



## *Deconstructing Generous Reading: Revising a Writing Assessment*

---

*Lucy K. Spence, University of South Carolina*

### **Abstract**

*This discourse analysis explored the affordances and constraints of Generous Reading (GR), an alternative writing assessment used in teacher professional development. First, GR is traced through its development in empirical studies. Next, a critical discourse analysis of a GR professional development conversation between three European-American educators is described. A teacher of math and science, a teacher of language arts and social studies and a university researcher discussed an African American girl's math writing. The conversation was excerpted from a larger study of GR. A discourse analysis of this conversation uncovered raciolinguistic ideologies that negatively positioned the student, even as the math teacher began to address new possibilities for instruction. The article concludes with a discussion of culturally sustaining pedagogy used to revise the GR form.*

**Keywords:** *writing; generous reading; language' raciolinguistic ideologies; discourse analysis; math writing; assessment*

This discourse analysis explores the affordances and constraints of Generous Reading, an alternative writing assessment (Spence, 2010) and how it was used with teachers in a racially and ethnically diverse setting in the southeastern US. Because raciolinguistic ideologies (Alim, Rickford, & Ball, 2016). were expressed during the writing assessment conversation, Spence used critical discourse analysis to understand how this ideology was introduced and maintained. This was necessary because raciolinguistic ideologies must be confronted and understood for change to occur. Because diverse student writers have persistently faced discrimination in US education settings, it is important to address the potential for raciolinguistic ideologies surfacing during writing assessment (Ball, 1996; Baugh, 1995; Dyson & Smitherman, 2009; Escamilla & Coady, 2001, 2005; Johnson & VanBrackle, 2012; Kinloch, 2010).

Deficit notions of varieties of English are persistent in both instruction and assessment (Cazden, 1988; Coady and Escamilla, 2006; Delpit, 2006). It has been shown that varieties of English such as African American Language and writing features typical of English learners unduly influence teachers and others who score student writing (Johnson & VanBrackle, 2012). Negative assumptions about students based on their style of speech impact opportunities for linguistically diverse students. Deficit-based prescriptive practices, a focus on assessment that narrows curriculum, and pre-existing notions of what counts in writing position students as lacking language skills. For educators to resist such practices in writing instruction it is necessary to interrogate teachers' views of linguistically diverse student writing and to understand how cultural and

linguistic diversity can be addressed in teaching and assessment practices (Hornberger & Link, 2012).

Recent writing assessment scholarship has explored issues of diversity and what this means in terms of validity (Poe, 2014). For example, analytical rubrics used with diverse student writers fail to address sociocultural aspects of writing such as content, context, culture, and linguistic diversity (Spence, 2010). Teachers depend on their interpretations of the written product and these interpretations may be based on deficit perspectives. Therefore, Soltero-González, Escamilla, & Hopewell (2012) recommend using a holistic bilingual perspective when assessing linguistically diverse student writing. Holistic perspectives are necessary to counter notions of a standard version of English that lead to deficit perspectives toward linguistic diversity (Dunstan & Jaeger, 2015). This paper challenges deficit perspectives through a discourse analysis of one writing assessment conversation.

### **Background**

Generous reading is a form of writing assessment that allows educators to read student writing focusing on the writer and the process of writing (Calkins, 1986; Graves, 1983, Murray, 1980). Generous reading explores student writing focusing on strength and voice. Among other scholars who have taken this approach, Dyson (2003) traced children's writing and talk to imaginative play, songs, movies, sports teams, and classroom practices, highlighting the dialogic aspect of writing. Other scholars have explored student writing through the lens of literary analysis and descriptive processes. Armstrong (2006) used descriptive and interpretive inquiry to demonstrate how children used purposeful procedures in crafting their texts. Similarly, Carini and Himley (2009) used descriptive review to understand the student as a person and learner. Kaomea (2001) used literary and critical analysis to explore children's written texts about race and ethnicity. Her analysis revealed classroom, school, and community discourses in student writing.

