizes students' intellectual, cultural, and political agency and calls for educational practices grounded in freedom, joy, justice, and the transformation of oppressive conditions [1]. From this perspective, curriculum is not merely a fixed repository for transmitting official knowledge. It is a social and cultural exercise that can either reproduce or challenge inequitable relations of power.

Bianca Baldrige et al. further demonstrate that educational justice cannot be understood solely within the boundaries of the formal school. Their analysis of community-based educational spaces shows how youth organizations, after-school programs, and other community settings can support minoritized students' educational experiences, political identity development, and activism [6]. Such spaces offer valuable examples of how education can relate to community knowledge, cultural practices, and collective liberation.

Funds of Knowledge and Cultural Capital of Minorized Students

Research on funds of knowledge demonstrates that households and communities possess historically developed bodies of knowledge and skills that can support classroom learning [3]. Knowledge may involve language skills, occupational experience, cultural customs, migration experience, kin relations, and ways to deal with institutions. Funds of knowledge should not be treated as a resource that schools extract from families. Instead, teachers can develop reciprocal relationships with students and communities and draw on community knowledge to connect academic content to students' experiences. The related framework of community cultural capital explains how communities of color possess multiple forms of capital, including aspirational, linguistic, familial, social, navigational, and resistant capital, that are often overlooked by deficit-oriented schooling [4].

Baldrige and colleagues extend this asset-based perspective beyond the classroom by emphasizing the educational contributions of community-based spaces. Their work suggests that youth workers and community organizations serve as cultural workers and educators whose relationships with young people can challenge institutional inequality and support forms of learning that are not always recognized by schools [6].

Identity Validation and Broader Horizons of Understanding

The incorporation of students' histories, cultures, languages, and communities in the curricula will ensure that their representation culminates in a feeling of belonging and validation of their identities. It is important to note that the inclusion of the student's history, cultures, language, and community does not imply the reductionist notion that the student represents their culture.

Baldrige's scholarship is particularly useful for understanding education as a relationship among schools, communities, youth workers, and families. Community-based educational spaces can support the development of political identities and provide settings in which minoritized youth interpret their experiences, develop collective agency, and participate in cultural and educational work [6]. This perspective complements research on Indigenous educational sovereignty and TribalCrit, which emphasizes the relationship among schooling, colonization, Indigenous identity, and sovereignty [5].

The curriculum, which includes different histories and epistemologies, would also enhance learning for students of the dominant groups. Knowledge that has been left out or ignored in the curriculum might result in a more complex view of history, society, and humanity.

Critical and Decolonial Perspectives on Teaching and Learning

Christopher Emdin's work on reality pedagogy offers a framework for connecting instruction to students' cultural experiences and for treating students as co-constructors of classroom knowledge [7]. Reality pedagogy asks educators to learn from students' cultural worlds and to use that knowledge to shape classroom practice. It therefore challenges the assumption that teachers alone are the authoritative producers of knowledge.

Emdin's theory can support the belief that curricula should be adaptable and responsive rather than culture-free. By centering around community, language, identity, and epistemology, teaching becomes more interactive. Cultural identities need not be left at the door; rather, they are used to analyze the world critically.

Decolonization of the curriculum goes beyond merely providing information to oppressed and non-Western populations and includes analyzing how information is selected, organized, validated, and assessed. C Their inclusion should prompt critical examination of the institutional structures that have historically defined legitimate knowledge [5], [7].

Emdin is concerned with the cultural dimensions of teaching and learning in educational contexts; Baldrige is interested in the larger networks of community organizations, youth workers, and educational relationships that assist minoritized youth [6], [7]. Both approaches help understand education as a mutual endeavor based upon culture, community, and learner agency.

Professional Development and Accountability of Educators

For educators to design an effective curriculum, they have to engage in professional development. This process entails educators reflecting on their identity, beliefs, and roles that affect their decision-making and interactions concerning the curriculum. It is a process of learning from students, families, other educators, and the community.

