

INTRODUCTION

If you want to take the temperature of a nation, just turn to its discussions about citizenship. In 1916, in the midst of the First World War and a spike in immigration from countries outside of northern Europe, the United States Bureau of Naturalization sponsored a Citizenship Convention in Washington, DC. Various stakeholders, including teachers, labor leaders, and congressional representatives, were called together to discuss how to shape the citizenship of new immigrants. This convention synthesized a host of disparate lessons already circulating across the United States in workplaces, community groups, and schools about how to communicate with your boss, how to dress for work, how to read and write, and many other topics, all designed to produce versions of the good citizen. Similar conversations can be tracked throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, a time when even the president of the United States can have the authenticity of his citizenship questioned as evidenced by the “birther” movement that sought to discredit President Barack Obama’s citizenship. How a nation defines, constructs, and produces citizens communicates not only the ideals of that nation, but also its anxieties, particularly in moments of political, cultural, and economic uncertainty.

Defining citizenship can be both absolutely clear and seriously tricky business. If we stick to legal aspects, a citizen is a person who is a member of a nation-state, either by birthright or by fulfilling the requisite duties required by the state in order to have the status of citizenship conferred. In the eyes of the law, you are either a citizen or you are not. But, of course, a nation is not made up of only legal citizens. In the United States, there are permanent

residents and temporary workers and undocumented immigrants and international students who also make up the fabric of the nation. While people in these different categories are welcome, to varying degrees, to work or study in the United States, they are not legally citizens and do not have full access to the privileges of citizenship. Even some who have legal citizenship status are still disenfranchised—politically, culturally, and economically—and cannot be said to have access to what is often called “full citizenship,” in which all rights and privileges of citizenship are available.

This is where defining citizenship becomes tricky business. Attempts to do so are not merely explicit discussions about the nuances of these legal categorizations, but also implicit debates about the processes through which people move in and out of legal categories and attain culturally recognizable versions of citizenship. Citizenship beyond strict legal definitions is most often described as cultural citizenship, which Aihwa Ong defines as the “dual process of self-making and being made” and the “cultural practices and beliefs produced out of negotiating the often ambivalent and contested relations with the state and its hegemonic forms” (738). This *process of cultural citizenship production* provides a useful framework through which to interrogate practices in many learning situations, most certainly because citizenship is such a persistent theme in education and also because it is so intertwined with student preparation. Peruse any document that articulates the purpose of an educational institution—a university website, its strategic plans, a course syllabus, a program’s learning goals, the K–12 Common Core State Standards—and quite often, producing good citizens is invoked as a goal.

Citizenship assumes such prominence in education; it was a learning outcome before there was such a thing. Consider John Dewey, Horace Mann, Thomas Jefferson, Aristotle—all of whom argued for citizenship as part of the educational endeavor. Education trains citizens. And it eases anxieties about citizenship because it offers structured, institutionalized, and routinized spaces for the widespread production of citizens and communication of citizenship ideals. The need to cultivate a more participatory democratic citizenship, a more literate citizenship, a more active citizenship—these are all common refrains. But what are the practices and definitions of good citizenship beyond the common platitudes? What do teachers, particularly those who teach literacy, teach as citizenship? And why is literacy so often at the center of citizenship production? *Producing Good Citizens: Literacy Training in Anxious Times* examines these questions by historicizing the role of literacy within the broader processes of citizenship instruction and citizen-making and by examining the enduring appeal of citizenship in literacy training spaces.

While current educational discourse often celebrates literacy as a neces-

sary pathway to citizenship, U.S. history is filled with examples of literacy's restrictions on citizenship (e.g., literacy tests for voting in the Jim Crow South and for immigration in the 1917 Immigration Act). Addressing the complex historical relationships between literacy and citizenship, I connect these two strands—the wholly expected outcome of citizenship for literacy instruction and the troubled use of literacy as a measurement of personhood—to uncover the interplay between literacy and citizen-making efforts, particularly in the context of labor and work preparation. Drawing on literacy studies, composition history, and citizenship theory and situating them alongside historical evidence of U.S. immigration and labor practices in the early twentieth century (1910–29), this book constructs a history of work-oriented citizenship in literacy learning spaces, thus complicating the liberatory and participatory notions of citizenship commonly taken up by contemporary educators, particularly literacy teachers.