Generous reading builds upon and furthers a line of inquiry that analyzes student writing with the expectation that each piece of writing will contain unique strengths and reflect the sociocultural context of the writer. With this perspective, it is understood that writing is a social practice, and the way students organize their language will be evident in their purpose for writing. As students' participation in social practices change, their writing will also change (Street, 2012).

Generous reading was developed in a largely Spanish dominant US community. The aim was to encourage teachers to acknowledge student voices and literary strengths (Spence, 2006). Generous reading has since been used in other contexts, with students of diverse linguistic backgrounds including Chinese bilingual writers and African American writers (Spence, 2010). Generous reading involves two analytical tools, heteroglossia and literary elements. Bakhtin's (1986) notion of heteroglossia is used to notice the voices in a written composition. Voices of parents, school, popular culture, home languages, cultural practices, current events, child culture, among other voices, can be found in student writing. Additionally, literary theory including analysis of metaphor (Lakoff, 1992) is used. Figurative language, repetition, binary opposites and telling details uncover the linguistic strengths that children internalize through hearing and reading language every day. Generous reading recognizes these literary elements as a natural part of language acquisition. A form was developed for noting the voices of others and figurative language in student writing (table 1), below.

**Table 1: Figurative Language in Student Writing**

<b>GR</b>			
Student	Date	Grade	Teacher
Genre	Process stage	Title	
<b>Voices of Others</b>		<b>Figurative/Descriptive Language</b>	
What does this tell you about the person?			
What does this tell you about the writer?			
What does this reveal about the writing?			
What is the student doing especially well that I want to reinforce?			
What can I teach that will help the student grow as a person or as a writer?			
What can I teach that will help improve this piece or future writing?			
<i>Student notes: English learner (level), AAE Dialect, Gender.</i>			

This paper concerns a segment of conversation during a professional development study using generous reading. In the larger study, five teachers learned to use generous reading to analyze their students' writing. The current discourse analysis explores how the author and two teachers approached the math writing of an African American fifth grade girl, Shamika. All names in this paper are pseudonyms.

### **Raciolinguistic Ideologies**

Raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015) help explain a deficit view of language variation that persists in education. Such ideologies entail superseding the students' home language with a standardized version of language valued by educators. In practice, the white speaker/listener marks certain language characteristics of racialized people, while leaving the language of other groups unmarked. "That is, raciolinguistic ideologies produce racialized speaking subjects who are constructed as linguistically deviant even when engaging in linguistic practices positioned as normative or innovative when produced by privileged white subjects." (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 150).

Notions of language superiority and inferiority exist within political and educational systems. These multifaceted contexts include dominant French settings in Canada, France, and other countries, dominant English and bilingual educational settings within the US, and a variety of language groups in majority white, Latinx, or African American classrooms and schools (Briceño, Rodriguez-Mojica, & Muñoz-Muñoz, 2018; Flores & Rosa, 2015; Flores, Lewis, & Phuong, 2018; Lo, Park, & Vigouroux, 2017; Low, Sarkar & Winer, 2009).

Raciolinguistics aptly describes prevalent attitudes toward African American Language in the United States. In some contexts, African American speakers are regarded as speakers of standardized English, while their linguistic and academic needs are neglected (Sung, 2018). In other contexts, African American Language (AAL) is singled out by teachers and parents for correction (Martinez, 2017). Yet linguists have shown that AAL is rule governed and systematic, not slang, lazy or haphazard (Hudley and Mallinson, 2011; Lanehart, 2015; Rickford, 1999; Smitherman, 1977). Linguists have shown that AAL is a language, not a dialect. AAL follows a system of grammar rules that is stable across African American language communities, although regional variations occur. AAL is also rich in meaning and is an important part of American history and culture. The question of how best to serve students of African descent has been explored through culturally relevant pedagogy.

