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Abstract

As postsecondary scholars continue to challenge deficit-based thinking that harms Students of Color and other minoritized populations, researchers have called for an increased understanding of how they mobilize anti-deficit thought in scholarship and practice. As one example of a theory that pushes against deficit perspectives, Yosso’s community cultural wealth (CCW) framework has risen in popularity. To better comprehend how scholars apply CCW in higher education literature, this content analysis investigated research that examined, broadened, and operationalized the CCW framework. In particular, we analyzed 85 peer-reviewed journal articles. Findings revealed which forms of capital were most prevalent in studies, to whom scholars applied this framework, as well as how researchers expanded CCW through new capitals and implications. We then offer recommendations for research and practice.
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As higher education institutions witness an increase of students from historically minoritized backgrounds enrolling (Quaye et al., 2020), staff and faculty need to create initiatives, programming, and policies that are attentive to these communities. Specifically, in recent years, scholars have been interrogating taken-for-granted practices that practitioners assumed were meaningful to college students broadly, not considering the realities of minoritized individuals along the lines of race, gender, sexuality, ability, and more. This literature includes people challenging high-impact practices like first-year seminars and internships (see, e.g., Lange & Stewart, 2019; Stewart & Nicolazzo, 2018), what constitutes student engagement (see, e.g., Quaye et al., 2020), and pedagogical practices in college settings (see, e.g., Patton et al., 2015). What underscores these critiques is the importance of questioning how oppressive ideologies undergird these approaches and how these practices position Students of Color as well as other minoritized groups as not meeting the vision of a “typical” college student (e.g., white and middle-class).

Connected to this literature is an inquiry into how researchers frame their studies of minoritized populations. In particular, scholars have pushed back against deficit thinking in postsecondary education, which “holds students from historically oppressed populations responsible for the challenges and inequalities that they face” (Patton & Museus, 2019, p. 119). Rather than forwarding deficit thought, higher education scholars have begun to reimagine existing structures to honor people’s cultural backgrounds. One such framework is Tara Yosso’s (2005) community cultural wealth (CCW), which highlights the “under-utilized assets Students of Color bring with them from their homes and communities into the classroom” (p. 70). Since its development, Yosso’s (2005, 2006) work has been integral to attending to the lives of minoritized individuals in educational settings. And still, it continues to grow, develop, and expand as individuals build upon Yosso’s contributions by developing new capitals and applying them to students with various marginalized backgrounds. Thus, Yosso’s (2005) framework can serve as a touchpoint to comprehend how higher education professionals are addressing the needs of marginalized individuals on college campuses through their practices.

Hence, the purpose of this content analysis study was to understand how higher education scholars combat anti-deficit thinking about minoritized populations through their employment of the CCW framework. Specifically, we sought to illuminate how the literature discusses CCW and how researchers have expanded this line of inquiry. To guide this project, we asked the following research questions:

1. How have higher education scholars mobilized the CCW framework in their research?
2. How prevalent are certain forms of capital in higher education research?
3. How have higher education researchers extended the CCW framework through their scholarly insights and implications?
4. To whom have researchers applied the CCW framework in their scholarship?

This content analysis is of significance to scholars, student affairs practitioners, and institutional agents dedicated to advancing anti-deficit research and thinking in higher education. By identifying how individuals use the CCW framework in their scholarship, this manuscript allows readers to identify strategies to better attend to minoritized communities’ talents and strengths. Moreover, those interested in advancing CCW research will be able to create future lines of inquiry.

**Introducing Community Cultural Wealth as a Framework**

Building on Solórzano and Yosso’s (2001) conceptualization of critical race theory (CRT), which Yosso (2005) defined “as a theoretical and analytical
framework that challenges the ways race and racism impact educational structures, practices, and discourses” (p. 74), Yosso (2005) introduced community cultural wealth. Through counterstorytelling, or the stories of those not represented or accommodated by dominant narratives (Delgado, 1989), her framework further examined the rich knowledges and assets that Communities of Color have amassed to persist through societal contexts grounded in whiteness. In her framework, Yosso (2005) outlined six culturally based capitals (i.e., aspirational, navigational, familial, resistant, social, and linguistic) Communities of Color employ to survive, thrive, and, in some instances, resist oppressive environmental structures. Importantly, Yosso’s (2005) work complicates Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) scholarship, which readers interpreted as placing greater value on white conceptualizations of social and cultural capital. Moreover, Yosso interrupted Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) notion that “some communities are culturally wealthy while others are culturally poor” (Yosso, 2005, p. 76). Yosso’s six forms of capital move away from deficit-thinking to acknowledge resources minoritized groups possess due to their agency and resilience.