By focusing on the intersections between literacy training and contested citizenship production that coincided with changes in notions of U.S. democracy and national identity, *Producing Good Citizens* locates the roots of contemporary assumptions about citizenship and literacy for our current information and service economy much further back in the citizenship crisis of the early twentieth century. At that time, multiple immigration reforms such as the 1917 Literacy Test Act unfolded alongside profound economic changes brought on by the proliferation of mass manufacturing. In order to construct a genealogy of how literacy instruction takes up (or attempts to take up) demands for citizenship, particularly in the U.S. context, I analyze the literacy and citizenship lessons embedded in immigrant citizenship programs and worker education programs with an adjacent examination of the proliferation of the university writing classroom. The early decades of the twentieth century were marked by changes in immigration law, labor unrest, and the rise of a mass manufacturing economy, a world war, an international Communist threat, and U.S. imperialism, all of which created anxieties about citizenship and a desire for a sturdy sense of what it meant to be an American citizen in order to contrast against those who were not. In this period of contested citizenship, these educational spaces attempted to define and construct their students as the “right” kind of citizen with the “right” kind of literacy.

Considering citizenship at this previous historical moment offers a view of how the connections between teaching literacy and teaching citizenship have been drawn. While not a neat parallel, what the previous moment and our current one share is profound economic change and the uses of education through literacy as a mass strategy to shape citizenship. These kinds of recurrent citizenship questions can be one way of tracing the nation's history. Contempo-

rary discussions about citizenship are built on these previous moments, often compressing a variety of citizen rights and obligations with civil, political, and social elements into an uncomplicated and unrealized version of citizenship that is attainable to all, while sidestepping the economic and cultural factors that might preclude it. Rather than assuming literacy's absolute connection to citizenship, *Producing Good Citizens* investigates how this association has been constructed, with literacy often used to cultivate a brand of citizenship defined by an individual's productivity and work habits as opposed to more explicitly civic activity.

To that end, this book studies how sites of citizenship training in the early twentieth century, such as those organized by unions, community groups, and the government, constructed certain conceptions of the citizen through literacy training. I am particularly interested in how legal battles over drawing boundaries of citizenship—real boundaries with both legal and material consequences—shape definitions of citizenship and the evolving paths of who has access to it. What kind of force is being exerted not just legally but rhetorically as a result of these legal battles? And how does evidence of good habits or good behavior seemingly provide opportunities to push against those boundaries?

In order to examine the implications of these efforts to redefine citizenship, I examine three pedagogical spaces designed to help people attain citizenship during the 1910s and 1920s: Americanization and citizenship programs sponsored by the federal government and community organizations; union-sponsored literacy programs such as those organized by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and the Workers' Education Bureau; and first-year writing programs, which proliferated widely at colleges and universities in the United States during this period. With these three sites, the book historicizes literacy's role in the construction of U.S. citizenship and, conversely, how concepts of citizenship have been embedded in literacy practices (Heath, Street), specifically the historical and cultural context that surrounds literacy training and distribution. I pay particular attention to how working conditions and opportunities shape certain expectations for what a literacy training site—such as a citizenship class, union education program, or first-year writing class—promises to deliver. The book undertakes the critical task of understanding how such programs positioned literacy not only as a barrier (e.g., literacy tests for immigrants, African Americans, and other often marginalized populations), but also as a *habit of citizenship* that would extend opportunities. Habits of citizenship such as literacy are less explicit than civic activity such as voting but are not necessarily a less influential marker of citizenship. I direct attention to the institutions that supported literacy as a habit of citizenship through literacy training and the ways their conversations, rationales, and rea-

sonings for literacy simultaneously imagined opportunities and revealed the limited spheres of citizenship available to certain classes of laborers.