### **Culturally Relevant Pedagogy**

In 1995, Gloria Ladson-Billings introduced educators to culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP), which focuses on developing students academically while supporting their cultural and critical competence. Culturally relevant pedagogy involves notions of capability, relationships, and critique as the core of teaching that supports marginalized students. CRP involves teaching for academic excellence by challenging students to reach their highest potential. It involves teaching cultural competence, by first focusing on the students' own culture then generating an understanding the cultures of others. CRP also involves teaching sociopolitical consciousness. Students learn to question issues of power and class, with a goal of liberation (Boutte, 2015). Adding to CRP scholarship, Geneva Gay (2002) developed the concept of culturally responsive teaching, "defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively" (106). Building on this body of work, Paris (2012) argued for doing more than responding to students' cultures, but that pedagogy should sustain them. Culturally sustaining pedagogy "seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling" (95).

These pedagogies build upon and sustain what students bring with them to school through valuing and appreciating the richness inherent in language variation (Hudley and Mallinson, 2011). Within writing instruction, exploring language variation with students can be an enriching experience for both teacher and students, as they analyze texts to illuminate the diversity of human expression. Students can investigate language, using metacognition to understand their own discourse and the discourse of others. Students write within various sociocultural contexts and can navigate between these discourse communities while developing the literacies and rhetorical conventions needed for academic success (Ball, 1996). Research on culturally responsive pedagogy shows that academic achievement improves when teaching is filtered through students' own cultural experiences (Gay, 2018). Although CRT has progressed over two decades, additional CRT research is needed to unpack teaching practices that promote student access, equity, and empowerment in a variety of K-12 settings (Thomas & Berry, 2018). The current study addresses this

need through a critical discourse analysis of a conversation among fifth grade teachers and a university researcher within a majority African American school in the southeastern United States.

## **Methodology**

### **Context**

This discourse analysis is an excerpt of conversation from a larger study of a professional development with five teachers using GR to assess student writing. The two teachers in this conversation were between the ages of 33-55 and had between 13 and 19 years of teaching experience. They taught fifth grade in an elementary school with a large African American population (55%) in the southeastern US. The study group conversations were recorded and transcribed, then analyzed qualitatively. The present study is based on a conversation about one student's math writing. The participants in the conversation were European American, and the student they were discussing was an African American girl. One teacher taught language arts and social studies. Another teacher was the designated gifted and talented teacher for math and science. She agreed to take part in the professional development to explore the integration of writing within math and science instruction. Spence facilitated the study group conversation.

### **Discourse Analysis Method**

Critical discourse analysis attempts to draw intersections between the form that language takes and the functions it is used to accomplish (Rogers, 2004). In this critical discourse analysis, internal relations including hedges, repetitions, idioms, topic changes (Fairclough, 2003), and binary oppositions (Derrida & Caputo, 1997) were found within the conversation. Then, external relations were analyzed to determine how language was used to refer to social events and other texts. External relations included self-identifying and 'othering.' 'Othering' refers to casting a group or individual as intrinsically different from oneself.

The analysis focused on transcribed audio recording of the professional development session in which Shamika's math writing was discussed. This included 78 conversational turns. The transcript was first coded for internal relations. Then, using the coded transcript, external relations such as social identities, and relationships between people were determined. Spence facilitated the generous reading conversation, therefore additional perspectives from outsiders to the conversation were consulted. Critical colleagues reviewed the transcribed conversation and preliminary findings, providing their perspectives on the roles of the conversation participants. After this consultation, the coded transcripts were reviewed, and analytical memos were written to describe Jean, Amy, and Spence's roles in the conversation. The coded transcripts of internal relations were used to excerpt the conversational turns that illustrated the participant roles. Deconstruction of binary oppositions was ongoing throughout each phase of the analysis.

## **Findings**

Critical discourse analysis revealed the ways in which the conversation participants took stances in solidarity with one another, Shamika, and generous reading. It also revealed resistance to generous reading and to Shamika. As the participants constructed their arguments and adjusted their stance throughout the conversation, implicit raciolinguistic ideologies encroached upon generous reading.

Spence opened the conversation with information on linguistic diversity that addressed Spanish speaking students and African American Language. This was followed by a generous reading conversation about Shamika's math writing. Spence attempted to empathize with Jean's role as math gifted and talented teacher.