In brief, linguistic capital refers to the skills gained through both verbal and non-verbal communication in the form of cultural tongues (Braun et al., 2017). Aspirational capital describes the futurist hopes and dreams that Individuals of Color sustain despite systemic barriers. Familial capital refers to the shared history, cultural teachings, and importance of biological family, as well as chosen family (Duran & Pérez, 2019), that guide Individuals of Color. Social capital encapsulates support and resources gained from networks like peer groups, mentors, and educators. Similarly, navigational capital bridges strategies drawn from support networks and the intuition that Individuals of Color utilize to maneuver hostile spaces. Lastly, resistant capital identifies how lived experiences or instances of inequitable treatment help Individuals of Color mobilize in resistant manners. In the following section, we detail the literature on asset-based schools of thought in educational contexts.

**Literature on Deficit- and Asset-Based Thinking**

To inform this content analysis, we reviewed existing scholarship on deficit- and asset-based approaches in education. According to Patton and Museus (2019), scholarly interest in understanding and deconstructing deficit-based thought has grown over the past 20 years. Deficit thinking places conventionally white knowledge and abilities as having the most worth in terms of social mobility and success (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). In education, whiteness pervades the very structure of campus environments, systemically disenfranchising Students of Color (Gusa, 2010). However, those perpetuating deficit schools of thought frequently position Students of Color and other minoritized communities as culpable for their inability to succeed in these settings catered toward dominant populations (Harper, 2012; Patton & Museus, 2019; Valencia, 2010), advancing racist, classist, and other oppressive ideologies in the process. Put simply, deficit approaches blame individuals for not meeting certain academic and social standards, not the systemic barriers in place.

Attending to how educational agents place responsibility on students for their lack of success, Valencia (2010) provided six characteristics that define deficit thinking: victim-blaming, oppression, pseudoscience, temporal changes, educability, and heterodoxy. Educability, or the notion that those in power see students from minoritized backgrounds as unable to learn from programs or initiatives, is of particular relevance to this present study. Resulting from this deficit-based characteristic, targeted interventions for improving minoritized students’ success are scant (Valencia, 2010). In contrast to higher education research that challenges traditional measures of engagement and involvement from a critical lens (see, e.g., Lange & Stewart, 2019; Patton et al., 2015; Stewart & Nicoloazzo, 2018; Quaye et al., 2020), deficit-based studies fault students for their perceived shortcomings.
Furthering critical perspectives of deficit paradigms, Patton and Museus (2019) recently offered four distinct ways that researchers have framed deficit thought: “a blame the victim orientation, a grounding in larger complex systems of oppression, a pervasive and often implicit nature, and effects that reinforce hegemonic systems” (p. 121). These elements are inherently interconnected, meaning they all work together to paint a comprehensive picture of deficit schools of thought. In response to the damaging effects these elements create, scholars have mobilized anti-deficit thinking in numerous ways. Though K–12 scholars have largely taken up anti-deficit perspectives (Pérez et al., 2017), postsecondary researchers have started to imagine what anti-deficit thought means in higher education settings, including how practitioners can capitalize on students’ assets (see, e.g., Harper, 2012; Pérez et al., 2017).

Asset-based approaches attempt to build upon individuals’ strengths and talents “accumulated not from formal education but through lived experiences and life challenges that have helped them become survivors and move past hurdles” (Rendón et al., 2014, p. 7). Scholars leveraging asset-based thinking regularly employ critical theories, recognizing how contexts oppress minoritized groups and these individuals’ positive traits. For instance, Harper (2012) used CRT to construct his anti-deficit achievement framework (ADAF), which offers environmental and individual factors that agents can capitalize on in order to increase the persistence of Students of Color. Building upon the work of Harper (2012), Pérez et al. (2017) asserted that higher education educators do not typically tap into minoritized students’ assets. By recognizing the strengths individuals from historically disenfranchised groups bring with them to educational environments (Yosso, 2005, 2006), CCW provides one way professionals can challenge deficit thinking as an asset-based theory. Yet, we recognize that other asset-based frameworks exist including, but not limiting to the Museus’s (2014) culturally engaging campus environments (CECE) model and Rendón’s (1994) validation theory. To actualize Patton and Museus’s (2019) recommendation to comprehend the wide range of ways that people leverage anti-deficit approaches, we selected CCW as our central focus, with this content analysis study exploring its application in higher education scholarship.