Emdin's framework requires teachers to become learners of their students' cultural realities [7]. Similarly, Baldrige's analysis underscores the importance of recognizing community-based educators and youth workers as legitimate pedagogical actors [6]. These viewpoints question the notion that teachers alone make up the adults

responsible for creating educational knowledge. Rather, these approaches advocate a partnership approach where teachers, students, parents, youth workers, and community organizations contribute to the educational process.

Teacher professional identity studies reveal that identity is fluid and evolves around individual experience, institutional environment, and school and community interactions [8]. Professional development, in this case, does not involve learning teaching techniques. It includes ongoing reflection on power, culture, knowledge, and the purposes of schooling. Teachers who center students' funds of knowledge must remain open to revising their curricular assumptions and pedagogical practices.

CONCLUSION

Minoritized students are not merely participants in the educational system; they are producers of cultural, intellectual, and community knowledge [2–7]. Scholarship on abolitionist teaching, culturally relevant pedagogy, funds of knowledge, community cultural wealth, community-based education, Indigenous educational theory, reality pedagogy, and teacher professional identity provides a strong foundation for this argument [1–8]. Love's abolitionist teaching framework emphasizes liberation, joy, and agency [1]. Moll and colleagues' concept of funds of knowledge and Yosso's framework of community cultural capital explain how students' families and communities contribute valuable forms of knowledge [3], [4]. Baldrige and colleagues demonstrate how community-based educational spaces can disrupt inequality and support the political and educational development of minoritized youth [6]. In Emdin's reality pedagogy, teachers learn to incorporate students' cultural realities and regard them as coproducers of classroom knowledge [7]. These approaches, as a whole, imply that schools would be more equitable through linking curricula and pedagogies with students' communities, identities, and experiences.

This framework can help to alleviate feelings of isolation and foster connection within schools. Studies on belonging in school show that children do better academically, emotionally, and behaviorally when they are embraced, respected, and connected to their surrounding communities [9], [10], [14]. When they see that their language, their history, their community, and their knowledge are being deemed as valuable, they will feel they belong at school. Culturally responsive and sustainable pedagogy can promote the process by integrating classroom work with students' cultural backgrounds and community relations [12], [13].

Funds of knowledge and community cultural capital open up possibilities for students to relate their academic learning with their familial and communal connections [3], [4]. Similarly, Baldrige et al. argue that community-based educational settings encourage connections, collective identities, political consciousness, and kinds of assistance not only in the classroom [6]. Such connections help students feel recognized by peers and educators as well as connected to a wider community. Furthermore, reality pedagogy emphasizes that such connections are established through listening to students as co-constructors of knowledge rather than receivers of instructions from educators [7].

In this scholarship, it is central to remember that educational leadership needs to focus on achievement as well as on students' social, cultural, and relational experience. Educators who understand the need to incorporate community knowledge, collaborate with families and youth workers, and reflect on power can create schools where students feel known and valued, and encouraged to participate. In other words, the curriculum that responds to the community not only broadens students' education, but also enhances the relationship in which students' learning occurs. By allowing students to include the totality of their sense of self, schools can foster belonging and decrease isolation [9]–[14].

REFERENCES

1. Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.

2. Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465>
3. Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
4. 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>
5. Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425–446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y>
6. Baldrige, B. J., Beck, N., Medina, J. C., & Reeves, M. A. (2017). Toward a new understanding of community-based education: The role of community-based educational spaces in disrupting inequality for minoritized youth. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 381–402. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16688622>
7. Emdin, C. (2016). *For white folks who teach in the hood ... and the rest of y'all too: Reality pedagogy and urban education*. Beacon Press.
8. Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001>
9. Allen, K. A., Kern, M. L., Vella-Brodrick, D. A., Hattie, J., & Waters, L. (2018). What schools need to know about fostering school belonging: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 30(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9389-8>
10. [Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323–367. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003323>
11. Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students. *Science*, 331(6023), 1447–1451. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1198364>
12. Hammond, Z. (2015). *Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Corwin.
13. Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12441244>
14. Korpershoek, H., Canrinus, E. T., Fokkens-Bruinsma, M. H., & de Boer, H. (2020). The relationships between school belonging and students' motivational, social-emotional, behavioural, and academic outcomes in secondary education: A meta-analytic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 35(6), 641–680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1615116>