Whereas most reading is a solitary practice, performed in private, fans consume texts as part of a community. Fan culture is about the public display and circulation of meaning production and reading practices. Fans make meanings to communicate with other fans. Without the public display and circulation of these meanings fandom would not be fandom. 'Organized fandom is, perhaps first and foremost, an institution of theory and criticism, a semistructured space where competing interpretations and evaluations of common texts are proposed, debated, and negotiated and where readers speculate about the nature of the mass media and their own relationship to it.'[57]

Fan communities are not just bodies of enthusiastic readers; fan culture is also about cultural production. Jenkins notes ten ways in which fans re-write their favourite television shows:[58]

1. *Recontextualization* – the production of vignettes, short stories and novels which seek to fill in the gaps in broadcast narratives and suggest additional explanations for particular actions.
2. *Expanding the series timeline* – the production of vignettes, short stories, novels which provide background history of characters, etc. not explored in broadcast narratives or suggestions for future developments beyond the period covered by the broadcast narrative.
3. *Refocalization* – this occurs when fan writers move the focus of attention from the main protagonists to secondary figures. For

example, female or black characters are taken from the margins of a text and given centre stage.
4. *Moral realignment* – a version of refocalization in which the moral order of the broadcast narrative is inverted (the villains become the good guys). In some versions the moral order remains the same but the story is now told from the point of view of the villains.
5. *Genre shifting* – characters from broadcast science fiction narratives, say, are relocated in the realms of romance or the Western, for example.
6. *Cross overs* – characters from one television programme are introduced into another. For example, characters from *Dr Who* may appear in the same narrative as characters from *Star Wars*.
7. *Character dislocation* – characters are relocated in new narrative situations, with new names and new identities.
8. *Personalization* – the insertion of the writer into a version of their favourite television programme. For example, I could write a short story in which I am recruited by Dr Who to travel with him in the Tardis on a mission to explore what had become of Manchester United in the twenty-first century. As Jenkins points out, this subgenre of fan writing is discouraged by many in the fan community.[59]
9. *Emotional intensification* – the production of what are called 'hurt–comfort' stories in which favourite characters, for example, experience emotional crises.
10. *Eroticization* – stories which explore the erotic side of a character's life. Perhaps the best known of this subgenre of fan writing is 'slash' fiction, so called because it depicts same-sex relationships (as in Kirk/Spock, Bodie/Doyle, etc.).

What Jenkins finds particularly empowering about fandom is its struggle to create 'a more participatory culture' from 'the very forces that transform many Americans into spectators'.[64]

> I am not claiming that there is anything particularly empowering about the texts fans embrace. I am, however, claiming that there is something empowering about what fans do with those texts in the process of assimilating them to the particulars of their lives. Fandom celebrates not exceptional texts but rather exceptional readings (though its interpretive practices makes it impossible to maintain a clear or precise distinction between the two).[65]