**Study Design**

To examine nuances in scholars’ mobilization of CCW, we employed content analysis methodology, defined as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (Krippendorf, 2004, p. 18). We pinpointed how authors mobilized CCW through the different components of their articles by using summative content analysis, a method where researchers can calculate the frequency of phrases or words of interest (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Hsieh and Shannon (2005) argued that summative content analyses are especially well-suited when investigating how often ideas appear in journal publications or textbooks. Of note, scholars using this type of content analysis are not only interested in how often concepts manifest but in how the appearance of certain constructs communicates latent messages (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

**Data Collection**

Our data collection began by first locating publications that we would use for this content analysis. Specifically, we developed several parameters to identify the appropriate articles. Using databases like JSTOR, we decided to only search for articles published between 2005 to 2020, given that Yosso’s (2005) CCW framework served as the basis of this study. We searched through databases using terms like “community cultural wealth; higher education” and “community cultural wealth; college,” as well as conducted sub-searches for each individual capital (i.e., aspirational, navigational, resistant, social, linguistic, and familial) paired with terms like “higher education” and “college.” We also made the conscious
decision to search for only peer-reviewed articles to confine this study.

After we collected all the articles, we performed an initial abstract and reference review to confirm that each article explicitly mobilized CCW. This process also involved us ensuring that each article was situated within the study of higher education. Namely, we included articles if they focused on college experiences or the K–12 to higher education pipeline. After this initial filtering, 85 articles remained. Aligned with Hsieh and Shannon’s (2005) summative content analysis approach, we developed a rubric that targeted the major components of each article. These sections included: the research purpose/statement; paradigm and theoretical framework; methodology and study design; population/sample; data collection tools; findings; implications; limitations; and capitals mentioned specifically. We then filled out the rubric for the 85 publications in Microsoft Excel, including both summarized comments as well as direct quotes from the articles. This rubric lent itself to our overarching research purpose of distinguishing how scholars are mobilizing CCW in the context of higher education by allowing us to isolate (e.g., findings and implications for practice) and compare each segment broadly across the literature.

Data Analysis

Once we analyzed each article based on the rubric guidelines, we followed Hsieh and Shannon’s (2005) recommendation to break down data into thematic codes. We underwent this process by looking through the individual rubric sections and counting how often ideas related to CCW and other relevant trends manifested across each component of the rubric. After tallying how frequently concepts/approaches/assertions appeared (e.g., which methodologies were used, populations were centered, or capitals were featured), we wrote individual memos about patterns they noticed in the rubric. Following this step, we came together to have debriefing conversations around our insights to eventually form the findings for the study.

Our Connection to Community Cultural Wealth

Before introducing the findings of this analysis, we highlight how we entered this project and how our positionalities informed our approach to this investigation. Hannah Reyes identifies as a cis-heterosexual, Latina and Native woman invested in equitable opportunities for all students. Although the CCW framework revolutionized asset-based thinking for Communities of Color broadly, Hannah was also mindful of its Chicana/o origins. Bearing this consideration in mind, she was careful not to generalize or minimize the experiences of other non-Chicana/o students. For instance, Hannah regularly referenced Yosso’s (2005) conceptualization of familial capital and its unique manifestations for minoritized populations such as “the communal bonds within African American communities… and pedagogies of the home that Students of Color bring with them to the classroom setting” (Yosso, 2005, p. 79). To further practice critical reflexivity, she also regularly debriefed with Antonio and journaled.

Antonio Duran identifies as a queer Latino cisgender man who first came to use CCW in his work on queer Latino college men. Antonio sought to use a framework that would position these students in an asset-based perspective that also honored their racial/ethnic identities. In this project, Antonio was interested in how authors used CCW in ways that were attentive to individuals’ multiple minoritized identities, in addition to understanding which environments supported these forms of capital. To reflect on these topics and other trends in the literature, he discussed with Hannah and also journaled regularly.

