CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Update Culture

This book evolved from an unusual phenomenon that occurred while I was interviewing a blogger as part of a project about participatory audiences. The project investigated how digital writers consider their audiences who write back to them, often via comments. In 2013, I interviewed the blogger Kelly Salasin over the phone. I sat in my mother's home in Philadelphia, and Kelly sat in her home in Vermont. While we were talking about a blog post of hers that was spotlighted by the *New York Times*, we both had her blog open on our respective computers. Kelly sat in her home, reading through her blog posts as I asked her questions about the local tragedy she had blogged about. A funny thing began to happen. As I asked her questions about her blog posts and writing processes, she would say, "I need to update that." And then she would.

As soon as I'd leave the webpage and return, new changes would appear without any indication the blog post had been different moments before. I asked Kelly if she changed her texts based on the comments she received. "All the time," she said. "If the comments are any good, I'll change my posts." At one point, Kelly even remarked, "My own perception of a post can change depending on the comment." She pointed me to a series of her blog posts that had received numerous comments and thousands of pageviews.[1] "I went back and read each post again and again," she said, "because I heard from all sorts of [commenters]." Kelly talked at length about the work and time she put into her writing *after* it was already floating around on the internet, that is, after it was published to the internet and circulating on social media. As her writing was circulating, sometimes due to her actions and sometimes due to the actions of others, such as the *New York Times*, she found herself attending to the comments.

Years later, and after continuing to interview dozens more digital writers, I realized participants made changes to their texts based on audience comments. Even more frequently, those writers attended to their feedback and made savvy decisions based on comments and other

indicators of reception, such as Facebook Likes or Twitter Retweets. My interview data demonstrate that as digital writing circulates, it does not do so statically or without making a claim on those who initially wrote it. These data illustrate a fundamental shift in the analytic and inventive focus from an end product of writing to the emergent responses to online commenters. To be clear, print writers deal with editors, and newspapers print letters to the editor. However, social media is different from this response due to the scale of response and the real-time responsivity. Due to these factors, digital writers make a variety of decisions and engage in a remarkable range of activities after they initially complete a digital text.

This book argues that these decisions and activities are not only important considerations but are perhaps even more important than the analysis of the first text a digital writer produces. While most scholarship in writing studies continues to examine the end product, even as that end product circulates and changes, I suggest we examine how digital writers' processes and strategies change over the course of time as they experience their audiences' reactions and responses. In other words, this book documents and analyzes digital writers' decisions *after* a text has been composed and *during* its delivery. While print writers have in some ways always dealt with the afterlife of their texts, such as novelists going on book tours or journalists going on television to discuss an article, the internet and social media have greatly intensified this afterlife, as well as made the activities of this afterlife extremely heterogeneous. In an age of participatory audiences and audience comments on a "published" piece of writing, digital writers can now see how audience interaction impacts the reception of their texts—in real time and over long periods of time. Seeing and reading this audience reception influence the way digital writers *write during the circulation of their texts*, which is not possible for print-based writing. It is an outgrowth of real-time social media writing, wherein changes made to a "published" text can be read by internet audiences almost instantaneously. And in rhetorical terms, digital writers' new *topoi* (commonplaces) don't just inform their primary creative act. Rather, online audiences pose new *topoi* and change *doxa* (common beliefs) that beg for additional inventive possibilities and interactions.

To be sure, writing studies scholars have started to attend to the ecological and circulatory elements of writing, a conversation distilled in Laurie Gries and Collin Brooke's edited collection *Circulation, Writing, and Rhetoric* (2018), as well as in Gries's individual work (2013, 2015) and Dustin Edwards's work (2017, 2018). Circulation has engendered