Current anxieties about citizenship are influenced prominently by access to work opportunities, as seen in late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century debates over immigration policies such as temporary worker programs and the DREAM Act, in which the boundaries of citizenship rely on academic success as a key to economic success and, by extension, citizenship. Literacy training often eases these anxieties by certifying individuals as acceptable and providing a marker of cultural citizenship. An understanding of how anxieties were mitigated during the early-twentieth-century shift into a mass manufacturing economy could enlighten the current shift out of it, as well as the dual economic and citizenship anxieties prevalent in the United States in both eras. During the early decades of the twentieth century, profound changes in the American work experience (such as unionism, rise of office work, professionalism through college education and training, routinization and Taylorism, loss of power over working conditions) transformed the lives of citizens and potential citizens. Even though industrialization actually took place over the course of the nineteenth century as well, historian Herbert Gutman specifically describes the post-1893 United States as a “mature industrial society,” in which industrialism eclipsed previous agrarian and craft-oriented economies (13).¹ As part of this process, work moved away from craft production of an object toward a more abstract process of working for an employer simply for wages. David Montgomery suggests that this increase in personnel management and scientific management is characteristic of the change in the nature of work toward a mass manufacturing posture (32–33). I refer to this shift to a mass manufacturing economy throughout the book, marking not just an industrial shift in the way work was organized but a cultural one as well.

One consequence of this mature industrial society was a shift in the nature of work itself. Daniel Nelson depicts this change as the expansion of a system in which bosses increasingly made decisions about who was qualified for particular jobs, a system that “gradually substituted managerial direction and controls for the informal, ad hoc methods of the past” (10). As a result of this loss of autonomy, workers were judged and appraised for their work skills and potential through traits such as literacy. The advent of mass manufacturing and the rise of office work (Diner 156) established an economy in which certification, often impersonal, became a necessary part of doing business. In educative spaces, literacy was being used as a way to certify and then direct students into particular roles in the emerging mass-manufacturing economic system. The mantle of citizenship production was imposed onto this process, helping to create societal requirements for literacy (basic, advanced, university-styled,

cultural, or otherwise). An accompanying imperative to be productive became acceptable, even patriotic.

Following the citizenship theories put forward by Danielle Allen, Barbara Cruikshank, and Bryan Turner, I posit citizenship as more than just a construct or political institution that determines who can vote; as a membership structure, it works to determine who is acceptable and who is not. Like literacy, like a university diploma, like unaccented English, citizenship acts as a kind of credential with legal and cultural purchase. Citizenship is produced in more than just the moments when a person fills out the proper paperwork, passes a test, has lived in the country for the required amount of time, and then takes an oath of citizenship. Production of citizenship, of course, does occur in the legal realm, but also in cultural and material spaces such as classrooms, workplaces, and community spaces. The university represents one such training ground for particular kinds of literacy and citizenship, but *Producing Good Citizens* includes other training sites such as union education programs sponsored by the Workers' Education Bureau and federal Americanization programs to gain a broader sense of how literacy training was used in the service of citizenship production, particularly at a heightened moment of anxiety about citizenship when questions about U.S. imperialism, immigration, and communism mingled with changing economic conditions.

By examining a range of spaces where those hoping to acquire citizenship might have encountered literacy training, I ask how the everyday practices of producing citizenship through literacy have resulted in these practices being mutually but often contradictorily implicated for disenfranchised individuals, creating a situation in which the allure of democratic citizenship in the United States obscures its inequities. While I agree that the production of a democratic citizenry is a worthwhile goal for literacy instruction, I focus on demonstrating how literacy simultaneously influences the creation of worker-citizens in addition to participatory citizens. This comparative approach reveals how and why literacy teachers so often position literacy as a tool for students' social and economic mobility in their quests for citizenship, whether the students are immigrants, laborers, or college students (or all three), and locates that positioning in a long history of contested citizenship.

