ABSTRACT: In this paper, we take a rhetorical approach to weblogs as social action, examining two sets of blogs: blogs responding to a national literary event called Canada Reads and “homeless blogs.” Taking up Miller and Shepherd’s proposal (2004) that the exigence of the blog is self-cultivation and validation, we examine how such an exigence may be met, not through addressing or building community, but through rhetors’ engagement with and arrangement for recognition in what Michael Warner calls “discursive publics” (WARNER, 2002, p. 121). By focusing on uptake (FREADMAN, 2002) as a public dynamic, we suggest how features of the blog such as blog posts and meta-generic commentary (GILTROW, 2002) about antecedent genres may enable a blogger to legitimate the self as an integral part and perpetuator of discursive publics: a blogger’s uptake both actualizes a discursive public (declaring membership), and imagines it anew (envisioning subsequent uptakes).
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When free and user-friendly “blogging” software applications such as Blogger and Edit This Page were launched in the summer of 1999, individuals had a new way to make writing public: the weblog, or blog, a frequently-updated website with entries, or “posts,” arranged in reverse-chronological order. In her history of the blog, veteran blogger Rebecca Blood notes that with the arrival of this software, early-style “filter” blogs, which sifted through internet content to provide links to and commentary on that content, were joined by so-called “diary” or “journal” blogs, which offered personal accounts of writers’ lives (BLOOD, 2000). Since then, further distinctions have evolved in relation to technical developments (e.g., “audio-blogs” or “video-blogs”), content (e.g., “political blogs” or “travel blogs”), and types of users (e.g., “teen blogs” or “corporate blogs”). Such distinctions, however, do not account for blogs’ social action, or for the ways we measure instances of the genre against our expectations of its social action. In this paper, we inquire about the evolving social action of blogs written by individuals for public consumption, the kind of blogs that Carolyn Miller and Dawn Shepherd focus on in “Blogging as Social Action” (2004). Miller and Shepherd characterize these blogs as united by a common exigence, a “widely shared, recurrent need for cultivation and validation of the self” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004). Looking at two sets of contemporary blogs, we ask how such an exigence may be met through rhetors’ engagement with and arrangement for recognition in what Michael Warner calls “discursive publics” (WARNER, 2002, p. 121).

Examining the combination of social factors in the late 1990s that gave rise to the blog, Miller and Shepherd conclude that the genre formed out of a kairos of “mediated voyeurism,
widely dispersed but relentless celebrity, unsettled boundaries between public and private, and new technology that disseminates these challenges beyond capital and corporations to individuals” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004). This *kairos* both called forth and acknowledged the blog as what Lloyd Bitzer would deem a “fitting” response (BITZER, 1968, p. 10) to an exigence of self-cultivation and validation. While questions about “the peculiar intersection of the public and private that weblogs seem to invite” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004) guide Miller and Shepherd throughout their inquiry, they shift their terms from *public* to *community*—a community of readers, a community of bloggers—based on “talk about” the genre or metageneric commentary (GILTROW, 2002, p. 187) from bloggers such as Blood (BLOOD, 2000) and Meg Hourihan (HOURIHAN, 2002) (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004). Turning to bloggers’ own reflections, Miller and Shepherd note that talk about self-expression and community is “ubiquitous,” adding, “Many bloggers see blogging as a way of developing relationships, via linking back, with an online community” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004). They thus invite us to consider whether the blog is a novel response to this exigence because bloggers can “engage in self-expression *in order to build community*” and “build community *in order to cultivate the self*” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004, emphasis theirs).

Like Miller and Shepherd, we take a new rhetorical approach to examine how blogging is recognized as social action (or, in our investigation, how types of blogging are recognized as social action), asking, in response, whether bloggers might achieve cultivation and validation of the self in ways that fall outside Miller and Shepherd’s interplay of self and community. In our individual studies, Kathryn examines Canadian bloggers united by their uptake of *Canada Reads*, an annual literary event produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), a public broadcaster, and fashioned after a popular reality TV show, *Survivor*: five celebrities each champion a literary work that they believe Canadians should read, and over the course of a five-day debate, they vote books off until only one remains, the sole “survivor.”  

