

Desperately trying to mediate immediacy: a discussion of lived experiences in the digital and mediated context of esports

Andreas Schellewald

(email: aschellewald@acm.org)

Cite as: Schellewald, A. (2018). Desperately trying to mediate immediacy: A discussion of lived experiences in the digital and mediated context of esports. *Press Start*, 4(2), 1–17.

<https://press-start.gla.ac.uk/index.php/press-start/article/view/82>

Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) of an article published at

<https://press-start.gla.ac.uk/index.php/press-start/article/view/82>

Desperately trying to mediate immediacy: a discussion of lived experiences in the digital and mediated context of esports

Abstract

Evermore aspects of contemporary cultures, societies and human life appear to be changed through processes of digitization and mediatization. In analysing these processes, aspects of leisure and aesthetics are not discussed very often and seldom regarding a bodily and worldly dimension of reality. In trying to contribute to such analyses, the paper discusses the phenomenon of esports alongside these developments. More precisely, the paper situates the aesthetic dimension and practices of watching and doing esports in contemporary cultures and societies, focusing on lived experiences in digital and mediated contexts. In showing how these constitutive bodily immediate experiences are made sense of, the paper argues that, because the digital world is a superimposed one, immediate experiences are both in digital and non-digital contexts coped with the same way. By that, ongoing philosophical debates about the constitution of being can be supported in their progress along an emerging digital world.

Keywords: esports; watching esports; aesthetics; lived experiences; mediatization

Introduction

Increasingly, the world we produce, reproduce and reproduced has become superimposed by a digital world, by a world of new media and communication technologies. It is obvious that these technologies are bearers of change, in the sense that all technologies are created in a social and cultural context and thus have a function, purpose or use. However, there have been other technologies before digital ones, which extend, substitute or amalgamate different aspects of our social and cultural life (Schulz, 2004). Hence, it is not technologies per se that instigate change, but rather the appropriation and use of such technologies that fosters change. Therefore, in trying to understand and analyse such processes of change, the paper focuses on the emerging social and cultural life that makes use of different media and communication technologies.

Playing video games can be seen as one of these emerging forms of our social and cultural life. Esports as professionalized video game play (Taylor, 2012) is, in that context, a smaller part of this broader form. While the body plays a central role in discourses about sporting practices and entertainments (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 431), it often plays a less central role in the rest of our social and cultural life. One reason behind this is the dominance of a meta-physical worldview, meaning that the mere physical dimension of our reality is seen as less relevant than the meaning ascribed to things beyond their physical materiality interpretatively (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 21). In understanding esports as a set of sporting practices and entertainments, we are therefore able explore the role of the body in a digital world – and thus a context of emerging forms of our social and cultural life that are not inevitably associated with the human body.

To do so, the paper situates esports as part of contemporary media cultures and societies – cultures and societies that are getting more and more digitized and through processes of

mediatization heavily rely on media and communication technologies as meaning resources and means of action (Adolf, 2017, p. 52). Following Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht's argument of *In Praise of Athletic Beauty*, we argue that aesthetic experiences play a constitutive role for both watching and doing sports. Following Gumbrecht's argument of *Production of Presence*, we understand aesthetic experiences as quantitatively increased mode of being in regards of a bodily and worldly dimension. With this dimension we grasp onto Gumbrecht's notion of presence as precisely that dimension of our reality which "can have an immediate impact on human bodies" (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. xiii). Translating this into the context of esports and a superimposed digital world, we argue that the practices used to cope with those immediate experiences, used to interpret and make sense of them, so they can become meaningful for our social and cultural life, are because of that superposition the same ways of coping with immediate experiences as in a non-digital context.

We are therefore, firstly, outlining the processes of digitization and mediatization. Adding up on this, we discuss the basic structures and mechanisms of our contemporary media cultures and societies, outlining the problematic role of a bodily and worldly dimension in these.

Following this, we, secondly, situate esports as a phenomenon of video games culture and as part of our contemporary media cultures and societies. What is key in this section is the historic process along which esports emerged from the video games industry and culture that was shaped through different appropriations of media and communication technologies.