Good Citizens and the Literacy Myth

With the publication of *The Literacy Myth* in 1979, Harvey Graff set into motion a way of thinking about literacy that debunked common assumptions associating literacy with progress and viewed it as a "measure of modernity" (8). In doing so, Graff emphasized how literacy was "more central to the training, dis-

cipline, morality, and habits it accompanied and advanced than to the specific skills it represented” (321). As Graff describes it, the literacy myth perpetuates a belief that literate skills yield certain benefits and progress. Yet faith in literacy, a kind of literacy hope, still remains the backbone of much literacy instruction, not because those who believe in it are naïve, but because there are material, legal, and political effects of literacy that merit attention. As Deborah Brandt argues in *Literacy in American Lives*, “literacy skill is treated primarily as a resource—economic, political, intellectual, spiritual—which, like wealth or education, or trade skill or social connections, is pursued for the opportunities and protections that it potentially grants to its seekers” (5). Literacy instructors often play a role in the process of imbuing hope and value in literacy, even if only by reinforcing literacy’s importance by teaching it. Though many of us recognize, thanks to Graff, that literacy is not a panacea, those of us who teach literacy often continue to believe that the skills we teach are useful and can have a positive impact on the lives of students, whether in other classrooms or the world at large.

In this book, I strive to understand the role of literacy hope in citizenship production and the implications of using literacy as a measure of citizenship. Such implications are clear in events such as the literacy test for immigrants of the early twentieth century or literacy requirements for suffrage, but perhaps less clear in spaces like Americanization programs, union education programs, or even university writing classes from this same time period, where literacy is seen as a means to extend opportunity and cultivate citizenship. Sharon Crowley warns against “conflat[ing] economic inequality and racial discrimination with a literacy problem” (234) because addressing the latter does not automatically solve the former. Yet this conflation perseveres because of literacy hope, a belief in the power of literacy to cure these larger societal problems. This literacy hope is so powerful because literacy appears to reconcile existing inequalities by helping to provide access to certain privileges of citizenship and their attendant societal resources. But too often, inequalities remain. For example, as discussed in chapter 2, immigrants who learned English in federal Americanization programs also learned lessons about productivity and good work habits embedded in stories that taught workers how to disagree with their boss (don’t do it), how to call in sick (only if there is a danger of infecting the rest of the workforce), how to question paycheck errors (politely because it is probably an “honest mistake”), and how to gain a promotion (obey the rules of the factory and go to night school). These texts used literacy teaching as a way to cultivate specific definitions of the good worker-citizen, while simultaneously reinforcing the idea that citizenship and all of its benefits were earned through individual behavior. In his study of rhetorical approaches to literacy,

John Duffy argues that literacy practices must be framed within “arguments about such topics as race, language, history and the place of the Other” (227). Citizenship provides one such frame. When literacy acts as a measure of citizenship in this way, it perpetuates the possibility of equal footing for all individuals. In turn, the will to citizenship in writing classes operates as an extension of the literacy myth.

The desire to use literacy to mitigate inequality flourishes because literacy acts as a mechanism for citizenship: if citizenship is defined by characteristics that can be cultivated and achieved, then literacy instruction can serve as the process through which to attain these markers of citizenship. As educators, when we see ourselves as part of the citizen-making enterprise, it is often connected to the seemingly benign desire to increase the participatory efficacy of students; however, our will to citizenship holds other values and messages. In the context of literacy learning, the definition of citizenship in more specific legal and cultural terms reveals the civic values that are being supported and promoted. For example, an instructor who sees citizenship as primarily an enterprise in growing liberty and another who views citizenship as participatory would approach literacy’s role in citizenship differently. While each imagines using literacy to promote or define a distinct definition of citizenship, the citizenship promoted is almost always imagined to liberate, rather than restrict. Morris Young describes how “discourse about literacy” is “often a coded way to talk about race, citizenship, and culture in America” (6). Following Young’s approach, coercive examples of citizenship production through literacy, such as the productivity imperatives found in Americanization programs set in motion by the Bureau of Naturalization in 1916 or the push for political power in union education around World War I or the arguments about the utility of English as a discipline forwarded by a newly formed NCTE in the 1910s and 1920s, can be placed alongside today’s current liberatory scenarios and can help us better understand how literacy acts as a mechanism in the process of citizenship production, and conversely how conceptions of citizenship shape literacy and literacy training.