*8 Spence: Yeah, so that makes sense that you don't have any of that in your classroom.*

This move by Spence quickly "othered" linguistically diverse students through the impersonal pronoun, "that." Jean followed in the same manner with the phrase, "children that are." Jean created a binary opposition with "kids who are slightly above grade level to gifted" and "children that are..." Although Jean left it unsaid, she implicitly referred to linguistically diverse students.

*9 Jean: I don't teach children that are...I teach the kids who are slightly above grade level to gifted. I really don't deal a lot with improper grammar. This is the one I was pulling my hair out.*

Jean's view of linguistic diversity was described through the phrase, "improper grammar." This marked Shamika's writing as lacking. Jean referenced her frustration with Shamika's writing with the metaphor, "pulling my hair out" then continued to reveal her view of linguistic diversity.

*10 Jean: She circled her important words in the question to make sure she was getting it, right? And then she put, equivalent fraction. And this is common for her dialect, putting the S at the end...Equivalent fraction are. See that's a dialect issue right there.*

Jean became frustrated because Shamika used a feature sometimes found in African American language; the generalized plural S absence. The absence of plural S occurs with relatively low frequency in AAL (Rickford, 1999); therefore, it is unclear if this was a feature of AAL or was due to some other factor such as hasty handwriting.

As the generous reading facilitator, Spence's language was directive, although with hedges, for example when Jean noticed repeated phrases in the writing, Spence softened her directive with modal verbs saying, "you might", "she's almost" and "you can put."

*16 Spence: So you might want to write the repetition, so she's almost relying on that. I mean that's a strength of hers that she knows, so she's got to get those words in there and she repeats them. And then down here you can put that you noticed the dialect with the dropping of the S. Down here.*

The use of directives with hedges revealed Spence's role of moving the teachers toward generous reading while indicating this was a shared aim among the three educators. However, Jean ignores the attempt to see repetition of math vocabulary as a strength, instead describing Shamika's language as deficient.

*17 Jean: Dialect. Yeah, dropping of the S. She's good with that. Or adding the S where it doesn't belong.*

*In proper English please. Repeat to me.  
I can't do that Mrs. B.*

*You will do that. If you are going to college in the future. You will speak to me in proper English.*

Jean implies that a conversation took place between her and Shamika at some time in the past. The reported conversation portrays the teacher and student misunderstanding one another. Jean seems to know that Shamika is not metacognitively aware of absent plural markers in her speech. She requests something that Shamika cannot do; produce standardized English on demand. Jean positions herself as responsible for Shamika's future and positions Shamika as incapable of taking advantage of the opportunity Jean is providing. Spence did not address this negative positioning of Shamika, but following Amy's lead, once again tried to divert the conversation to Shamika's appropriate use of math vocabulary.

*18 Amy: She uses odd and even.*

*19 Spence: Okay, she uses odd and even up here as adjectives. So, I haven't seen anybody else do that. So that stood out to me.*

Amy and Spence established a pattern of redirecting the conversation to writing strengths, while ignoring deficit discourse. Binary oppositions revealed underlying notions about what was acceptable to the teachers. "Dropping the S and adding the S; "college" in opposition to uneducated; "proper" in opposition to vulgar (Derrida & Caputo, 1997). These oppositions uncovered the racial-linguistic ideologies within the generous reading conversation.

The conversation continued to position Shamika negatively. As a math teacher, Jean valued the correct answer to the given math problem. For her, the purpose of writing was to assess the students' understanding of the concept. In the excerpt below, Jean positions Shamika as deceitful because she uses the vocabulary but does not understand the concept. Jean and Amy see Shamika's language ability as a cover for not understanding the math concept.