Going deeper and following this definition of esports, we, thirdly, outline the aesthetic dimension of esports. Key to that is the inclusion of esports into the sports and entertainment discourse. In this aesthetic dimension of esports, we are also exploring the notion of aesthetic experiences as lived experiences (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 100). Adding to this understanding of aesthetics, three types of coping with its immediacy are presented. By this, we are able to see how people make sense of such bodily experiences, so they can become a meaningful part of

their life and the life of others. To close the paper, we outline the form of aesthetic experiences as a contribution to game studies and philosophy.

This paper, surely, can't live up to analyses of Taylor (2016), discussing the embodied work shaping practices of watching esports, or Witkowski (2012), discussing the bodily and worldly dimensions inherent in practices of doing esports. Since we are also more cultural and social scientific in scope, so to say, are interested in the dimensions of meaning and social interaction, we are faced with the problem that many common methods of inquiry are not able to grasp onto an immediate dimension of reality very precisely. This is because many analyses of the social dimension are, historically constituted, more concerned with interpretative constructions than with aspects of materiality and (physical) space (Kaldewey, 2011). The paper should, therefore, not be seen as an attempt of a detailed analysis, but rather as an attempt that shows what relevance such analyses have or could have.

Processes of digitization and mediatization

Contemporary cultures and societies can be described through processes of digitization and mediatization. These processes appear to be impactful on different levels of observation. They span from the micro-social interactions in the everyday life to the macro-cultural patterns that regulate how to address, feel and think about or deal with things, people or oneself. Along digitization we can describe the increasing distribution and appropriation of electronic and digital technologies in almost every part of our social and cultural life (Baecker, 2017; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Along mediatization we can describe the process of the changing role of media and communication technologies and forms for the constitution of cultures and societies. Friedrich Krotz describes mediatization as a long-term development of our human condition, similar to processes of individualization or globalization. Mediatization does in this sense account for the changing nature in which

people communicatively construct their realities (Krotz, 2007, p. 37). While there are different notions to such an understanding of mediatization, Knut Lundby summarises that all of them are concerned with the interrelation of structural changes in mediated communication and changes in social and cultural contexts - transforming both the practices and institutions shaping our cultures and societies (Lundby, 2014, p. 32).

However, following the processes of digitization and mediatization, we can also describe our contemporary cultures and societies as media cultures and societies (Adolf, 2006; Kellner, 1995). Those are cultures and societies in which human social and cultural life is, to a dominant and constitutive degree, reliant on media as both meaning resources (producers of culture) and means of communicative action (technological forms of communicative practices) (Adolf, 2017, p. 52).

Given this assumption, to situate a bodily and worldly, an immediate dimension of our reality inside this context focused on mediation, we need to take one (analytical) step back. To communicate with and understand others, we need certain shared sign and meaning structures. We need representational systems on which we can rely as common ground. Using an example from Clifford Geertz, we need a framework that enables us to understand the movement of an eyelid as either twitch or wink (Geertz, 1973, p. 6). We need to be able to differentiate things being either meaningful or random (Soeffner, 2000, p. 167).

Historically constituted, these representational systems are grounded in meta-physical endeavours. Practices of assigning names to things beyond their physical materiality thus sets one historical starting point to reflect on the ways we can mediate ideas and concepts about the world (Foucault, 1970). To be part of a culture and society one, therefore, needs to understand and experience reality through given sign and meaning structures. However, as these structures are the product of social construction processes, different and conflicting sign

and meaning structures can emerge. They are, hence, not static but dynamic and always part of continuous processes of negotiation, meaning that they are not given, but in every situation have to be reproduced - they have to be reflected on (Soeffner, 2004).[1]

In reflecting on the constitution of such sign and meanings structures, one can conclude that they always are contingent, are created at a specific point in time and space and thus could have been different (Gumbrecht, 2013). We need to keep in mind that in these meta-physical endeavours of institutionalizing representational systems, through what is called the subject/object paradigm, the bodily dimension has been excluded from the list of valid ways of engaging the world (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 32). In reflecting on these representational systems, we are thus not only faced with the problem that we could have experienced the world differently, through different ideas and concepts, but also that the body, our sensual perception of the world before we have interpreted it through sign and meaning structures, plays a crucial role in engaging the world.