Findings

To honor our goal of presenting the nuanced ways

1 We use Latinx/a/o as an umbrella term to capture the various ways that people may identify as it relates to gender. However, we use variations of the term to refer to our own identities or when authors employed different language.
scholars mobilize the CCW framework, we studied the formative choices each author made in shaping their scholarship. Specifically, we noted each study’s research design to gain insight into authors’ unique approaches, how and to whom they applied different forms of cultural wealth, as well as their implications to provide future directions for researchers.

Methodologies and Methods

In terms of broader study designs, 67 articles employed qualitative strategies, three used quantitative, and seven used mixed methods. 45 qualitative studies’ main method of gathering information was semi-structured interviews. Like many other scholars, Means et al. (2019) discussed the advantage of “participant-centered” interviews that allow for deeper reflection of students’ experiences in education, especially as they relate their own knowledges and cultural wealths. Other common methods included case studies (n = 15) and focus groups (n = 12). Less common methods were researcher observations (n = 6), ethnography (including both autoethnography and transnational) (n = 4), and narrative inquiry (n = 3).

What our summative analysis showed was an overall lack of engagement with methods outside of qualitative data collection. For scholars like Sablan (2019), however, centering quantitative methods allowed her to quantify how students navigate their college environments and garner cultural capitals. Per Sablan (2019), this approach was important considering existing instruments measuring cultural capital that have reproduced “reductionist notions of what counts and does not count as valuable cultural capital” (p. 187). To disrupt these notions, Sablan (2019) developed a scaled survey that gauged students’ possession of capital by enlisting Yosso’s (2005) definitions of four cultural capitals (i.e., aspirational, familial, navigational, and resistant) to devise statements and questions around self-efficacy, familial relationships, and economic security. Similarly, Cuellar’s (2019) scholarship on Latina/o students at Hispanic-Serving Institutions also integrated questions pertaining to CCW as she strove to understand participants’ college choice process. Therefore, though scholars underutilize quantitative and mixed-methods approaches, a select number of researchers saw promise in using them to understand minoritized students’ CCW.

Prevalence of the Six Cultural Capitals

Upon examining the 85 articles, we recorded and tallied on a spreadsheet the capitals that each scholar explicitly applied in their study. Researchers mentioned aspirational capital most often with 59 unique entries, followed by familial capital with 55 and navigational capital with 54 mentions. Social, resistant, and linguistic capital subsequently followed with 49, 43, and 29 references, respectively. What this summative analysis reveals is the importance placed on particular forms of capital, especially aspirational capital. Scholars like Pérez and Taylor (2016) underscored the centrality of aspirational capital for Students of Color (in their case, Latino men) when they named the reality that “traditional models that are built on White, middle-class values dismiss the perspectives and contribution of Latino males and perpetuate deficit-based models of education” (p. 14). Participants in the study drew upon the goals and aims of their communities, friends, and family members to bolster their own aspirational capital (Pérez & Taylor, 2016). Related to this point, research mobilizing CCW underscores the resounding value of familial support. Out of the 85 articles examined, 55 explicitly identified familial capital as a resource that helped students persevere through higher education. Although many described the role of biological family as it relates to this capital, some even expanded the notion of family. One such instance is the familia described as kinship connections with friends present in queer and trans* communities in Duran and Pérez’s (2019) article on queer Latino men. What this pattern indicates is that a support system of either biological or chosen family was crucial for those with minoritized identities navigating higher education in these studies. In the following section, we expand on the prevalence of these
Capitals for specific identity groups.

Capital Applications to Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Intersecting Identities

The next area of interest involved the social groups that researchers applied a CCW framework to in their studies. Before presenting these patterns, however, we first describe other identities less attended to than race/ethnicity and gender. Of these identities, scholars mentioned first-generation educational status 12 times, income-based considerations five times, disability three times, and working-class status once. Due to the sparse mention of these identities, we offer this observation as a future direction for research.

In examining the foci of these manuscripts, clear patterns manifested in regard to those minoritized on the basis of race/ethnicity and gender. Notably, 43 articles investigated CCW as it related to Latinx/a/o communities, with only 19 focusing on Black students, three on Asian students, three on Native/Indigenous groups, and two on Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander students. Considering Yosso drew on LatCrit as well as CRT in her research agenda, it makes sense that the Latinx/a/o academic community in particular has taken up this work.