an extensive conversation in writing studies that includes rethinking and critiquing the canons in light of seismic changes in semiotic resources and modalities (Brooke 2009; Prior et al. 2007), as well as moving beyond classroom practices of writing (Dobrin 2011). This diverse conversation on circulation—or more accurately, conversations—includes remodeling delivery (Porter 2009; Ridolfo 2012; Ridolfo and DeVoss 2009; Trimbur 2000; Yancey 2004), distant reading and thin description (D. Mueller 2018), addressing the economies of circulations (Chaput 2010; Eyman 2015; Johnson-Eilola 1995; LeCourt 2017), algorithms, bots, and propaganda (Laquintano and Vee 2017), multimodality and remixing (Dubisar and Palmeri 2010), fandom (DeLuca 2018), self-publishing (Laquintano 2016), and the effects of circulation on digital tools and researchers (Solberg 2012). Moreover, new media researchers have addressed circulation in the context of metrics (Beer 2016) and neoliberalism (Dean 2005). Writing studies theory on circulation has also bled into the digital humanities, addressing feminist historiography (Enoch and Bessette 2013), virality (Wuebben 2016), and attention (Horn, Beveridge, and Morey 2016). At the intersection of circulation, writing studies, and the digital humanities lies Jim Ridolfo's work on textual diaspora, or the idea that the existence and circulation of manuscripts communicate the existence of a people (Ridolfo 2013, 2015).

While this body of work is productive and certainly an improvement on older static models, such as Lloyd Bitzer's rhetorical situation (1968), these conversations trace the evolution of texts, conversations, and discourse as they circulate rather than what writers or speakers are doing as that discourse evolves. These conversations on circulation focus intently on content rather than on the processes of those who wrote or initiated that content.

In terms of circulation, writing studies considers the life of documents, texts, and other discourse as they move outside the control of the initial writer or content creator. James Porter (2009) has even gone so far as to posit, "Circulation refers to the potential for [a] message to have a document life of its own and be re-distributed without your direct intervention" (213). This approach, while an important and necessary element to address, has left largely unattended the circulatory activity of writers who initiate discourse, leaving circulatory writing processes ripe for study. By studying these neglected circulatory writing processes, we can better learn about what digital writers do after they've published a text and delivered an argument. We can learn about the ways digital writers create audiences and attract attention for their texts to increase circulation. We can also learn how digital writers develop novel inventive

strategies for selecting which comments to respond to as a primary inventive act that grows their digital *ethos* or brand. Opening up these processes assists us in seeing all the various activities and responsibilities writers have *after* they've written—and in turn, the ways those activities shape how they write.[2]

For example, in Gries's highly useful concept of iconographic tracking (2013, 2015), Shepard Fairey's image of Obama remixes rapidly, spreading into sometimes shocking contexts and purposes. The images themselves, rather than those who composed them or edited them, are of primary concern for researchers engaged in iconographic tracking. Circulation here seems to focus upon the *results* of the circulation, not necessarily on the writerly processes of circulation. I propose an alternative view of circulation: what if circulation in writing studies focused on how writers or discourse producers alter their activities in response to audience input? An analogy here might be a scenario in which Shepherd Fairey decided to change the color or aesthetic style of his image in response to critical tweets or perhaps created a new image in response to a critical mass of suggestions.

Thus, as its subject matter, this book asks, *What are writers doing once their writing is in circulation?* This book responds to this broad question about circulation by extending this concern to digital writing and rhetoric. It asks the following: What are writers doing during the circulation of their *digital* texts and how are they doing it? Furthermore, how do their writing styles change and adapt over time as they learn how to predict or negotiate their audiences' public praise, criticism, or myriad forms of online interaction? My short answer is that, due to the speed, frequency, scale, and access of audience participation on the internet, writers attend to the afterlife of their texts through a variety of strategies that fuse oralities and literacies through what I call *textual timing, textual attention,* and *textual management* (chapters 3, 4, and 5 of this book).