While our cultures and societies were able to find more or less useful solutions for the first problem, we did not manage to find a way to include a bodily and worldly dimension of our reality into the constitution of our cultures and societies yet. A bodily and worldly dimension is, therefore, excluded from many parts of our social and cultural life and especially our everyday life (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 100). The solution for the first problem obviously is broadly speaking culture and more particular media themselves, understood as both meaning resources and means of communicative action. However, media are only a solution if one does either exclude the own bodily experiences made or frame them entirely through the inherent sign and meaning structures. This is because, not using the sign and meaning structures of a medium opens up the risk of not being understood by others and possibly not being able to understand others.

This becomes more obvious if we follow the argumentation of Niklas Luhmann regarding the role of experience and perception in art, which we here oppose to the everyday life. In our everyday life, we are concerned with reproducing certain social and cultural structures, like our identities. To do so efficiently, without running the risk of not being understood by or being able to understand others, we need to use media through which we can mediate our experiences, but also frame them in the first place. Given that our everyday life is highly functionalized, media are constructed in a way that enables us to function as part of a social and cultural context. Opposing the field of arts, we are faced with a context in which we are not primarily concerned with functioning and reproducing a certain identity. We are rather faced with a context in which we imaginarily move outside a given context and reality. The conclusion to draw from here is that in art contexts, media like languages are used in a way that breaks with their normal, ordinary use in the everyday life. Hence, we are faced with a context that requires us to consider our sensual experiences in reflecting on the very meaning structures shaping our social and cultural life, shaping our human condition and mode of existence (Luhmann, 2008, pp. 249-257).

Given this, we can describe our cultures and societies as context in which bodily and worldly experiences are more extraordinary than ordinary – are more a site of possible change than stabilized reproduction. However, for them to become a meaningful part of our social and cultural life, they need to be coped with in certain ways. They must be translated into sign and meaning structures, at least as long as our cultures and societies constitutively rely on media and communication. After situating esports as part of our present media cultures and societies in the next section, we are in the last section outlining its aesthetic dimension through looking at lived experiences and analysing the ways these bodily experiences are made sense of.

This paper can thus be seen more in context of mediatization research than in a clear media or game studies oriented discourse. "Rather than the technology in operation [we are] concerned with the mediations of which the technology is a part. [This] concept of mediation involves people and social movements acting with media in communication." (Lundby, 2014, p. 9). Situated in a game studies oriented discourse, this paper thus stands in line with works that concern the social and cultural dimension of video games and video game play, its role in the everyday life and the appropriative practices surrounding it (Crawford & Gosling, 2011; Deterding, 2013; Taylor, 2006; Tolino, 2010; Wimmer & Schmidt, 2015). However, in looking at these appropriative practices through a bodily and worldly dimension, an extraordinary and not ordinary one, we might offer a perspective that is able to describe the mutually constitutive relationship of how video games move us in and out of the everyday life context. We might be able to offer social and cultural scientific perspective on how games move us (Isbister, 2016).

Esports in contemporary cultures and societies

A first appearance of esports can be traced back to 1980s arcade gaming contests. However, besides the then emerging context of a video games industry, as well as "newly materializing digital creative industries" (Borowy & Jin 2013, p. 2270), the amalgamation of sports and media, often referred to as media sport (Rowe, 2004; Wenner, 1998), too, played a crucial role. With the media sport development, we can describe a peak in the professionalization of sporting practices. Crucial in that context is the increasing role of an audience that is watching professional athletes compete in a sport while, at the same time, media companies are creating narratives and experience frameworks around the sport. The broader context in which this early form of esports thus can be observed is the context of experience economy

and event marketing strategies used by the video game industry to market and enhance their products.

"Gaming events provide an important opportunity for the mass marketing and promotion of the digital industries as part of a broader transposition of competitive play within the experience economy. Sport has served as an example of successful entertainment-based event marketing in a mediated culture where play has become an involved, performance-centric experience as well as a spectatorial one." (Borowy & Jin 2013, p. 2269).