Breaking these trends down further by race and gender, we observed familial and aspirational capital being mentioned most often for Latinx/a/o communities throughout 30 articles each. These aspirations often manifested as a desire to better themselves and their community, provide better living conditions for their families, and avoid disadvantageous structures (e.g., poverty and worker exploitation) their parents endured by getting a formal education. Aspirational and familial capitals may be the most salient for the population most reflected in the literature due to the immigrant background of many Latinx/a/o students and these students’ desire to carry out their and their collective families’ dreams of “an unknown, but hopeful future in the United States” (Allen-Handy & Farinde-Wu, 2018, p. 791). However, when we examined gender, we also noticed some patterns with authors implicitly focusing on cisgender people in a binary nature. In particular, articles focused specifically on Latino men showed the importance of aspirational, familial, and navigational capital, each of these respective capitals showing up in eight articles. Articles centering Latina women also discussed aspirational and familial capital eight times each. Moreover, we observed resistant capital manifesting in two articles for Latina women, perhaps in response to the additional prospect of gendered subordination compared to their Latino men counterparts.

For Black students, authors used familial capital most frequently, showing up in 13 articles. Aspirational, navigational, and social capital were close behind with 12, 12, and 11 articles, respectively. For these students, many agents served as a source of familial capital, including their biological and extended families. Additionally, scholars noted the centrality of institutional environments like Historically Black Colleges and Universities where administrators and athletic coaches cultivated a familial culture (Cooper et al., 2017), as well as the importance of peers and mentors broadly. Butler’s (2015) study exploring Black middle-class college men aptly reflected this prevalence and, in turn, the importance of familial capital, concluding that “the family unit provided the majority of capital required for acceptance and success at college” (p. 31). Articles explicitly on Black men also reflected this pattern, with seven mentioning familial capital. For Black women, however, researchers mobilized navigational and resistant capital most often with two articles each.

With such small samples for the remaining three racial/ethnic groups discussed in the 85 articles, we are limited in discussing what the applications of the capitals reveal. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders students’ three most discussed capitals were navigational, familial, and aspirational with two each. Social and resistant capital were close behind, with each discussed in one article. Authors did not mention linguistic capital at all. In this content analysis, neither Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander men nor women were a
central focus in any of the 85 articles. Discussed in three articles, Asian students’ most prevalent capital was also aspirational. Except for familial capital, each of the remaining capitals only had two mentions for Asian students. Researchers used familial capital only once. Asian men were not the sole focus of any of the articles examined in this content analysis. Researchers centered Asian women in one article (Rogers & Anderson, 2019), and every capital, except for linguistic capital, was mentioned once in their manuscript.

Lastly, for Native/Indigenous students, authors named aspirational, familial, and resistant capital once each. Similarly, Native/Indigenous men were not a central focus in any of the 85 articles. For Native/Indigenous women, researchers explicitly employed familial capital in one instance (Waterman & Lindley, 2013). What these patterns showcase is the relevance of certain capitals for specific populations and the dearth of literature on student groups like Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian, and Native/Indigenous men.

Additionally, of the 41 articles that explicitly mentioned converging identities like race/ethnicity, gender, and other identities (e.g., sexuality), approximately 16 clearly named the relevance of additional frameworks. Such articles included intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) or a matrix of domination (Collins, 2000/2009) as a preface in their introduction, consideration in their theoretical framework, or an integral part of their literature review. Therefore, researchers differed in how they applied CCW. The majority of articles solely focused on intersecting identities, but others discussed the presence of intersecting systems of power, central characteristics of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), and Collins’s (2000/2009) matrix of domination.

**Emergent Capitals**

In addition to showcasing how researchers mobilized Yosso’s (2005) original six forms of capital, we noted when authors advanced other emergent capitals. Due to the exclusion of non-peer-reviewed articles as well as books and dissertations, the list of capitals captured may not be exhaustive. There were 11 new capitals in total in this content analysis, some of which the authors proposed themselves. Of note, one scholar outlined four capitals as part of an adapted CCW framework termed maternal cultural wealth in an article exploring Latino men’s mothers as a source of support and inspiration (Ballysingh, 2019). For how scholars operationalized these emergent capitals, see Table 1.