*24 Amy: Her concept is off.*

*25 Jean: Her concept is off.*

*26 Spence: So I would say something like, experiments with mathematical language to explain. (laughter)*

*27 Jean: I would say here, experiments, would have to say, yeah.*

*28 Amy: I think it's really great, but I hate to say that sometimes when we don't know the answer, we try to BS our way out. Like I said, I think this is excellent that she tried, she put out words, she used her numbers, she's got pictorial representation. She did what was asked of her with the knowledge that she had, albeit, it's a little...*

*29 Jean: Right. I mean, she did. She did all that was asked of her. Okay, I guess when I was looking at it, I was like...*

*30 Spence: And you know what I would say, she has the voice of the test. Isn't this a test taking strategy?*

Facilitator is consistent in her role, prodding the teachers to see Shamika's vocabulary in a positive light, "mathematical language to explain." Although Amy moves between expressing solidarity with Spence, "I think it's really great" and deficit discourse, "but I hate to say that sometimes when we don't know the answer, we try to BS our way out." Amy continues to vacillate between solidarity with Spence, who insists on finding strengths, and Jean, who wants to see the correct math concept.

A few lines later in the conversation, Jean agrees with Amy's negative assessment of Shamika then Amy suddenly asserts her solidarity with Shamika. Spence again ignores the deficit discourse and instead redirects the conversation toward analyzing Shamika's writing process.

*34 Jean: She has a future of being a good BSer.*

*35 Amy: Yeah. But you know, I have a love for those girls.*

*36 Spence: If you think about this part right here. Where did she get this? Did she get it from you, the classroom?*

By deconstructing Jean's "future of being a good BSer" we find the opposite of her earlier statement, "if you are going to college in the future." Within a raciolinguistic ideology, Shamika is cast as deficient, although she demonstrates good writing by using appropriate mathematical vocabulary such as "odd and even" and "denominator." Amy hedges her agreement with Jean and voices solidarity with Shamika, "yeah, but I have a love for those girls." Leaving unsaid, which girls she is referring to and grouping Shamika with other girls who might not be trusted. Spence ignored the teachers' deficit discourse and was therefore complicit in continuing an unjust practice of assigning negative traits to students based on their race, skin color, and language.

Discourse analysis clarified the need to disrupt raciolinguistics and other unjust practices within writing assessment. The conversation participants were not aware of their raciolinguistic ideology. Instead, Jean's language indicates frustration over the absence of the plural S, and her perceived responsibility for Shamika's academic future. Jean insisted that Shamika produce "proper" English in preparation for college. As Jean adopted the role of monoglot college preparatory teacher, she found it difficult to move past Shamika's misunderstanding of adding fractions with unlike denominators. Amy revealed a raciolinguistic ideology through assigning a negative trait to Shamika and othering "those girls" positioning all of them as untrustworthy even though she professed, "I have a love for those girls." Facilitator's focus on generous reading was meant to shift the conversation away from deficit language, yet the teachers returned to it regardless. Generous reading alone was not productive in revising deficit beliefs and did not disrupt raciolinguistic ideology.

In a later interview, Jean remarked that finding writing and math strengths was challenging and a completely new way of assessing math writing. Yet Jean persevered with generous reading. Despite the deficit perspectives in the conversation, ultimately generous reading seemed to be helpful to Jean in reflecting on how she used math writing to assess Shamika's understanding of fractions.



*70 Jean: I would sit down and talk with her. First of all, I did this about a week ago...So, I could sit down with her and say, okay, let's look at what you wrote. And what do we know about equivalent fractions. Just have a talk with her. And talk about equivalent fractions. Maybe give her an example, let her solve one, talk her way through it. And then I would ask her, I want you to look at what you did. How would you change what you wrote?*

Jean reflected on an instructional conversation she had with Shamika, “I did this about a week ago,” while also pondering how she would use the insights from generous reading in a hypothetical conversation, “I could sit down with her and say” This illustrates that reflecting on teaching was one of the benefits of generous reading because Jean had to think about how the analysis of student writing could be used to move the student forward as a writer or as a person. It is important to consider the whole person rather than only the writing because writing is always about some topic that arises from the person’s interactions in the world. In this case, Jean reflected on what she learned about Shamika as a math student through her writing. Jean also realized she was helping Shamika develop as a writer.