A crucial step from this rather professionalized and event based form of esports is, however, the move to a context of networked play. LAN parties in the 1990s and 2000s (Jansz & Martens, 2005) as well as the internet form a key socio-technological frame in this development. It is in the event based nature of LAN parties, making use of local networking technologies, and the internet, enabling more decentralized networked play, that competitive video game play was able to grow into a set of leisurely everyday life practices. Opposed to the 1980s context, which already set the starting point for watching other people play, we are now confronted with a context that allows people to play video games competitively on a broad scale. Hence, in the 1990s and 2000s we can see the starting point for practices of doing esports – we can see the starting point of an emerging community, making use of networking technologies to organize video game play (Taylor & Witkowski, 2010).

Therefore, esports appears to be grown along technological advancements that enable networked play on a broad scale, but also grown by wider changes of cultures and societies in processes of digitization and mediatization. It is thus the appropriation of new media, communication and information technologies that form a key driving force in the development of esports. It is people using online forums to organize tournaments and form

community structures. It is people using game servers to carry out such competitions and allow people to watch it. It is people interacting with a variety of human and nonhuman actors in their leisurely practices, both on- and offline, that fostered the development of esports as a set of sporting practices and entertainments. On a very fundamental level, we can thus state that “e-Sports is born in and of media [...] This is sport as media, meaning that e-sports is the product of the logic of media, communication and information flows” (Hutchins 2008, p. 857).

Since the 2010s we can, however, observe a more concrete form of esports. We can observe a form that at its core emerged from the intersection of all these contexts and processes and is boosted by the emergence of live streaming technologies, enabling practices of watching other people play on a broad scale. It is a form of esports that can be described not only as professionalized video game play (Taylor, 2012), but more recently also as included into an already existing sports and entertainment discourse. This ranges from non-esports related media covering esports, to sponsors outside the video games and technology industry sponsoring events, to companies from the sports and entertainment industry not only investing into esports but also getting involved into or starting their own productions themselves.[2]

“Cultures do not hold still for their portraits. Attempts to make them do so always involve simplification and exclusion” (Clifford, 1986, p. 10). It is in this sense that the current development of esports, as it is being included into a sports and entertainment discourse, is hard to grasp on. While, hence, more research on this development is needed, from inside the field, we can for now assume it to be a development taking place.

“‘This marks the end of the Wild West days of eSports,’ said Jack Etienne, Cloud9 CEO. ‘The community and players want stability and dependability. Leagues come

and go, teams join them and depart, but with the PEA, the teams are making a long-term commitment to be here, playing for the fans, for the indefinite future.” (Steiner, 2016).

Therefore, we have to confront esports not only as a set of sporting practices that is part of a media sports contexts, but also a context of modern sports that is globalized and commercialized (Gruneau, 1999). Sports leagues and organization are in this context focused on producing “involved publics that eagerly stand ready for regular reactivation” (Leifer, 1995, p. 4). The aesthetic dimension of sports might be a good starting point to understand these reactivation processes, the reasons why people are interested in and care about a sport. In assuming the inclusion of esports into these contexts, keeping in mind the constitutive digital and mediated context of it, in focusing on a bodily and worldly dimension, we are therefore able to get a feeling for the importance and changing nature an immediate aesthetic dimension plays in a digital world.

The aesthetic dimension and practices of watching and doing esports

Following the aim to discuss a bodily and worldly dimension of contemporary cultures and societies and a digital world, the work of Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht is an important source. With Gumbrecht’s understanding of lived experiences outlined in *Production of Presence*, we have an understanding at hand that sees aesthetic experiences not in the structured interpretation of certain events and things, but rather as a mode of being. It is analytically speaking the present experience of the world after it has been physically perceived, but before it has been culturally structured and interpreted (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 103). In cultures and societies dominated by sense and meaning, by a meta-physical worldview, lived experiences are thus finite experiences. Concerning the idea of identity and the sense of one’s place, they may be understood as a temporarily stable footing (White, 2008) in a cultural and societal

complex context that needs increasingly more mechanisms of stabilisation. They are therefore more a momentarily mode of a quantitatively increased form of being than a mode of a qualitatively changed form of being.

"There is nothing edifying in such moments, no message, nothing that we could really learn from them – and this is why I like to refer to them as 'moments of intensity.' For what we feel is probably not more than a specifically high level in the functioning of some of our general cognitive, emotional, and perhaps even physical faculties."

(Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 98).

Moving this understanding into the context of watching and doing sports, there are especially two aspects that can be taken from Gumbrecht's work. Firstly, we have aesthetic experiences through what Gumbrecht calls 'mystical bodies' (2016). By this we understand the experience that emerges from (physically) being part of an audience. The aesthetic dimension, to a very large degree, is affected by physical and especially themed contexts: i.e. the location people watch esports in, be it at home, in bars, studios, at trade fairs or in arenas. We want, however, to trace back and situate the aesthetic dimension with a focus on digital contexts.

The second aspect we can take from Gumbrecht is aesthetic experiences through epiphanies of form (2006). What we understand with these is the forms that emerge through athletes making plays, moving their bodies in a way that enables lived experiences, body movements that enable one to be "lost in focused intensity" (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 104). To focus on a digital dimension, we have to trace back the body movements made in the digital world, in the netting of media, communication and information flows (Hutchins, 2008, p. 857). But, we too need to trace back the ways these body movements are experienced, made sense of and communicated.

To situate our approach more precisely, we can use the research of Seo (2013) and Hamari & Sjöblom (2015). Their work outlines and measures the experiential horizon in which the practices of watching and doing esports can be situated. Their works show that these practices are embedded into a network of different interests and meanings. We can observe an interest in watching esports because of the drama the tournament and matches offer as well as an interest in the skill level of the players (Hamari & Sjöblom, 2015, p. 20). This surely is an aspect that can be traced back to the early roots of esports and the media sport context. A context that is supported by different media forms like event teaser and trailer videos, player intros and highlight clips, event aftermovies as well as pre- and post-match discussions or the live commentary during the game. Connected with this, we can observe that often an educational interest lies behind watching other people play, meaning that the practices of doing esports are produced and reproduced not only in the everyday leisurely practices themselves, but also in the realm of professionalized play (Seo, 2013, p. 1549).

Through the works of Gumbrecht and their application in a digital world, we are able to provide a conceptual background that enables the discussion of the aesthetic dimension, a bodily and worldly immediate dimension that has yet not been considered in the discussion of such interests and meanings around watching and doing esports. We are, however, faced with the problem of how to analyse and communicate immediate aesthetic experiences from a social and cultural scientific perspective. We are not trying to outline these experiences, a bodily and worldly dimension of a digital world per se – as we i.e. can find it in Emma Witkowski's work (2012) on practices of doing esports. Rather, we are looking at how such experiences can become meaningful, how they can be communicated and become part of the interaction with others, how they can become a constitutive part of modern sports that deal with keeping people interested in a set of sporting practices and entertainments.

Ways to mediate immediacy in esports

So, how do you mediate immediacy? How do you communicate an immediate dimension of the world? A dimension that primarily is experienced in a way that you can only paraphrase. The approach of Gumbrecht and others, for instance Gaston Bachelard (1964), is a philosophically humanist and poetic one. Confronted with our skillset and interest that is more social and culturally scientific, we thus need to find another approach. A first step for a solution could be to tentatively assume that there is an aesthetic dimension, a dimension of body movements in digital and mediated contexts that is comparable to the body movements in a physically more immediate context. Comparable rather in the way it can be perceived and experienced than in the way it is performed.

The solution can thus be seen in the following. Since we are part of the very reality we are trying to understand and analyse, we can say that the actual ways of coping with immediate aesthetic experiences are the same ways of coping with them in an academic discourse. The different modes used in our contemporary cultures and societies to (desperately) try to mediate immediacy are thus also the methodological starting points to academically discuss immediate experiences. Dealing with immediate experiences from a social and cultural scientific perspective thus means looking at how people deal with them.

We can outline three modes of coping with immediate (aesthetic) experiences. The first (1) mode is the failing attempt to understand. The second (2) mode is the attempt to re-present, the attempt to make the event, the experience present again. The third (3) mode is *Gelassenheit* (composure). *Gelassenheit* is understood through the works of Heidegger as the “capacity of letting things be” (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 71).