These newer forms of capital provide additional insights into how Students of Color and minoritized populations navigate higher education environments. For instance, O’Shea (2016) observed experiential capital as, “provid[ing] skills in managing competing demands, deal[ing] with difficult people (sometimes staff) and also maintain[ing] resilience in often very trying circumstances” for first-in-family students in the study (O’Shea, 2016, p. 74). Additionally, racial and/or ethnic empowerment capital helped Latina/o students claim their space and develop individuality (Ayala & Contreras, 2019). What this finding showcases is that there are more strengths minoritized students bring with them when they enroll in post-secondary settings. Practitioners should learn about these emergent capitals as they design interventions and programs specifically for certain groups on college campuses.

**Operationalizing Implications**

A final interest of our investigation included how researchers suggested that higher education professionals apply the lessons gained from their studies to practice. There were 21 recommendations that appeared as themes. These implications included actions such as: educators reflecting on their privileges when tapping into students’ cultural wealth (n = 7), developing specific initiatives that attend to CCW like instituting university–community and high school–college partnerships (n = 8), and developing mentoring programs to bolster strengths like navigational capital (n = 6).
Nevertheless, two main strategies appeared most commonly, each with 12 unique mentions among the 85 articles. The first included researchers’ assertion that practitioners implement a culturally sustaining pedagogy, which integrates critical perspectives, at higher education institutions. To accomplish this, scholars suggested that faculty, staff, and/or administrators “recogniz[e] Eurocentric bias in curriculum” (Morales, 2020, p. 10) since current models of pedagogy frequently do not take into account the unique forms of cultural wealth minoritized students bring with them to campus. Similarly, Locke et al. (2017) suggested that educators enact an “institutionalization of a humanizing pedagogy, which values each student’s capital” (p. 31) in contrast to a dehumanizing nature of knowledge production that does not engage asset-based perspectives.

The second major implication across the articles surveyed was that institutional agents should both realize and actualize the merit of cultural wealth. Though deceptively simple, researchers named this as a crucial recommendation to combat the deficit thinking that

---

**Table 1. Emergent capitals in community cultural wealth higher education studies reviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent capitals</th>
<th>Definitions of Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy capital (Trigos-Carillo, 2019)</td>
<td>“the knowledges, practices and uses of literacy in a community that allow people to maintain their culture and resist the influence of the dominant power dynamics” (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential capital (O’Shea, 2016)</td>
<td>“skills and knowledge... acquired in their pre-student lives” (p. 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and/or ethnic empowerment capital (Ayala &amp; Contreras, 2019)</td>
<td>“the sense of pride that students feel by being members of their racial and/or ethnic group... enabling students to remain connected to, and even reinforce, their racial and/or ethnic identities” (p. 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native capital (Waterman &amp; Lindley, 2013)</td>
<td>Cited Ward’s (2005) definition: “the cultural resources of Native peoples, the particular ways in which American Indian community members internalize tribal values and orientations, engage in social relations and cultural practices, and develop skills and abilities needed to achieve success within their own communities” (p. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic consciousness capital (Gogue, 2016)</td>
<td>Cited Rendón et al.’s (2014) definition: “cultural pride and the sense that personal accomplishment could lead to the betterment of the…collective whole” (p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual capital (Gogue, 2016)</td>
<td>Cited Rendón et al.’s (2014) definition: “notions that how we treat each other and how we see the world in general is positively affected by a sense of spiritual nobility. Religiosity is represented by a faith in God or a higher power and communicated through the performance and adherence to religious rituals and beliefs” (p. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing capital (Matos, 2015)</td>
<td>“links aspirational and familial capital... draw[ing] upon the aspirational capital parents use to motivate students to complete tasks and familial capital by closing the circle of the family’s journey to the U.S. in search of better opportunities for their children” (p. 449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal cultural wealth framework (Ballysingh, 2019)</td>
<td>• Provident capital: “students’ motivation to matriculate to and graduate from college, so they might ultimately provide for their mothers and families” (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Filial piety: “the strong sense of duty students felt to care for their families upon college completion” (p. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Custodial capital: “the discerning and protective approach mothers maintained while raising Latinos to be academically successful that transferred to their sons” (p. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emotional capital: “the strong emotive connection sons experienced with their mothers” (p. 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pervades postsecondary education settings. Scholars like Pérez and Taylor (2016) believe that affirming the cultural capitals minoritized students carry with them to higher education spaces will lead educators to “design and enact an empowering model of education that validates students’ ability to succeed” (p. 14). Furthermore, Holland (2017) charged educators to not only recognize cultural wealth’s value but also legitimize these capitals “in order to level the academic playing field and create a genuine opportunity for the redistribution of power, resource, and social mobility” (p. 808). These examples underscore that translating cultural wealth in practice first requires an understanding of this multifaceted concept. Though we agree with this implication offered by scholars, we found that most stopped short of offering tangible strategies to actualize these students’ assets. Guided by this existing scholarship, we thus take a deeper dive in our recommendations offered in a subsequent section.