The speed, frequency, scale, and accessibility of circulating discourse have inaugurated what I label an *update culture,* one in which writers like Kelly attend to comments on their writing, write continuously in response, and contend with emergent audiences at extreme intensity. And, potentially, digital writers can never cease responding to these readers, especially if these writers are committed to answering their commenters' questions. More precisely, update culture is an ongoing expectation to reread, edit, and update texts in digital environments mediated by interactive internet interfaces—think here of social media applications wherein average users do not need to know how to program or use markup language. Update culture describes a type of digital semiosis in

which audiences and writers are engaged in discursive exchanges with one another. To rethink Roland Barthes's claim about the death of the author, the digital writer is often alive, answering questions and responding to comments from the audience—along with a variety of other activities. This call and response enables digital writing and rhetoric to exist in a state of flux and fluidity. Boundaries between texts, words, conversations, and digital activity become fluid and changeable—ideas I turn to in the conclusion of this book. As legal scholar Peter Tiersma (2010) notes in *Parchment, Paper, Pixels,* "The distinction between speech and writing is not as clear-cut as it once was. Modern technologies have made it possible to preserve speech for long periods of time as well as to transmit it over long distances" (13–14).

While writing studies and rhetoric scholars understand speech and writing were never entirely separate, update culture extends and reorients this description because it emerges from a particular technology: interactive and participatory internet (IPI) templates. This book consequently offers the claim that an important part of studying update culture lies in assessing how templates influence both the comments audiences leave as well as how digital writers negotiate these comments. These templates are structures that provide decorum and, following James Brown Jr.'s *Ethical Programs: Hospitality and the Rhetorics of Software* (2015), Wendy Chun's *Updating to Remain the Same: Habitual New Media* (2016), and Steve Holmes's *The Rhetoric of Videogames as Embodied Practice: Procedural Habits* (2017), habits for users, thereby providing *expectations* about how to write and communicate. I use *decorum*, following Robert Hariman (1992), to mean "a dynamic practice of social composition for rhetorical effect" (150). More simply, templates provide conventions and expectations about how to write digitally, and templates prefigure the writer-audience relationship. Although I say more about templates in chapter 2, for now, you might think of an empty Facebook profile or a content-management system such as WordPress. An everyday person can communicate with these templates without any specialized computer expertise. By providing decorum, habits, and expectations of continuous communication, these templates provide the technological capability previous technologies such as the cuneiform tablet, the scroll, the codex, and the book did not enable. These templates enable the slide among reading, writing, talking, and listening to become easier—and confirm that the digital rhetoric theories of the 1990s and early 2000s have been borne out (Gurak 2003; Lanham 1993; Welch 1999). Templates enable users to talk through, around, and with text. They allow, as many new media theorists have argued, communication similar to the speed of

talking but through writing. In the context of these templates, writing and digital communication can be updated, edited, and revised. The *expectation* in update culture is that texts circulate rapidly, words mutate, and images become modified—what Jim Ridolfo and Dànielle Nicole DeVoss (2009) call "rhetorical velocity," with respect to the movement of texts, and what Gries's *Still Life with Rhetoric* (2015) has documented as the changing evolution of images through iconographic tracking.

This book thus makes two overall claims. First, update culture is a contemporary phenomenon related to internet interfaces that I call *interactive and participatory internet (IPI) templates.* These templates, as structures for everyday users, encourage a continuous process of rewriting and rereading texts with the expectation that digital texts will be different at subsequent times (Gallagher 2017). As Katelyn Burton (2015) has observed in an analysis of various digital media, the digital world is not as permanent as we might think. We now *expect* digital writing and rhetoric to be mutable in ways simply not possible with previous forms of media and interfaces. It's tempting, then, to focus on how rhetoric flows, as many circulation theories have. By contrast, templates show where procedural rhetorics produce constraints, such as creative constraints like procedural enthymemes (Brock and Shepherd 2016). While many prior forms of media and interfaces enabled certain aspects similar to update culture, IPI templates have encouraged an expectation of rapid and scaled exchange.

Second, writers cope with and react to update culture in ways that result in departures from writing processes that do not account for these rapid expectations. I aim to *document* the ways individual writers do this by identifying and analyzing the decisions writers make and execute given their impressions of their participatory audiences. I am not simply arguing that writers employ strategies to contend with rapid audience response. I document *how* they do so. While I reference some theoretical contexts such as habitus or new materialism in the context of circulation work, I also bolster these approaches with qualitative data. Methodologically, rather than taking a theoretical approach to update culture, I take a descriptive, empirical approach of forty case studies of digital writers, and I attempt to extrapolate some of the broader implications of these descriptions. Very broadly, I find that writers use oral modes of communication to describe their own writing tactics.[3] The three primary strategies my participants reported and demonstrated were timing, attention, and management. I focus primarily on these writers because they cope with update culture *taken to its highest intensity* in that they actively consider their audience participation.