Elizabeth studies the “homeless blog,” a blog written by homeless or formerly homeless people about the experience and circumstances of homelessness. Homeless bloggers like Kevin Barbieux (*The Homeless Guy*) and James McCoy (*Jamie’s Big Voice*) post personal narratives, ethnographic accounts of others’ experiences (through photos, interviews, and stories), editorials, and journalistic reports of services and policies affecting homeless people. What these two groups have in common is that the bloggers in each write as private individuals rather than under the aegis of a business, organization, or institution. The bloggers in both our sites of inquiry respond to an exigence of self-cultivation and validation by engaging directly with publics (the public of *Canada Reads*; the public surrounding homelessness) and arranging for their discourse to be recognized by these publics. We turn to one blogger’s posts about *Canada Reads 2006* to study engagements with a public, and then to a homeless blogger’s negotiations over antecedents to examine arrangements for a public. The dynamic of public engagement and public arrangement prompts us to revisit Miller and Shepherd’s suggestion that the blog expresses the self as a means to foster community and fosters community as a means to develop the self. Our bloggers may indeed build community—with loyal readers, with fellow bloggers, with “real-life” friends and family who read their posts—but their acts of public address construct a mediated self in other significant
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2 The semiotic ties between *Canada Reads* and the American TV hit *Survivor* were discernable in the CBC’s 2002 announcement that launched *Canada Reads*: it describes how “[d]ay by day” panelists “vote a book off the list until only one remains” (CLA, March 13, 2002); on *Survivor*, contestants stranded in a remote setting compete in “Challenges” (first in teams, then individually), and every three days, they vote off one person until only one survivor remains.
ways. In our examples, community seems a lesser concern: these bloggers “engage in self-expression” in order to write their selves into publics; their public participation in turn validates the self as holding—and being seen to hold—public subject positions (e.g., citizen, cultural critic, social activist). Moreover, it seems important to our bloggers to be recognized publicly as inhabiting subject positions that are less obviously public (“reader,” in Kathryn’s case, and “writer,” in Elizabeth’s).

We emphasize bloggers’ social action within publics by engaging Michael Warner’s theory of “discursive publics”: publics that are multi-textual, multi-vocal, multi-generic, and multi-media (WARNER, 2002, p. 90), publics that exist only “in relation to texts and their circulation” (WARNER, 2002, p. 66). Discursive publics therefore differ from social totalities—such as “Canadians” or “homeless people” or “tax accountants” (the subject of Amy Devitt’s 1991 study)—, which exist separately from the discourse that addresses them. And unlike members of John Swales’ discourse community, participants in a discursive public do not share “a commonality in goal” (SWALES, 1991, p. 25); rather, what binds “otherwise unrelated people” together as a public is that they have taken up the same texts “at different times and in different places” (WARNER, 2002, p. 68). Warner introduces the concept of “active uptake” (WARNER, 2002, p. 87) to explain how the “fiction of the public” (WARNER, 2002, p. 15) is reproduced. A public “exists by virtue of being addressed” (WARNER, 2002, p. 67, emphasis his): texts turn to a public someone, anticipating an uptake. And a public “is constituted through mere attention” (WARNER, 2002, p. 87, emphasis his): people who take up a text, however fleetingly, however distracted, are members of its public. Those addressed may differ from those who pay attention because of the text’s “circulatory fate” (WARNER, 2002, p. 114), actual uptakes (or the absence of uptakes) that are outside of its control: for example, a public text is taken up by a homeless blogger, a rhetor not likely imagined as part of its discursive public; a blogger addresses the public of Canada Reads, but no one reads her post. This gap between the discursive public that a text imagines and the discursive public that a text realizes (WARNER, 2002, p. 114) is significant to our analyses of bloggers’ social actions.