(1) Since we live in cultures and societies dominated by the dimension of sense and meaning, immediate, present experiences are only possible in difference to culturally structured

experiences. "[T]hey are necessarily surrounded by, wrapped into, and perhaps even mediated by clouds and cushions of meaning." (Gumbrecht, 2003, p. 106). In the context of esports, these clouds and cushions of meaning are all the narratives created in a media sport context, created through live commentaries, pre- and post-match discussions, promoted through news media and community sites discussing certain plays, events or trends.

Immediate experiences can't be understood or communicated. They can however be expressed if you embed them. In this way, you may not be able to phrase them, but have the opportunity to paraphrase them and share them with others.

(2) Another way to share immediate experience with others is to try to make the experience present again, to re-present it (Gumbrecht, 2012, p. 213). In trying to recreate the experience you open the opportunity for others to have a similar experience and are able to communicate from common ground. In the context of esports, we can observe those attempts to re-present in the form of highlight videos, and montages like teaser and trailer videos, or aftermovies. Those are videos, that, for the most part, use editing and montage techniques that make images resistant to interpretation (Gumbrecht, 1998). The content of the video per se is not key, but the materiality of it – the way the images form a moving body. A moving body that enables an experience close to that of an experience made watching or doing esports.

(3) However, the most important mode is *Gelassenheit*. The capacity of letting things be is in this context understood as discontinuation of attempts to understand. *Gelassenheit* is a mode that enables one to discontinue the continuous processes of sense and meaning making. It is the mode in which you accept that you cannot understand the immediate and present experiences just made. In cultures and societies that heavily rely on such processes of sense and meaning making as mechanisms in processes of stabilisation, *Gelassenheit*, to be socially and culturally impactful, to be understood by others, heavily relies on structural boundaries.

As a mode *Gelassenheit* is, however, very centred around the individual or subject itself. While the other modes as attempts to communicate seem more relevant, *Gelassenheit* is crucial in that to be understood by others you need a context that allows *Gelassenheit* as valid mode of being. You need a context in which everyone knows that *Gelassenheit* is the dominant mode of operation. However, if we go this way, you can imagine that *Gelassenheit* cannot be a specific mode in esports. There is the possibility of specific contextual forms emerging in the fields of esports, but these would not change the underlying logic, the underlying functioning of it. We are faced with modes of operation that function in a fractal manner. Meaning, no matter how deep or far away you go, you always find the same logic driving certain practices and spaces (Abbott, 2001).

Following the inclusion of esports into an already existing sports and entertainment discourse as well as a desire for immediate (aesthetic) experiences in contemporary cultures and societies, *Gelassenheit* becomes not only a crucial mode to cope with such immediate experiences, but also a dominant mode in structuring and constructing the experiential horizons of contemporary leisure and entertainment practices and spaces. It is thus a consequence of the inclusion of esports that the practices and spaces of watching and doing esports follow the same logic as almost all leisure and free time practices and spaces follow.

Outlook

In a world that is highly functionalized,[3] but at the same time highly sportified (Elias & Dunning, 1986), more and more gamified (Sicart, 2014) and aestheticized (Reckwitz, 2017), the desire to just be one with the world, be part of something, while not contemplating what and where else one could be, is a key mode of not only aesthetic experience, but of human life in general.

This paper has argued that our media cultures and societies are superimposed by a digital world, by a world of digital media and communication technologies and forms. Throughout the paper, we have situated esports and the aesthetic dimension, the practices of watching and doing esports, in broader contexts of societal trends and developments in a discourse about sporting practices and entertainments. A consequence of this superposition is that the logic of coping with immediate experiences in digital and mediated contexts is the same logic that we can find in other contexts where people desperately try to mediate immediacy. It was not an aim of this paper to provide a detailed analysis of such processes and aspects. Rather, this paper has tried to show the potential such an analysis could have.

The relation between a bodily and worldly dimension and digital media and communication technologies like video games, their appropriation in form of esports, in context of a game studies related discourse, can be understood in the same way the relation between bodily practices and gender in a gender studies oriented discourse can be. Just like gender studies have opened the potential to reflect on the social, cultural, and bodily practices in the processes of constructing genders (Butler, 1993), game studies are able to open the potential to reflect on the role of the body in a superimposed digital world.