THE INTERVENTION OF THIS BOOK

To describe the intervention of this book, I offer context about the relationship between writers and their audiences. In the fields of writing studies and rhetoric, researchers have frequently investigated how writers, speakers, and rhetors produce discourse. Less frequently but still regularly, they study how audiences receive discourse, that is, texts, visuals, videos, and GIFs. As Jens Kjeldsen (2016) reminds us, "If we really want to understand rhetoric and argumentation we have to understand audiences, we have to study how people receive, interpret, and respond to instances of rhetoric" (138). While some research, particularly marketing-oriented studies as well as fandom studies (see, for example, Barnes 2015; DeLuca 2018; Jenkins 2008, 2013; Potts et al. 2018; Reagle 2010), has engaged in empirical study of the reception of television shows, films, and texts, the study of audience reception occurs less frequently because it is expensive and time-consuming and does not necessarily yield new insights (the null case). Even less studied is the topic of this book: how writers, speakers, and rhetors respond to audience reception. Methodological and technological considerations confront this third type of research. Do writers and communicators even have audience reception? How often and in what ways? Can they respond to audience reception? Will they? How is this different from the role of an editor in the postproduction inventional process?

While these questions could have been posed in the past, answers would have been found less frequently and with more difficulty before the rise of IPI templates because, as I noted at the outset of this introduction, these templates enable real-time, synchronous audience reception to be reacted and responded to on the part of writers. These templates open digital communication to nonspecialists who cannot author their own websites. With these templates, digital writers can see part of their audience reception by reading through digital comments and tracking analytical data. Due to web-scraping techniques that can make use of templates and application programming interfaces (APIs) that record input data, we can effectively document audience reception at scales never before possible (with profoundly new ethical considerations, too).

While reaction to editorial feedback has been well documented, reaction to the participatory audiences' reception has not been well established. There are a few examples of television audiences affecting the storyline of a television show, but they are rare. Netflix and other algorithmically driven services have harnessed reactions to certain shows, directors, and actors. For example, the 2013 show *House of Cards* was algorithmically developed based on audience behaviors (Hallinan

and Striphas 2016, 128). Nevertheless, editors are often present and function to serve as intermediaries.

Participatory audiences, via their comments, are different from editors for five reasons. First, participatory audiences are not offering feedback meant for a draft or revision. They are reading a text they perceive as published, or the internet equivalent of published. Second, participatory audiences are often literally much closer to a writer's text. I often label this latter individual the *initial writer*. That is, participatory audiences often have a writing space designed on or near an initial writer's text, such as a comment function. We might even label commenters *responding writers*. Third, because they have a readily accessible space designated for commenting and reacting, participatory audiences can respond much faster and in greater numbers than editors. Fourth, participatory audiences are not acting as mediators between readers and writers. They *are* the readers. Finally, participatory audiences are heterogeneous. Whereas a writer might have at most a few official editors, digital writers can have innumerable participatory audiences, many of whom are unexpected and, quite often, unwanted. The contribution of this book is primarily to document and analyze how digital writers communicate *after* the production of a text and *during* its circulation. Writing has an afterlife those in writing studies, I believe, should attend. My claim here gives rise to the title of this book: *Update Culture and the Afterlife of Digital Writing.*

THE TERM *UPDATE*

At the outset of this book, I need to explain the phrase *update culture*. I use the word *update* for three reasons. First, *update* echoes the print notions of *update*, such as when a newspaper issues a correction to a story in subsequent issues. This use of the word *update* invokes not an entire break from prior media but a *remediated* connection (Bolter and Grusin 2000). Digital updates can be made to the same article, in rapid succession, over the course of a few hours, days, or weeks. Second, *update* folds in the language of software updates. Because we encounter updates in our smartphones, mobile devices, and computer software, I locate update culture as part of digital culture and digital rhetoric. Third, *update* implies not only that new information can appear but also that information may be recycled or rewritten based on new input. Entire texts are not always entirely rewritten—parts and segments of them are revised or edited at a high intensity. It is a more granular process than Ridolfo and DeVoss's (2009) concept of rhetorical velocity. In update

culture, then, an expectation of updating is accepted and acceptable. Writers must contend with this expectation.