Uptake is essential to the engagement and arrangement of discursive publics. The gap between imagined and actualized discursive publics requires that we pay special attention to uptake along two trajectories: blogs take up public texts, and blogs are taken up publicly by other texts. In genre theory, “uptake” is Anne Freadman’s term, used to describe the “bi-directional
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3 There appears to be a productive overlap between Warner’s theory of a discursive public and Carolyn Miller’s theory of rhetorical community that deserves extensive contemplation beyond the time constraints of this paper. But we offer some preliminary connections. Miller aims to move beyond a taxonomic collective (speech community) and relational collective (discourse community) by positing a rhetorical community as a “virtual collective” (MILLER, 1994, p. 73) that includes “the ‘other’” (MILLER, 1994, p. 74), a definition that may meet one of Warner’s criteria: “a public is a relation among strangers” (WARNER, 2002, p. 67). Like Warner’s “fiction of the public” (WARNER, 2002, p. 15), Miller’s rhetorical community is a “rhetorical construct” (MILLER, 1994, p. 73). We favour Warner for his emphasis on the circulation of texts (rather than a collective) and these texts’ dependence on uptake in order to constitute a discursive public. While genre is one of Warner’s many concerns in positing a discursive public, genre is foundational in Miller’s theory of a rhetorical community; as such, her work would offer a more nuanced understanding of genre’s role within a public.

4 The bloggers that we study do not share a common goal with the discursive public that they take up. For instance, two bloggers that take up the public of Canada Reads might seek different outcomes; a blogger and a news reporter might both be interested in homelessness but have dissimilar purposes. Swales himself offers a good illustration of the difference between discourse communities and discursive publics: “The fact that the shared object of study is, say, the Vatican, does not imply that students of the Vatican in history departments, the Kremlin, dioceses, birth control agencies and liberation theology seminaries form a discourse community” (SWALES, 1991, p. 25). These disparate rhetors are, however, members of a discursive public, for they take up the same texts.
relation” between (at minimum) a “pair of texts” (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 40). Working with Charles S. Peirce’s concept of the “interpretant” (PEIRCE, 1867-8), Freadman argues that a “text is contrived to secure a certain class of uptakes” and its interpretant text either “confirms its generic status by conforming itself to this contrivance” or modifies or denies this status “by taking its object as some other kind” (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 40). Warner insists that uptake, the link between texts, must have a “social character”: the link “is not mere consecutiveness in time but an interaction” (WARNER, 2002, p. 90). Freadman concurs: uptake is not “automatic”; rather, uptake “selects, defines, or represents its object” from a pool of “possible others” (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 48). The apparent seamlessness of uptake, though, can result in genre sequences (a ramified series of uptakes) that produce official narratives (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 43): for example, “The Canada Reads panelists deemed that we should all read this book, and Canadians did so” or “homeless people need others to speak for them.” The uptake by bloggers, we argue, reveals “possible others,” alternative viewpoints that these seamless narratives conceal: a Canadian blogger rejects the book recommended by the Canada Reads celebrity panel; a homeless blogger counters stereotypes of the homeless as having nothing to offer. Further, the “moment of uptake that constitutes a public can be seen as an expression of volition on the part of its members,” Warner argues, which enables us to conceptualize publics as “scenes of self-activity”: the “direction of our glance can constitute our social world” (WARNER, 2002, p. 89). Engaging with and arranging for publics, then, enable bloggers to meet the exigence of self-cultivation and validation.

Public engagements, seen as a means to form our social world, enable a blogger to legitimate the self as an integral part and perpetuator of discursive publics: a blogger’s uptake both actualizes a discursive public (declaring membership) and imagines it anew (envisioning subsequent uptakes). Efforts to understand public engagements—why individuals mark their belonging to discursive publics—reinforce Freadman’s contention that genre is “more usefully applied to the interaction of, minimally, a pair of texts than to the properties of a single text” (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 40). In studying bloggers’ uptakes of Canada Reads, Kathryn examines genre pairs, which entails a shift in textual focus from the blog to blog posts, dated entries that are interpretant texts of public texts about Canada Reads. In blog posts, we can discern rhetors’ uptakes of specific public events and private happenings: these individual uptakes each disclose something of the self, and, taken together, the posts meet the blog’s exigence of self-cultivation and validation. If, as Warner argues, the “direction of our glance can constitute our social world,” then blog posts are a materialization of this glance, an intricate view of a blogger’s social world and place within it.