Discussion

Answering Patton and Museus’s (2019) call to “underscore the diverse ways in which scholars and activists can and often do advance research anti-deficit perspectives and discourses” (p. 126), findings from this content analysis study contribute to the literature in higher education by shedding light on how scholars employ Yosso’s (2005) CCW framework. Given that authors published 65 out of 85 articles included in our sample within the last five years, this manuscript is timely for postsecondary educators. Our intentional focus on each article’s study design, findings, and implications gives a comprehensive view of how scholars have used CCW to challenge deficit thought (Valencia, 2010) and where oversights still exist.

To begin, certain trends emerged in how people designed their research projects and which forms of capital were most salient. For instance, it was notable that 67 articles used qualitative methodologies to investigate the presence of cultural wealth for minoritized communities moving through postsecondary environments. Given how CRT, and CCW by extension, place importance on counterstorytelling (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001), it is perhaps not unsurprising that scholars have largely employed qualitative approaches to illustrate these counternarratives. Yet, the work of scholars like Cuellar (2019) and Sablan (2019) showcase how researchers are beginning to tap into quantitative methods in order to empirically examine CCW in higher education.

This content analysis also uncovered the forms of capital researchers most frequently recognize in their research. Illustratively, authors most frequently acknowledged aspirational capital in their manuscripts, appearing in 59 articles. Why this is important is because deficit thought places the fault on individuals for not succeeding, reflecting a blame-the-victim standpoint (Patton & Museus, 2019; Valencia, 2010). In contrast, these articles emphasize that minoritized students, in fact, have the desire to reach their goals, meaning that institutional agents should instead direct their attention to educational environments that prevent their success. Moreover, resembling other anti-deficit frameworks like that of Harper (2012), our own findings emphasize the importance of familial networks in the lives and educational trajectories of minoritized college students.

In analyzing the existing body of literature, it was also notable that about half of the articles brought attention to how intersecting identities, like race and gender, influence the unique ways minoritized students deployed their cultural wealth. This pattern also prompted a closer look into how scholars framed students’ multiple identities in relation to CCW. As mentioned above, 41 articles explicitly discussed converging identities (e.g., queer Latino men), but roughly 16 discussed additional theories like Crenshaw’s (1989) intersectionality or Collins’s (2000/2009) matrix of domination in their study designs. What this insight showcases is that scholars are bringing attention not only to individuals’ intersecting identities that shape their experiences in postsecondary settings, but also to the overlapping axes of oppression that construct
inequitable environments for minoritized communities. Since anti-deficit scholarship directly addresses oppressive systems (Patton & Museus, 2019), this trend communicates that scholars are recognizing oppressive structures’ compounding effects on people with multiple minoritized identities; additionally, it sheds light on how these individuals leverage their cultural wealth.

Finally, this content analysis reveals how scholars are building on Yosso’s (2005, 2006) formative work by offering new forms of capital. As staff and faculty continue to develop interventions for the increasingly diverse populations present on college campuses (Quaye et al., 2020), these emergent capitals offer additional places to start creating targeted innovations that account for students’ assets. The 11 emergent capitals indicate the variety of inherent talents that minoritized individuals bring with them to educational environments. Furthermore, they provide evidence for the critiques of existing best or high-impact practices in higher education (see, e.g., Lange & Stewart, 2019; Patton et al., 2015; Stewart & Nicolazzo, 2018; Quaye et al., 2020), because they highlight the numerous forms of cultural wealth that professionals have yet to tap into in their practices. Connected to this point, the insights gained around the implications that authors offered showcase how professionals can better mobilize CCW in its various forms.

Implications

Though scholars have mobilized CCW in meaningful ways, there have also been some stark shortcomings. Thus, we offer some implications for future research that will reveal deeper understandings of what valuable capitals minoritized students employ during their college careers. Additionally, we offer some implications for culturally relevant practices.