Following this potential, current philosophical debates that deal with a physical dimension in a meta-physical world (Eco, 1990; Gumbrecht, 2003; Latour 1993, Nancy, 1993; Taussig, 1993; Vattimo, 1997) can be supported in their progress, specifically in games studies. In analysing video game play and esports as professionalized form, those debates could be enriched through a perspective into and from a digital and mediated context.

Notes

[1] Following the assumption that reality is constituted in the continuous linkage of situations (Abbott, 2016; Knorr-Cetina, 1988), we could describe structural forms like discourses

(Foucault, 1971), processes of structuration (Giddens, 1984) or the organization of experiences (Goffman, 1974) as mechanisms to stabilise certain realities, certain sign and meaning structures.

[2] Cf. e.g. the creation of interest groups like the World Esports Association (<http://www.wesa.gg/>), ESL's cooperation with David Hill, a former award winning Fox Sports producer (<https://www.eslgaming.com/press/multi-award-winning-executive-david-hill-and-esl-launch-esports-hill>) or the cooperation of Turner and WMG | IMG in creating the ELEAGUE (<http://www.e-league.com>).

[3] Cf. contemporary social theories that argue for a functional differentiation of society as core mode of operation (Luhmann, 1997) and even fundamental works in the fields of leisure and free time activities, that constitute those activities only differentiated from work, differentiated from the functional world (Rojek, 1995).

References

- Abbott, A. (2001). *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, A. (2016). *Processual Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Adolf, M. (2006). *Die unverstandene Kultur. Perspektiven einer kritischen Theorie der Mediengesellschaft*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Adolf, M. (2017). Zwei Gesichter der Mediatisierung? Ein Beitrag zur theoretischen Fundierung der Mediatisierungsforschung und ihres Verhältnisses zur Mediensozialisationsforschung. In D. Hoffman, F. Krotz & W. Reißmann (eds.), *Mediatisierung und Mediensozialisation. Prozesse Räume Praktiken* (pp. 41-57), Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Bachelard, G. (1964). *The Poetics of Space. The Classic Look at How We Experience Intimate Places*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Baecker, D. (2017). Wie verändert die Digitalisierung unser Denken und unseren Umgang mit der Welt? Ausgangspunkte einer Theorie der Digitalisierung. R. Gläß & B. Leukert (eds.), *Handeln 4.0* (pp. 31-63), Berlin: Springer.
- Borowy, M. & Jin, D.Y. (2013). Pioneering eSport. The experience economy and the marketing of early 1980s arcade gaming contests. *International Journal of Communication*, 7(21), 2254-2274.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). How can one be a sports fan? In S. During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London: Routledge: 339-355.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'*. New York: Routledge.

- Brynjolfsson, E. & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age age. Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies.* New York & London; W.W. Norton & Company.
- Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial Truths. In J. Clifford and G.E. Marcus (eds.). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crawford, G. & Gosling, V.K. (2011). Game Scences. *Theorizing Digital Game Audiences.* *Games and Culture*, 6(2), 135-154. doi: 10.1177/1555412010364979
- Deterding, S. (2013). *Modes of Play. A Frame Analytic Account of Video Game Play.* Dissertation at University of Hamburg. Retrived from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286402058_Modes_of_Play_A_Frame_Analytic_Account_of_Video_Game_Play
- Eco, U. (1990). *The Limits of Interpretation.* Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Elias, N. & Dunning, E. (1986). *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process.* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things.* New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours.* Paris: Gallimard.
- Geertz, C. (2001). *Available Light. Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of structuration.*

Oakland: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organization of Experience.* Boston:

Northeastern University Press.

Gruneau, R. (1999). *Sport, Class, and social development.* Champaign: Human Kinectics.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (1998). *Perception Versus Experience: Moving Pictures and Their*

Resistance to Interpretation. In T. Lenoir & H.U. Gumbrecht (eds.), *Inscribing*

Science. Scientific Texts and the Materiality of Communication (pp. 351-365),

Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (2002). *Riskantes Denken. Intellektuelle als Katalysatoren von*

Komplexität. In U.J. Wenzel (ed.), *Der kritische Blick. Über intellektuelle Tätigkeiten*

und Tugenden (pp. 148-157), Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (2003). *Production of Presence. What Meaning Cannot Convey.* Stanford:

Stanford University Press.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (2006). *In Praise of Athletic Beauty.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard

University Press.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (2012). *Präsenz.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Gumbrecht, H.U. (2013). *Historisierung der Beobachtung zweiter Ordnung - eine*

epistemologische Rahmenerzählung. In P.C. Pawling, A. Mazzucchelli, H.U.