Why do bloggers engage the Canada Reads public? Their uptakes serve two exigencies: that of Canada Reads and that of the blog itself. The rhetorical situation of Canada Reads has a governing exigence, choose a book for the nation to read, which is met by an official genre sequence (texts produced by the CBC) that includes a shortlist announcement, the five-day debates, and the winner announcement. While many people perceive the exigence of Canada Reads (a nationally recognizable event), some individuals feel the “situated motive” (BAWARSHI, 2003, p. 37) to act upon this exigence in a variety of genres: for example, taking up the shortlist announcement by hosting a “book club discussion,” participating in a “debate” at a local library, or writing a “winner prediction” in a blog post. While all of these generic uptakes act on the Canada Reads exigence, the uptake in a blog seems a particularly fitting response as it enables a rhetor to respond to a public exigence in public: while a rhetor in a book club speaks to a group, and a rhetor in a library addresses an audience, the rhetor in a blog may imagine a public readership. These different ways of participating in Canada Reads underscore Freadman’s
argument that uptake is not “automatic,” but the “taking of an object” from “a set of possibles” (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 48). Bloggers’ genre selection—choosing the “winner prediction” in a blog instead of a different genre to act on the exigence of Canada Reads—affects the ways in which these rhetors can act within the rhetorical situation; as Anis Bawarshi reminds us, genres not only help rhetors to “articulate motives or desires” through writing, but also help rhetors to “obtain motives and desires to write” (BAWARSHI, 2003, p. 12). By taking up the blog, a “cultural artifact” (MILLER, 1984, p. 164; BAWARSHI, 2003, p. 41) already embodying the social motives of self-cultivation and validation, rhetors act on the public exigence to choose a book for the nation in a way that expresses and legitimizes the self.

The blog offers rhetors the ability to cultivate and validate the self through posts in a wide range of recognizable genres, a generous pool of “possible others” from which to construct the self in relation to Canada Reads and its exigence. For instance, public texts from Canada Reads 2006 were taken up by John Mutford in posts on his blog, The Book Mine Set. A self-described “book geek,” Mutford refers to Canada Reads as his literary “Superbowl” because “the game of Canada Reads” appeals to him (MUTFORD, Feb. 19, 2006). He took up the 2006 shortlist announcement in posts of three different genres, each constructing a different facet of self. First, he wrote posts recognizable as informal “book reviews” of the competing titles (e.g., MUTFORD, Jan. 4, 2006; Jan. 10, 2006; Feb. 5, 2006); these reviews constructed a self as public reader. He next took up the shortlist announcement in two posts—“Who Should Win” (MUTFORD, Feb. 19, 2006) and “Who Will Win” (MUTFORD, Feb. 20, 2006)—that are recognizable from similar generic instances when critics predict who “should” win (based on merit) and who “will” win (based on politics and other factors) an upcoming sports or cultural event (e.g., The Superbowl or The Oscars). These posts enabled Mutford to cultivate a public self as literary critic and Canada Reads expert. His genre selection and assumed subject positions—confident reader, literary critic, Canada Reads expert—lent Mutford the credibility to then take up the five-day literary debate in posts written in the “daily recap” genre (MUTFORD, Apr. 17-21, 2006), through which he adopted subject positions of “play-by-play announcer” and “colour commentator” for his bookish Superbowl. His engagement with Canada Reads produced texts that held the potential to circulate his opinions—opinions of a knowledgeable, trustworthy self; opinions that often countered those voiced by the celebrity panelists—within its discursive
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5 For Canada Reads 2005, these posts included the “to read” list (FABULOUS ALEX takes up the shortlist announcement with a post that lists the five books as “new additions to [her] ‘to read’ list” (FABULOUS ALEX, Feb. 22, 2005)); the “blog news commentary” (Autumn, taking up the shortlist announcement, offers her opinions about the books (AUTUMN, Nov. 18/19, 2004)); and the “addict confession” (a blogger takes up the debate about one contending title and writes, “My name is James, and I have a problem. I’ve recently started reading novels and I think I might be hooked. It started with Canada Reads” (KOOLE, Mar. 17, 2005)). While the “blog news commentary” genre label comes from Kathryn, the identification of the genre arises from a meta-generic description by blogger Rebecca Blood. In “Weblogs: A History and Perspective,” she describes the “style” of pioneer weblogs, which “[m]any current weblogs follow”: “Their editors [bloggers] present links both to little-known corners of the web and to current news articles they feel are worthy of note. Such links are nearly always accompanied by the editor’s commentary” (BLOOD, 2000). She proposes that blogs that predominantly include posts aligning with her meta-generic description are filter-style weblogs (BLOOD, 2000), a generic type taken up by Herring et al. in their depiction of the filter blog as containing “observations and evaluations of external, typically public events” (HERRING et al., 2005). The bloggers that Kathryn studies sometimes take up public events in posts that meet Blood’s description and other times take up public events and private happenings in posts of different genres; as a result, she suggests that Blood’s meta-generic explanation, as it pertains to “current weblogs,” might be more productively applied to the genre of specific posts rather than to the genre of entire blogs.