Citizenship and literacy are often used together as credentials to gain access to society’s resources. This literacy and citizenship-conferred credential has become most prevalent and influential in the context of securing employment where one’s citizenship status and literate ability has tangible and material gains. This focus on distribution of societal resources through work reveals how workers and immigrants positioned literacy as a tool for social and economic mobility in their quests for full citizenship, and as a result how such positioning of literacy defines citizenship through these terms. Literacy, and the ideological freight that accompanies it, is created by and perpetuates these

other inequalities and reframes them in citizenship terms. While literacy as an attained skill may not necessarily guarantee specific advances for an individual, having such a skill (or not having it) marks that individual as *worthy* of certain kinds of resources. So while literate ability does not inherently make resources and opportunities available, one often follows the other.

Understanding literacy as a mechanism of citizenship that appears to reconcile inequality can help to reveal the limitations of a model of citizenship disproportionately focused on participation (a prevalent model in educational circles), and to overlook the importance of legal and cultural boundaries to citizenship. As Catherine Prendergast contends in *Literacy and Racial Justice: The Politics of Learning after Brown v. Board of Education*, claims to equal legal rights in the realm of education have not always resulted in equality in the material world. In that same vein, despite the theoretical and legal possibility of conferral of equal citizenship rights to individuals, the resulting equality narrative that accompanies discourses around rights, privileges, and obligations obscures the fact that full citizenship itself cannot be realized equally by all. While citizenship theorist T. H. Marshall acknowledges the ongoing presence of inequality, he also imagines the conferral of rights as creating a “uniform status of citizenship,” in which equal access to rights would equalize the other disparities among citizens. In literacy instruction, a space or tension exists between equality and individualism, where a citizen might gain a kind of equality through increasing literate skills but would still need to rely on personal success in developing certain citizenship practices to gain full access to citizenship. With a focus on an individual’s literacy, the burden of realizing citizenship remains on individual acquisition of these practices rather than a larger system of inequality.

The role of literacy in providing access to citizenship is simultaneously coercive and empowering, perpetuating a tension between a definition of citizenship rooted in equality and one rooted in individualism. In *The Will to Empower* (1999), Barbara Cruikshank defines technologies of citizenship as “participatory and democratic schemes . . . for correcting the deficiencies of citizens” (4), calling attention to the idea that regulation is embedded in the making of participatory citizens. For example, contemporary pedagogical practices such as critical literacy or letter-to-the-editor assignments or public writing can be viewed as both offering a way of empowering students, but also providing a space for citizen dissent that is unthreatening. The citizenship and literacy training of the early twentieth century also functioned in this dual role. Administrators of union education programs, for instance, hoped that literacy learning could be used as a way to turn workers into good citizens of the country and good citizens of the union, yet the lessons promoted in this space often

limited participants to narrow ways that good citizens would use their literacy. Citizenship production spaces like the ones discussed in this book promoted literacy learning as a way to achieve good citizenship, but that citizenship was often restricted to certain narrow definitions, while simultaneously offering vague liberatory and equalizing possibilities. Such possibilities, whether or not ever fully realized, are what continue to perpetuate hope in literacy.