Implications for Research

In terms of identity groups, women of all race/ethnicities were seldom the sole focus of these research studies. Namely, Black and Latina women were the focus of three articles, while Black men were the focus of seven articles and Latino men 11 articles. Conversely, researchers overlooked both men (with no articles as the sole focus) and women (with 1 article each as the sole focus) of Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian, as well as Native/Indigenous identities. Furthermore, one author discussed trans and non-binary persons in their article as a limitation in participation but did not make up any of the study’s focal population. Therefore, it would behoove scholars to develop studies that investigate how those who hold multiple minoritized identities, like Women of Color and Transgender Individuals of Color, possess and apply capitals in unique ways because of their social location. In doing so, researchers should consider framing their studies with an attention to overlapping structures of oppression, resembling the authors who used Crenshaw’s (1989) conceptualization of intersectionality or Collins’s (2000/2009) matrices of domination to accomplish this aim.

Moreover, in reviewing the data, it seems that scholars may be limited in how they consider linguistic capital. Of the 85 articles, authors only mentioned linguistic capital 29 times. The next capital, in ascending order, was resistant capital with 43 mentions, showing quite a large gap. One reason for this gap may be that multilingualism is an assumption of the student populations scholars are researching, especially Latinx/a/o students, and therefore linguistic capital is not investigated more deeply. Scholars like Ayala and Contreras (2019) echoed this conflation: “[b]ecause Latina/o cultural capital is often reduced to bilingualism, linguistic capital is one of the most talked-about forms of capital among our respondents.” (p. 231). With 13 articles centering Latinx/a/o students mentioning bi/multilingualism in some form, we saw how these students exemplified the advantages and stressors associated with being bi/multilingual, and yet, we also challenge scholars to think past traditional notions of linguistic capital and question assumptions held for bi/multilingual students.
Implications for Practice

For practitioners, findings from this content analysis also set the stage for more equitable initiatives on college campuses. Most common across the articles was the recommendation that professionals recognize the value of CCW before they apply it to their practice. Indeed, we assert that faculty and staff must engage in self-reflection on why they might not acknowledge students’ cultural wealth in the first place. To identify its value, educators must question why deficit thinking is ingrained in their subconsciousness. For this reason, we recommend that faculty and staff create community groups where they work to unlearn their propensity toward deficit thought. These collectives can have discussions about privilege and their socialization around asset-/deficit-based approaches, as well as read the articles included in this content analysis. Such forms of accountability, in addition to other professional development, are important steps toward actualizing CCW and challenging oppressive contexts present at institutions.

Next, practitioners should assess the opportunity gaps that disproportionately affect Students of Color and other minoritized populations in higher education, in addition to creating new structures informed by the capitals present in CCW scholarship. By creating identity-specific programs around first-generation student status, for example, administrators and staff can make concerted considerations for high-impact practices like study abroad programs or internships. Since CCW stems from CRT (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001), it is imperative to question the racism (and other forms of oppression) that underscores structures on college campuses. It would also be beneficial for practitioners and faculty to reorient their praxis in ways that are culturally relevant for minoritized students, another recommendation offered by authors. Practitioners and administrators can accomplish this by considering students’ major sources of capital—both those in Yosso’s (2005) scholarship as well as those discussed by subsequent scholars—before they develop programs and interventions. Offices and departments should integrate questions such as “how can I tap into students’ familial capital or Native capital when designing this practice?” when planning new initiatives.

Conclusion

As scholars increasingly engage with asset-based thinking, we hope higher education professionals will build upon this content analysis to collaborate with Students of Color and other minoritized populations to advance their agency. This attention to more asset-based approaches is needed as college campuses continue to welcome more diverse populations (Quaye et al., 2020). In doing so, scholars and practitioners can tap into underutilized forms of cultural wealth. Additionally, professionals should implement programs, policies, and pedagogies that value the holistic nature of all students, echoing those who have asserted that postsecondary educators need to challenge traditional approaches (see, e.g., Lange & Stewart, 2019; Patton et al., 2015; Stewart & Nicolazzo, 2018; Quaye et al., 2020). By accomplishing these future directions, institutional agents can push against deficit thinking, constructing equitable environments for minoritized individuals in the process.
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