6 The Superbowl is the championship game of the USA’s National Football League.
public, thereby possibly disrupting the seamless narrative of *Canada Reads* and potentially influencing others’ views about which book Canadians should read.

Mutford’s actualization of the *Canada Reads* public, however, did not assure him that others would take up his texts. Freadman’s emphasis (following Peirce) on uptake’s infinite semiosis (FREADMAN, 2002, p. 42) reminds us that each generic instance takes up a previous text and assumes subsequent uptakes will follow; Warner would suggest that each text circulating in a discursive public both realizes that public and imagines it anew. We turn to Elizabeth’s site of inquiry, the homeless blog, to illustrate how bloggers not only engage with publics but make arrangements for their own texts to be recognized as participating in them. Just as bloggers actualize the discursive public imagined by *Canada Reads*, homeless bloggers signal that they are part of the publics that take up texts about homelessness. In posts responding to a wide range of such texts—from newspaper editorials to TV news reports to government policy documents—homeless bloggers show that they are part of these texts’ discursive publics. Bloggers offer perspectives on homelessness not often heard, like Nashville-based Kevin Baribieux, whose blog *The Homeless Guy* was the first such blog to receive a significant number of public uptakes. Inserting the homeless blog into a circulating body of texts about homelessness, bloggers respond to and expand the exigence of self-cultivation and validation by arranging for new subject positions not only for themselves but for other homeless people: as writers, advocates, and citizens.

Since uptake is not automatic, how, then, do bloggers like Baribieux arrange for uptakes of their discourse that will confirm its social action? How might a rhetor like Baribieux, turning to the blog as a genre that might accommodate his needs, negotiate the possibilities for both generic innovation and misrecognition of that innovation? Baribieux’s genre-talk about his blog suggests that meta-generic claims about what Kathleen Jamieson called “antecedent genres” (JAMIESON, 1975, p. 407) played an important part in his arrangements for public uptake. The evolution of...
Barbieux’s blog, and of the homeless blog genre, suggests that though the blog may provide the impulse to address a public in the service of self-cultivation and validation, rhetors may refine this impulse in the anticipation and experience of uptake. Barbieux initially took up the blog in August 2002 in a spirit of uncertainty, writing in one of his first posts, “Well, here I am. I've done it - gone blog. Now what happens?” (BARBIEUX, Aug. 20, 2002). His question suggests that he recognized the blog as a genre embodying form and motive, but was unsure what kind of uptakes were likely or possible for his own blog. By the fall of that year, Barbieux had attracted the attention of Salon.com journalist Noah Shachtman, one of several journalists who would write about The Homeless Guy. For Shachtman, Barbieux’s blog was clearly a journal or “Internet diary”—of the same kind that tells readers “what cereal a total stranger eats for breakfast or how he feels about invading Iraq”—albeit a diary with novel content, with Barbieux revealing “what it's like to sleep in a '71 Ford Granada” (SHACHTMAN, 2002, p. 1). At the same time, Shachtman reports Barbieux as having written that his “intention is to legitimize homeless people” (SHACHTMAN, 2002, p. 1), and thus acknowledges the social action to which Barbieux’s blog aspires. While the article gestures to the exigence that The Homeless Guy seeks to address, uptakes that stress the diary, as Shachtman does, draw attention to a genre not associated with that exigence or ambition: diaries do not commonly legitimize the class of people to which the diarist belongs.