Citizenship in the Writing Classroom and Beyond

In recent years, a spate of publications has questioned the efficacy of higher education.² Such publications represent millennial anxiety about the relevancy of education; hand wringing over whether students are learning enough or doing the right kinds of learning; whether institutions of higher education are taking the necessary steps to produce “good citizens”; and whether the citizenship being produced should be defined through a framework of productivity, liberal humanism, or globalization (or perhaps all three simultaneously). For those who teach or administer writing classes, these assessments of the efficacy of higher education reflect our own questions about what we imagine students are doing with literacy once they leave the classroom, which in turn informs curricula and teaching practices.

Literacy and education are often conflated but with good reason. Literacy frequently stands in for education, in a similar way that it acts as a measure of citizenship. Literacy, the most basic of skills, provides a measureable way to decide whether someone is educated. If someone cannot speak, read, or write in a dominant language, then they are perceived as unworthy of having access to society’s resources. If someone cannot pass a first-year composition class, they often are not allowed to move through the rest of a curriculum. The contemporary United States might not have a formal literacy test for citizenship, but evidence of literacy is necessary. In the context of literacy instruction, the power to certify someone as literate—and as this book explores, as a citizen—often relies on individual responsibility when it comes to success in educative spaces.

With their focus on the role of writing within the development of the university in the United States, historians of the field of rhetoric and composition such as James Berlin, Robert Connors, Sharon Crowley, David Gold, Charles Paine, and Kelly Ritter have done much of the critical background work on the early twentieth century to analyze implicit connections between the college writing requirement, often viewed as a microcosm of the values of the larger university, and beliefs about the production of an American citizenry. Berlin’s *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900–1985* makes clear that changes in the writing requirement were related

to other social, economic, and political developments: “the college writing course, a requirement for graduation for most students throughout the century, responds quickly to changes in American society as a whole, with literacy (as variously defined by the college curriculum over the years) serving as the intermediary between the two—between the writing course and larger social developments” (5).

Similarly, Connors sets up his *Composition-Rhetoric* by drawing a connection between literacy skills and citizenship as defined by an individual’s productivity, explaining, “there is a new rhetorical tradition that arose in the United States during the nineteenth century to try to inform an ever increasing demand for literacy skills for the professional and managerial classes” (4). Following Berlin and Connors, I take up the idea that literacy becomes defined, shaped, and distributed in ways that mediate the relationship between the sponsoring institution and larger social trends. That is, literacy becomes a tool to shape citizenship in response to societal shifts, such as the changes in work explored in my subsequent chapters. Berlin and Connors limit considerations of the citizen to the college-educated segment of the population, but these university-centric debates over writing requirements and standards reveal how notions of literacy are informed by general societal concerns about the health of the American citizenry, as expressed in early-twentieth-century public debates and proposed solutions to improve the state of citizenship. For instance, deliberations about immigration laws, the rise of public schooling, and the Americanization movement, to name a few, took place in a wide variety of spaces, including the academy, community groups, the media, the government, and unions.

Invocations of “citizenship” or “the citizen” in educational spaces often imply a cultivation of ideals through civic habits such as voting and participation. However, attributes such as productivity and hard work have also always been crucial characteristics of the U.S. brand of citizenship, particularly in spaces designed to prepare students for employment. Nowhere do we see this more than times of economic change, in which both formal and informal education become antidotes to broader societal anxieties and crises. When the influx of immigrant workers in the 1910s typically landed mass manufacturing jobs, Americanization programs could do the simultaneous work of teaching them English and teaching them how to function and behave in their new workplaces, all in the name of citizenship training. At the center of this connection between citizenship and literacy is the obligation to make curricula relevant in specific learning situations and in the face of beliefs about what literacy can and should help an individual to achieve.