HISTORICAL FORMS OF UPDATE CULTURE

It's important to note that update culture is not a radical break or emergence from the past. My approach hopefully avoids, following the example of other researchers and public critics, positing the present as radically new. If update culture is not radically new, then it is more a dramatic intensification of historical antecedents and precedence. While print writers had to attend to the afterlife of their writing, the scale, scope, and frequency of that afterlife exceed print analogues. Update culture in this sense extends three historical concerns: (1) frequency and overload, (2) marginalia and comment culture, and (3) a movement from mass literacy and authorship to mass revision.

Digital writing often faces charges from authors such as Nicolas Carr (2010) and Sherry Turkle (2011) of force-feeding readers and writers too much information. Frequency and overload are assumed in update culture, notably the intense frequency of producing text and reengaging texts after the initial production of discourse. Frequency and overload do not appear ex nihilo because of technology, however. They are historically bound and imbricated with past uses of writing.

Frequent writing has played an important role since at least Julius Caesar's initiation of the *acta diurna* in the Roman Republic. The *acta diurna* ("daily acts"), or the *acta diurna populi Romani* ("daily acts of the Roman people"), was a daily gazette—a sort of newspaper without the paper—of official acts carved into stone or metal in public places or forums. The *acta diurna*, which continued "publication" from 59 BCE to the third century CE, is a very old example of what some critics identify as a new problem: writing is a frequent occurrence. While critics like Carr and Turkle maintain that twenty-first-century reading and writing are too frequent and rapid to allow readers to maintain focus and attention, the *acta diurnal* is just one historical example of the increased frequency of writing. Jeremiads that argue digital writing is too frequent and overloads readers miss the histories of reading and writing.

The view that writing is too frequent and rapid is contestable, particularly in light of Ann Blair's *Too Much to Know* (2011). Blair argues convincingly against the "decline narrative" offered by academic and public technocritics who see the present as an ineffective era for maintaining attention and, in my view, want to refocus readers to appropriate topics

worthy of study. As Blair writes, "The decline narrative has been used for centuries and continues to appeal today, often fueled by general anxieties rather than specific changes. But given the long history of the trope, it seems no more appropriate to our context than it does to the Renaissance or the Middle Ages when it was used so extensively" (267). While Blair's aim is to document the ways Renaissance writers, scholars, and readers managed an unprecedented (for that time) scale of information, the broad goal in *Too Much to Know* is to offer "some historical perspective on our current concerns" of information overload (5).

Blair's text offers context for this book: update culture is part of a long trajectory of the increasing speed, scope, and intensity of writing. The extreme frequency and overload of social media and digital exchanges are part of the historical evolution of reading and writing and the technologies of both. *Too Much to Know* presents an account of the fear of overload in the time of the Renaissance, offering a corrective for contemporary critics of digital reading, writing, and user habits. I specifically bring up Blair's argument because it helps frame this book as part of a long history, one that precedes and will continue after *Update Culture and the Afterlife of Digital Writing.*

Working under the assumption that audiences are participatory, writers expect audience response when communicating in IPI template environments. While digital cultures assume participatory cultures, as argued notably by Henry Jenkins's *Convergence Culture* (2008) and *Spreadable Media* (2013), writing has a long history of audience participation. Recordings of everyday minutiae, via digital comments, frequent emails, and digital forums, have tendrils throughout our recorded history, as H. J. Jackson's *Marginalia* (2001) argues. Reader response, marginalia, and comment culture offer us antecedents of update culture and the afterlife of digital writing.

