However, in reading this article I found myself troubled by a few ideas that I would like to propose for discussion:

* The first doubt has to do with the six forms of alternative capital that the author describes as community cultural wealth. Although I understand the author’s attempt to counteract the prevailing deficit model in which communities of color are viewed as somehow lacking, I still found myself wondering whether these six forms are mostly a proliferation of theoretical categories which are already included under Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital. (Isn’t it really the case, for example, that white middle class groups *also* possess all these forms of community cultural wealth in addition to other forms of capital? In that case, it would seem more important to analyze the *differences and inequalities* between groups.)

Terry,

I think that CRT does aim, in some part, to analyze the differences and inequalities, but CRT doesn’t stop there. As I understand CRT, it’s about more than analyzing differences and inequalities, but addressing why certain things are seen as differences, and inequalities. Simply put, CRT, in my opinion, tries to understand not only why some of these differences exist, but also what there is of value. So, maybe it’s less about romanticizing and more about addressing a positive, when most tend to see a negative. I do, however, understand where you’re coming from because it can skew your research. However, outside of areas of study like these, and other similar ones, where do we as researchers have the space to address these issues, and applaud specific cultural capital? So, I see it less as a romanticizing, and more as including.

* The second doubt has to do with what struck me as a certain romanticizing of communities of color. Again, I understand the attempt to see value into situations where traditionally researchers have seen primarily deficit -- but I noticed a pattern of describing what are basically features of all functional families as if such features were somehow the properties of communities of color. For example, the description of children who arrive at school as “engaged participants in a storytelling tradition” (pp. 78-79) and therefore skilled in various forms of narrative. Again, isn’t this true also for the white middle class that the author is trying not to use as the standard of measurement?

My concern is that CRT -- as articulated in this one particular article -- might lead a researcher to focus on creating a positive narrative and thereby overlook very real discrepancies in access to resources. I’m not sure how valid this concern is, but I think it might make an interesting topic at some point in our discussion.