This book has been inspired by the many projects in writing studies that explore the “extracurricular,” as Anne Ruggles Gere describes learning spaces outside of formal school settings. In order to gain a better understanding of citizenship and the ways it is activated in service of literacy training, I have brought together nonschool literacy training sites with the first-year composition classroom, focusing on these sites of extracurricular study for two main reasons. First, I want to illustrate how nonschool instantiations of literacy and citizenship worked together to influence the value of each. And second, I unpack the consequences of acquiring literacy for students who were not “mainstream” college students. Such an approach facilitates an examination of the many ways that literacy—emerging out of Americanization programs, defined by unions, or university-styled literacy born out of writing classrooms—was used to respond to anxieties surrounding changes in the occupational sphere as well as shifting demographics, with a certain kind of citizenship constructed for the students of each type of program.

Producing Good Citizens is based primarily on an examination of documents that played a role in the literacy and citizenship training of workers and immigrants in the early-twentieth-century period—limited circulation publications such as citizenship training books or factory training manuals, policy documents on educational programs, and public deliberations on such training—providing a better understanding of the ways citizenship and literacy converged across purposes for these often disenfranchised populations. I rely on sources that reveal the goals and rationales for teaching literacy, how teachers and architects of programs imagined students acquiring citizenship and literacy through their courses, and what these designers thought students would do with that citizenship and literacy once they left the classroom. The documents examined—labor newspapers, federally produced citizenship textbooks, conference proceedings, hearings, journals—came into contact with teachers or students and reveal rationalizations of the connection between literacy and citizenship in the practices of different literacy training sites. By following a number of citizenship training spaces, I examine how literacy training telegraphs an individual’s citizenship potential and subsequently, his or her access to a society’s resources.

This historical and theoretical investigation reveals how themes of work and productivity have been integral to how we imagine the citizen and also addresses how fluctuating concepts of citizenship have been embedded in practices of literacy training by examining literacy’s role in the distribution of societal resources during periods of economic restructuring such as those explored here. The good citizen constructed by this training is one who participates but must also meet eligibility criteria that speak to an individual’s potential for

productivity, often defined through educational background and along race, class, and gender lines, in order to become a full citizen. Analysis of citizenship training for immigrants and workers during a period of heightened citizenship anxiety also allows for comparison between the citizenship training of those with more tenuous citizenship status vis-à-vis the citizenship-producing mechanisms of the university, as well as a deeper understanding of how literacy is implicated in these different situations. Through a close examination of disciplining mechanisms like citizenship and work, I examine how economic opportunities and expectations (in the form of jobs and other resources) of those trying to gain citizenship status shape the credentialing potential of literacy in the pursuit of citizenship and, likewise, how literacy is used to mark a citizen's potential for productivity.

The first chapter provides the theoretical and historical framework for an investigation of this credentialing process in relation to literacy training in the United States. I introduce several key concepts from citizenship theory, such as Danielle Allen's "habits of citizenship," to illuminate how literacy training is a form of citizen-making and to lay the groundwork for the major questions addressed in the following chapters: In the classroom setting, is there a consistent idea of what is meant by citizenship or are there different ideas? What is the danger in letting these definitions remain unspoken? Why is citizenship such an appealing goal, and why is literacy often positioned as a means to acquire it? How is literacy imagined to extend the opportunities afforded by citizenship?

Chapters 2 through 4 address these questions by examining three sites of citizenship production—federal Americanization programs, union education, and university English classes, all from the period 1910–29. The literacy training documents analyzed reflect a worker-defined citizenship as developed by several different groups—the nation, the university, the union, the factory, and the community. Chapter 2 investigates the role of literacy training in immigrant Americanization programs during the early twentieth century, revealing a number of cultural lessons about citizenship. This chapter focuses on how the term "good citizen" became equated with productivity in emerging citizenship and literacy classes for immigrants as well as federal and community-produced training documents such as textbooks and guidebooks provided to immigrants by Americanization programs. Literacy training was used to promote a particular construction of citizenship to new immigrants, one that emphasized work habits in order to make *potential* citizens into *productive* citizens. An analysis of publications like federal Americanization textbooks, for instance, illuminates literacy's influence beyond the literacy test in the immigration debates of the era. The heightened stakes and impact of literacy during this moment

of economic change are also examined, such as in the move from a craft-producing and agricultural economy to a mass manufacturing one, as described by labor historians Herbert Gutman and David Montgomery. In this context, equating good work habits with characteristics such as productivity provides insights about the economic expectations and opportunities for potential citizens, with immigrants expected to internalize these habits in order to gain access to opportunities and to full citizenship.