Using evidence from Renaissance manuscripts, William Sherman's *Used Books* (2008) helpfully reframes the act of reading as inherently an act of participation. Sherman claims, "Reading is just part of the process that makes for fruitful interaction with books. Only with marking and practice can books lead us to the kind of understanding needed to make them speak to our present needs" (4). If we replace books with digital texts in the preceding passage, then Sherman's words become relevant to studies of the internet and digital culture. The act of reading a text is only a small part of its value. Discussion, dissection, and responding to texts are a vital part of why we write and read—a fact proven by the rise of digital forums and literally trillions of digital texts made since the turn of the millennium.

Sherman's *Used Books* (2008) serves as a reminder, and perhaps corrective, to the idea that only recently have readers responded to writing and made comments. Sherman notes that a number of Renaissance manuscripts have extensive reader notes, many of which don't simply summarize an author's statement but extend and reorient it to the thoughts of the reader: "A large percentage of the notes produced by readers had no obvious connection with the text they accompanied—but nonetheless testified to the place of that book in the reader's social life, family history, professional practices, political commitment, and devotional rituals" (xiii). While other readers could not have seen these comments immediately, manuscripts were circulated and readers could think about and process what other readers wrote, possibly even responding to other commenters. In fact, Phil Palmer's "'The Progress of Thy Glorious Book': Material Reading and the Play of Paratext in *Coryats Crudities*" (2014) offers a particularly penetrating example of the ways readers can respond in "print and manuscript marginalia" (339). Palmer analyzes *Coryats Crudities* in terms of reader comments, mining it for "distinct modes of reading and interpretation" (338). *Coryats Crudities* has, as a text, numerous comments that function as evidence of comment culture before the internet. Similarly, Matteo Pangallo's *Playwriting Playgoers in Shakespeare's Theater* (2017) argues that participatory culture has been alive and well since at least the 1600s, with "fandom" leading those in the audience to create and comment on the plays of famous playwrights. In *The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture* (1994), John Dagenais reflects Sherman's, Palmer's, and Pangallo's approaches. Dagenais recounts the following about reading manuscripts that contained reader response and reaction in manuscripts:

> I found that the medieval literature I had been studying till then—the medieval literature based on "texts" and an established canon of authors—was not the same medieval literature I encountered in the manuscripts. The medieval literature I found was far more fluid and dynamic. It had rough edges, not the clean, carefully pruned lines of critical editions; and these edges were filled with dialogue about the text—glosses, marginal notes, pointing hands, illuminations. (xvi)

My point in bringing up these authors and their work is that readers have a long history of participating with texts, making the texts heteroglossic. We even have records of ancient Sumerian scribes adding comments to the decrees of those dictating words on cuneiform tablets and clay tokens—comments that sometimes contradict or poke fun at those dictating. Comments and writer-reader participation have likely been around for as long as writing has existed.

IPI templates extend these dynamic writer-audience relationships by enabling everyday writers to revise their texts even as the text is in circulation. This ability means that not only are everyday people reading and writing, but they are also editing, a notion that extends Deborah Brandt's *The Rise of Writing* (2014) and Tim Laquintano's *Mass Authorship and the Rise of Self-Publishing* (2016). Brandt argues in *The Rise of Writing* that North American society is in the process of moving from mass literacy to mass writing: the general populace reads and can also write. Laquintano's work extends Brandt's claims by arguing that writers no longer need to be authorized by an official venue, such as a publishing house; instead, they can become authors through nontraditional means, such as publishing their books directly as ebooks. In short, we no longer have only everyday writers but also everyday authors. Together, Brandt's and Laquintano's arguments prompt us to think about reading, writing, and publishing as tasks that are quickly becoming common for the majority of the (US) population. People of various classes, races, and genders have greater access to writing technologies and develop wider ranges of reading and writing skills.

This book extends these arguments about increased reading and writing to revision and editing en masse, or mass revision. We don't just write and communicate at a rapid pace and on a staggering scale in update culture. IPI templates encourage a fluid view of writing, which in turn prompts us to see our writing as tremendously flexible. I dwell on this metaphor of fluidity in the conclusion of this book because it helps describe the writing that occurs with the digital writers I present in this project.