*78 Jean: Oh revision, yeah, okay revision. Okay. So that's what I did for her.*

Jean realized that an instructional conversation using math writing could help Shamika revise her math concepts, while also teaching revision of writing. This allows transfer of writing skills used in language arts for writing used in math.

A critical discourse analysis of this generous reading conversation revealed Jean as a monoglot college preparatory teacher, but one who opened her mind to the possibilities of writing and in particular to Shamika as a writer. Jean’s colleague, Amy expressed solidarity with generous reading and with Jean’s monoglot perspective on linguistic diversity. Spence directed Jean and Amy’s understanding of generous reading as a method for analyzing math writing, yet completely missed several opportunities to disrupt deficit discourse and to position language as a strength useful for instruction. The three participants together portrayed Shamika negatively despite her writing strengths. The following discussion will explore possibilities for eliminating raciolinguistic ideologies from writing assessment, particularly from generous reading.

## Discussion

Decades of research have revealed discrimination toward African American Language in student writing (Ball, 1996; Baugh, 1995; Dyson & Smitherman, 2009; Johnson & VanBrackle, 2012; Kinloch, 2010). However, much work remains for critical reflection of unquestioned and stereotypical messages in our society. This on-going work requires bringing implicit attitudes to explicit awareness and is a recursive cycle that can lead to liberation from such attitudes (Harro, 2000). This is personal work that must be discovered by educating oneself and interacting with people from diverse linguistic backgrounds. Educators and researchers have contributed to this work through pre-service teaching experiences, professional development, and research studies.

Generous reading as a form of writing assessment was designed to encourage teachers toward an asset-based analysis of student writing and was developed in a Spanish-dominant com-

munity. The current study focused on an African American student's writing and revealed raciolinguistic ideologies among the generous reading participants. This problem is addressed through a discussion of culturally relevant/sustaining pedagogy for African American student writers.

Culturally relevant pedagogy is a resources approach to instruction that was developed for culturally diverse student populations. Core concepts include focusing on academic success, maintaining students' cultural integrity, and developing sociopolitical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Several studies are informative for considering these concepts in relation to writing instruction. Ball (1996) suggested incorporating students' language-preferred text design patterns into instruction. These were used as bridges to academic-based text design patterns. This practice can be used to focus on academic writing success while maintaining students' cultural integrity. Tatum and Gue (2012) described African American males writing about complex issues within a collaborative context honoring student voices. This developed their socio-political consciousness. In other studies, educators emphasized elements of their students' heritages, languages or interests, using non-traditional texts including texts with culturally diverse authors. Teachers have used such texts to engender discussions that decenter standardized English and critique culture and power (Woodard, Vaughan, & Machado, 2017).

Given positive results of culturally sustaining pedagogy for motivating African American students to think critically and write for meaningful purposes, it follows that culturally sustaining pedagogy should be incorporated into generous reading. This would allow teachers to identify raciolinguistic ideologies that are detrimental to students' writing progress. In rethinking the generous reading form used with teachers in professional development, alterations were made based on findings from the critical discourse analysis. The first alteration was to remove the space provided for demographic information (table 1). Although used for research purposes, it sent the wrong message to teachers assessing student writing. "Student notes: English learner (level), AAE Dialect, Gender." This space for notes on the form has been removed so that it does not promote any preconceptions about student language. In the generous reading conversation, Jean referred to dialect, possibly influenced by this section of the generous reading form. It was time to remove this and simplify the form that had been developed in 2010.

The next alteration involved six questions included on the 2010 generous reading form. These questions were revised to provide space for discussing the ideologies teachers bring to their analysis of student writing. The 2010 questions follow:

After finding voices of others and literary elements in this piece of writing:

1. What does this tell you about the person?
2. What does this tell you about the writer?
3. What does this reveal about the writing?
4. What is the student doing especially well that I want to reinforce?
5. What can I teach that will help the student grow as a person or as a writer?
6. What can I teach that will help improve this piece or future writing?