Barbieux’s case suggests that rhetors may invoke multiple antecedent genres in order to refine or secure a certain class of uptakes, especially in the face of competing claims about antecedent genres. Barbieux’s subsequent invocations of antecedent genres countered assertions that the blog is simply a diary. Telling Shachtman and a USA Today reporter (HUMPHREY, 2003), and writing in a September 9, 2002 blog post (a month after the Shachtman article) that he had previously edited and published a street newspaper called Homeword, Barbieux offered the street newspaper as an alternative antecedent genre to the self-focused diary—an antecedent recognizable as providing “a voice for a once unheard community” (VAN LIER, 1999, p. 16). In a September 10, 2002 post on his blog, he points to another antecedent genre, the “flyer” or “pamphlet” of the kind his friend used to publish “describing life at the Mission” (BARBIEUX, Sept. 10, 2002); like the street newspaper, this antecedent situates the blog in a set of public genres that speak out on behalf of others. As his ability to arrange for uptakes becomes more secure, Barbieux begins to point toward the homeless blog itself, seeking out and listing links to other homeless blogs—consolidating the status of the genre—rather than pointing toward antecedents.

He also draws attention to the genre sequences in which he has secured a place for the rhetor and audience(s), the nature of the recurrent exigence, the decorum (or “fittingness” in Bitzer’s term) of response” (MILLER & SHEPHERD, 2004). This paper examines public meta-generic commentary about antecedent genres, suggesting that gesturing to the presence of an antecedent may also facilitate, rather than constrain, the social action of the blog.

Although a detailed examination of other uptakes of homeless blogs is beyond the scope of this short paper, bloggers like Barbieux must continue to take into account new uptakes of the homeless blog which may make competing meta-generic claims about the blog, including meta-generic comments about what antecedents inform it. Barbieux complains in 2002, for instance, about uptakes of his blog that take it as a prelude to begging rather than a literary performance: “On other sites the PayPal donation button is considered a tip jar, but on my site it’s considered panhandling?” (BARBIEUX, Sept. 19, 2002). In the case of the homeless blog, rhetors are faced with and must negotiate a resurgence of such uptakes when media directs attention to new instantiations of the genre, in turn often redirecting attention to more established instantiations.

In a March 2006 post, for example, Barbieux draws our attention to an article about a “New Homeless Blog,” Michael Brown’s View from the Sidewalk,” and requests: “I would like to create an up-to-date blogroll [a list of
his blog, as when he refers to students who have contacted him for school projects—projects about homelessness, not just about Barbieux (BARBIEUX, Dec. 5, 2004). His continual pointing to his successful arrangements legitimizes the self as an integral part and perpetuator of discursive publics, and confirms that Barbieux is speaking not only for himself but for the benefit of others.

In our examples, Mutford publicly engages with Canada Reads to construct a self who has meaningful opinions about which book the nation should choose, and Barbieux continually arranges for his blog to be recognized by others as public discourse on homelessness; their efforts demonstrate how the blog allows for a great deal of flexibility and innovation as rhetors act on an exigence of self-cultivation and validation. This flexibility is not unbounded, but requires ongoing negotiations: Mutford’s negotiations for different subject positions (reader, critic, expert) through different interpretant texts; Barbieux’s negotiations to cultivate and validate not only himself but other homeless people through different antecedent genres. In our examples, the flexibility of and constraints on the genre cannot be understood by examining its address to a social or bounded totality, as would be the case for genres like the journal article or office memo. Understanding these blogs’ generic potential and limitations entails a conceptualization of publics, not of communities. Michael Warner’s theory of publics and Anne Freadman’s theory of uptake offer ways to examine the evolution of public genres: how typification is recognized in publics, and how addressivity (BAKHTIN, 1986, p. 95) works in publics where uptake is not guaranteed. In the gap between a public imagined and a public realized, we find the potential for conflict and exclusion that Freedman and Medway (FREEDMAN & MEDWAY, 1994, p. 9, 11), and later Coe, Lingard, and Teslenko (COE, LINGARD & TESLENKO, 2002, p. 6) suggest are important to understand the political and ideological ramifications of generic developments. In applying their calls to public genres, we need to ask what kinds of publics are formed and perpetuated by these genres? Who is included in and who is excluded from the dynamic of public engagements and arrangements? What seamless narratives are constructed through public uptakes? What ends do public social actions serve? These questions compel us to study not only genres that enable private individuals to address a public (such as online book reviews, comments pages on newspaper websites, and personal profiles on social networking sites) but public genres more broadly (for instance, literary works, television news reports, and documentaries) with a focus on the roles that ideology and power play in generic evolution.
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