Chapter 3 takes up literacy as it was used in worker education programs organized by the Workers' Education Bureau and the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) during the same time period. Unions such as the ILGWU and groups such as the Workers' Education Bureau used the concept of the citizen to produce a version of literacy intended to level the ground between workers and management. If government-sponsored literacy programs equated literacy with productivity, union-sponsored programs attempted a more liberatory approach, focusing on the creation of good citizens *of the labor movement* while employing the rhetoric of cultivating good citizens *of the country*. By examining at the motives behind literacy training for workers, I underscore the unions' belief in a kind of literacy hope. Authors of these documents consistently imagined citizens who acted intelligently, collectively, and on behalf of workers' conditions. By cultivating more educated, rhetorically savvy, and literate workers, unions wanted its members to gain the practical and intellectual tools to negotiate for labor reform within growing mass industry.

Chapter 4 examines higher education through histories of the teaching of college writing. Analyzing the development of the first-year writing class through the lens of work, this chapter explores how students' prospective work opportunities impacted the writing requirement's connection to the fulfillment of citizenship. Literacy training in higher education illustrates how the concept of citizenship was used to help construct a burgeoning middle class that took up the lessons of productivity for individual social mobility and stability. Teachers and administrators, particularly at public institutions, positioned university-styled literacy as a crucial component of a college education and, thus, of social mobility. The chapter examines literacy distribution through higher education, particularly how universities articulated the "usefulness" of literacy at the same time as they were developing into comprehensive institutions.

In chapter 5, I connect the historical context for the literacy training discussed in previous chapters with contemporary studies of citizenship and literacy. By focusing on the present, when citizenship production and economic change are still in play, I track how twenty-first-century trends in general ed-

education curricula, strategic plans in higher education, and education-oriented immigration policy such as the DREAM Act are connected to current ideals of citizen production. Extending the study of literacy teaching for citizenship production into the present underscores how changing economic opportunities affect our current expectations for productive citizenship and, subsequently, how educators manage those expectations as they attempt to create literate citizens.

Taken together, the training at these various sites reveals how literacy operates in negotiations of the terms of citizenship, not just for voting rights but also for access to a range of other citizenship practices in the form of resources such as education or power over working conditions. Citizenship and literacy operate together to persuasively categorize, sort, and credential individuals. The material effects of these categorizations are critical, especially when considering the impact and role education and literacy can play in a person's enactment of citizenship. Not only are education and literacy viewed as predicting the potential a person has to access citizenship, they also guide the kind of training that potential citizens receive, shape their understandings of the meaning of citizenship, and influence whether that citizenship can be fully realized or not. Particularly when the actualization of citizenship is seen solely as the responsibility of the individual, persistent inequalities among citizens can be justified despite an increasing access to literacy and other habits of citizenship.

At its core, *Producing Good Citizens* is an investigation of how various literacy educators attempt to produce good citizens within the auspices of training and education. By considering the implications of these conversations on our own practices of citizen-making through the teaching of literacy, this book is intended to create a sense of possibility. By making concrete aspirations for a more robust citizenship, rather than just a routine call to action, we can think about the habits of citizenship being cultivated through our practices. And we can respond to continuing changes to how citizenship is being defined, whether that definition is dependent on shifting boundaries from globalization, legal restrictions, public policy decisions, or an individual's economic contribution. In doing so, we acknowledge the limits of what citizenship can do for students and the limitations put upon students by the idea of citizenship, while simultaneously considering how educators engage those restrictions. Understanding such limitations helps students and teachers move beyond impoverished notions of citizenship and allow richer, more politically and materially situated notions to take root.