As observed through using the generous reading form over several years, questions 2 and 3 were often conflated by teachers and question 6 was often answered when teachers discussed question 5, so these were combined. Drawing from culturally sustaining pedagogy, a question was added to encourage reflection on implicit understandings of language and writing. "How will I value this

students’ language and culture with a focus on academic success?” Although this question is challenging and will be different for each student writer, it is intended to generate new pedagogies that will liberate teachers from unproductive and discouraging assessments of student writing. The new questions on the revised generous reading form now read as follows:

After finding voices of others and literary elements in this piece of writing:

1. What does this tell you about the person?
2. What does this tell you about the writer’s process or this piece of writing?
3. What is the student doing especially well that I want to reinforce?
4. What can I teach that will help the student grow as a person or as a writer?
5. How will I value this students’ language and culture with a focus on academic success?

### Conclusion

Discourse analysis of a writing assessment conversation revealed raciolinguistic ideology that was perpetuated through a lack of reflection on preexisting prejudice toward African American Language. This unjustly positioned an African American girl as incapable of speaking standardized English and as dishonest in her writing. In fact, the writing included only one orthographic issue, absent plural S, that might have been AAL, but also might have been inadvertently omitted in the process of handwriting. The teachers agreed on Shamika’s writing and math strengths, even while positioning her as incapable of standardized English and as dishonest in her writing. As a result of these findings, the generous reading form was revised to include a question derived from culturally relevant pedagogy (table 2), below. Teachers are now asked to consider how they might value each students’ language and culture while focusing on academic success. Future studies using the revised generous reading form will potentially lead to culturally sustaining pedagogies for the writing development of linguistically diverse students.

*Table 2: Generous Reading Form (Revised)*

<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Title</b>	
<b>Voices of Others</b>	<b>Literary Elements</b>
After finding voices of others and literary elements in this piece of writing:	
<b>What does this tell you about the person?</b>	
<b>What does this tell you about the writer’s process or this piece of writing?</b>	
<b>What is the student doing especially well that I want to reinforce?</b>	

<b>What can I teach that will help the student grow as a person or as a writer?</b>
<b>How will I honor this students' language and culture with a focus on academic success?</b>

## References

- Alim, H.S., Rickford, J.R., & Ball, A.F. (Eds.). (2016). *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race*. New York: Oxford.
- Armstrong. (2006). *Children writing stories*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, A E. (1996). Expository writing patterns of African American students. *The English Journal*, 85(1), 27-36.
- Ball, A. F. (1997). Expanding the dialogue on culture as a critical component when assessing writing. *Assessing Writing*, 4(2), 169–202.
- Baugh, J. (1995). The law, linguistics, and education: Educational reform for African American-language minority students *Linguistics and Education*, 7, 87-105.
- Boutte, G.S. (2015). *Educating African American students: And how are the children?* New York: Routledge.
- Briceño, A., Rodriguez-Mojica, C., & Muñoz-Muñoz, E. (2018). From English learner to Spanish learner: Raciolinguistic beliefs that influence heritage Spanish speaking teacher candidates, *Language and Education*, 32(3), 212-226.
- Calkins, L. (1986). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Carini, P. F., Himley, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Jenny's story: Taking the long view of the child: Prospects philosophy in action*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Coady, M., & Escamilla, K. (2005). Audible voices and visible tongues: Exploring social realities in Spanish speaking students' writing. *Language Arts*, 82, 462-472.
- Delpit, L. (2006). Lessons from teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 220-231.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. & Caputo, J.D. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Dunstan, S. B., & Jaeger, A. J. (2015). Dialect and Influences on the Academic Experiences of College Students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 86(5), 777–803.
- Dyson, A. H. (2003a). *The brothers and sisters learn to write*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dyson, A H. & Smitherman, G. (2009). The right (write) start: African American language and the discourse of sounding right. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4), 973–998.
- Flores, N. & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.