OUTLINE

To make my argument, I divide this book into eight chapters. Chapter 1 introduces my methods and participants. Chapter 2 lays out the technological foundation of update culture: IPI templates and their rhetoric. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 empirically investigate how writers contend with update culture. These chapters discuss three broad oral concepts as they occur in text-based internet venues: timing, attention, and management. Chapters 6 (ethics), 7 (learning and pedagogy), and 8 (theoretical implications) tease out the implications of the data chapters. The appendix offers a methodology narrative to clarify the origins and development of this project.

After introducing my methods and participants in chapter 1, chapter 2 examines what I call *template rhetoric*. Template rhetoric provides

the technical capability for update culture to form, thereby supplying the ability of digital writing to have an afterlife. Interactive templates dominate contemporary networked communication; users do not need specialized web-development skills but can use click-based interfaces to communicate. This functionality has a democratizing effect upon users. Everyone can more easily communicate in a networked fashion, thus creating the intensity of update culture and the expectation for writing to change from moment to moment.

Chapter 3, "Textual Timing," recuperates the rhetorical concept of *chronos* by fusing it with *kairos,* thereby arguing for the importance of clock time and quantitative time when contending with environments that have the endless possibility for *kairotic* moments. This chapter thus asks, *When* do writers respond to participatory audiences? I describe three models of digital time in this chapter: *kairos-chronos* fusion, template timing, and algorithmic timing.

Chapter 4, "Textual Attention," explores the ways participants decide on *what* audience reception should receive attention and how to give that attention. Attention describes the way my participants contend with their participatory audiences. While giving attention to their audience reception, my participants create an emergent mental understanding (often referred to as a *hive mind, groupthink,* or the *writing police*) different from their original understanding of the audience. Participants, after reading and carefully thinking about their comments in a holistic sense, decided which comments to ignore, which ones to remain silent about, and which ones to refute. I then discuss textual attention as a three-part act in which writers attend to their audiences by offering some sense of thanks after searching for sincere or genuine responses and questions. While classical rhetoric prefigures speakers and writers as already having attention, new forms of persuasion and identification require *creating, keeping,* and *filtering audiences.*

Chapter 5, "Textual Management," argues that contending with update culture means that some participants decided to communicate back to audiences in ways that reflect managing audiences, literally through text and in broader ways that echo speakers managing listeners. Drawing on impression-management theory and Krista Kennedy's *Textual Curation: Authorship, Agency, and Technology in Wikipedia and Chambers's* Cyclopædia (2016), I identify a heterogeneous variety of tactics participants employed, including macromanagement, indirect management, direct management, and responsive management. These techniques help writers engage in branding their unpaid content, a type of branding I label *aspirational.*

In chapter 6, "Ethics in Update Culture," I discuss ethical implications of digital writing's afterlife and what happens when writers take on the circulation of their texts. I address the pitfalls of update culture as reported to me. I then address the issue of change and that we may not be able to look at writing itself to determine what is ethical. I suggest virtue ethics as a viable alternative for ethical writing in update culture because a virtue-ethics framework emphasizes writerly habits and dispositions, that is, *virtues*, over ethical rules or outcomes.

Chapter 7, "Learning and Pedagogy in Update Culture," teases out educational implications for general digital writers, as well as for teachers of digital writing. For the former, I discuss the issue of inadvertent attention. While this book focuses on writers who already have a participatory audience, its strategies remain useful for those without audiences because anyone on the internet can suddenly attract hordes of commenters. I use a case study to demonstrate the power of inadvertent attention. I examine how a faculty member at the University of Nebraska, Amanda Gailey, wrote an Amazon review and subsequently became the target of gun zealots. I discuss how Gailey's case offers us a reason for using timing, attention, and management, even for people who don't aim to inculcate participatory audiences. In the second half of this chapter, I examine pedagogical questions and implications.

In chapter 8, "An Epistemology of Change," I offer theoretical remarks about the strategies I present in the preceding data chapters. I argue that approaching writing as something malleable might enable us to better understand emergent types of literacy and writing practices that coalesce on various digital platforms. In synthesizing textual timing, attention, and management, I argue that digital writers generally view their writing as changeable.