- Flores, N., Lewis, M.C., & Phuong, J. (2018). Raciolinguistic chronotopes and the education of Latinx students: Resistance and anxiety in a bilingual school. *Language & Communication*, 62, 15–25.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106–116.
- Gay, G. (2018). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. Third Edition.* Multicultural Education Series. Teachers College Press.
- Graves, D., (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Johnson, D., & VanBrackle, L. (2012). Linguistic discrimination in writing assessment: How raters react to African American 'errors', ESL errors, and standard American English errorson a state mandated writing exam. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 35-54.
- Harro, B. (2000). Cycle of liberation. In M. Adams, W. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, X. Zuniga, (Eds). *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice* (pp. 463-469) New York: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N.H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory into Practice*, 51, 239-247.
- Kaomea, J. L. (2001). Chapter 9: Pointed Noses and Yellow Hair: Deconstructing Children's Writing on Race and Ethnicity in Hawai'i. In *Resistance & Representation* (pp. 151– 180).
- Kinloch, V. (2010). "To not be a traitor of black English": Youth perceptions of language rights in an urban context. *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 103–141.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Lakoff, G. (1992). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.) *Metaphor and thought (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lanehart, S. (Ed.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of African American language.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lo, A., Park, J., & Vigouroux, C.B. (2017). The discursive pathway of two centuries of raciolinguistic stereotyping: 'Africans as incapable of speaking French', *Language in Society* 46, 5–21.
- Low, B., Sarkar, M., and Winer, L. (2009). J'Ch'us mon propre Bescherelle': Challenges from the Hip-Hop nation to the Quebec nation, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 13(1), 59–82.
- Martinez, D.C. (2017). Emerging critical meta-Awareness among Black and Latina/o Youth during corrective feedback practices in urban English language arts classrooms. *Urban Education*, 52(5), 637–666.
- Murray, D. (1980). Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In T. Donavan and B. McClelland (Eds), *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*, 3–22. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97
- Poe, M. (2014). The consequences of writing assessment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(3), 271–275.
- Rickford, J.R. (1999). African American Vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Rogers, R. (Ed.) (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America.* Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

- Soltero-Gonzalez, L., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2012). Changing teachers' perceptions about the writing abilities of emerging bilingual students: Towards a holistic bilingual perspective on writing assessment. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 71–94.
- Spence, L. K. (2006). *Writing assessment: The rubric, generous reading, and English learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe.
- Spence, L.K. (2008). Generous reading: Discovering dialogic voices in writing. *English in Education*, 42. 253-268.
- Spence, L.K. (2010). Discerning writing assessment: Insights into an analytical rubric. *Language Arts*, 87, 337-347.
- Spence, L.K., Fan, X., Speece, L., & Bushaala, S. (2017). Generous reading expands teachers' perceptions on student writing. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 96– 106.
- Street, B. V. (2012). Society Reschooling. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(2), 216–227.
- Sung, K.K. (2018). Raciolinguistic ideology of antiblackness: bilingual education, tracking, and the multiracial imaginary in urban schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, 31(8), 667–683.
- Tatum, A. & Gue, V. (2012) The sociocultural benefits of writing for African American adolescent males, *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 28(2), 123-142.
- Thomas, C. A. ., & Berry III, R. Q. (2019). A qualitative metasynthesis of culturally relevant pedagogy & culturally responsive teaching: Unpacking mathematics teaching practices. *Journal of Mathematics Education at Teachers College*, 10(1), 21–30.
- Woodard, R., Vaughan, A., & Machado, E. (2017). Exploring culturally sustaining writing pedagogy in urban classrooms. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66, 215-231.

**Lucy K. Spence** is an associate professor at the University of South Carolina. She teaches in the Language and Literacy Program within the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education in the College of Education. Her main research interests are linguistic diversity, writing instruction, and reading development. She has studied writing in Japan, the Southwestern US, and the Southeastern US. These studies have focused on multilingual students who speak English, Spanish, African American English, Chinese, and Japanese. Student writing in these languages are explored in Spence's book, *Student Writing: Give it a Generous Reading* published by Information Age. Dr. Spence earned her Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction at Arizona State University. She currently teaches in the M.Ed. and Ph.D. programs in Language and Literacy at the University of South Carolina.