Gumbrecht (eds.), *Beobachtungen zweiter Ordnung im historischen Kontext* (pp. 7-

22), München: Fink.

- Gumbrecht, H.U. (2016). What Do Sports Spectators "Invest"? Talk at the 9th Toronto German Studies Symposium "Sports: Allure and Ethics". Retrived from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z28zsBd0SCE>.
- Hamari, J. & Sjöblom, M. (2015). What is eSports and why do people watch it? SSRN Working paper series, 1-31. doi: 10.1108/IntR-04-2016-0085
- Hutchins, B. (2008). Signs of meta-change in second modernity: the growth of e-sport and the World Cyber Games. *New Media & Society*, 10(6), 851-869. doi: 10.1177/1461444808096248
- Isbister, K. (2016). *How Games Move Us. Emotion by Design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Jansz, J. & Martens, L. (2005). Gaming at a LAN event. The social context of playing video games. *New Media & Society*, 7(3), 333-355. doi: 10.1177/1461444805052280
- Kaldewey, D. (2011). Das Realitätsproblem der Sozialwissenschaften: Anmerkungen zur Beobachtungen des Außersozialen. *Soziale Systeme*, 17(2), 277-307.
- Kellner, D. (1995). *Media Culture. Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics between the Modern and the Postmodern*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Knorr-Cetina, K. (1988). The micro-social order. Towards a reconception. N.G. Fielding (ed.), *Actions and structure: research methods and social theory* (pp. 21-53), London: Sage.
- Krotz, F. (2007). *Mediatisierung. Fallstudenten zum Wandel von Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

- Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Leifer, E.M. (1995). *Making the Majors. The Transformation of Team Sports in America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Luhmann, N. (1997). *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Luhmann, N. (2008). *Schriften zur Kunst und Literatur*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Lundby, K. (2014). *Mediatization of Communication*. In K. Lundby (ed.), *Mediatization of Communication* (pp. 3-35), Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nancy, J.L. (1993). *The Birth to Presence*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Reckwitz, A. (2017). *The Invention of Creativity. Modern Society and the Culture of the New*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rojek, C. (1995). *Decentring Leisure. Rethinking Leisure Theory*. London: Sage.
- Rowe, D. (2004). *Sport, Culture & Media. The Unruly Trinity*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Schulz, W. (2004). *Reconstructing Mediatization as an Analytical Concept*. *European Journal of Communication*, 19(1), 87-101. doi: 10.1177/0267323104040696
- Seo, Y. (2013). *Electronic Sports: A new marketing landscape of the experience economy*. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(14), 1542-1560. doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2013.822906
- Sicart, M. (2014). *Play Matters*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

- Soeffner, H.G. (2004). *Auslegung des Alltags. Der Alltag der Auslegung*. Konstanz: UVK.
- Soeffner, H.G. (2000). *Gesellschaft ohne Baldachin. Über die Labilität von Ordnungskonstruktionen*. Welerswist: Velbrück.
- Steiner, D. (2016). Professional Esports Association Launches, to Host \$1 Million NA CS:GO League. Available at <https://pvplive.net/c/professional-esports-association-launches-to-host-> (accesses 10 September 2017).
- Taussig, M. (1993). *Mimesis and Alterity. A Particular History of the Senses*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, N.T. (2016). Now you're playing with audience power: the work of watching games. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. doi: 10.1080/15295036.2016.1215481
- Taylor, T.L. (2006). *Play Between Worlds. Exploring Online Game Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Taylor, T.L. (2012). *Raising the Stakes. E-Sports and the Professionalization of Computer Gaming*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Taylor, T.L. & Witkowski, E. (2010). This is how we play it. What a mega-LAN can teach us about games. *Proceedings of the fifth international conference on the foundation of digital games*, 95-202.
- Tolino, A. (2010). *Gaming 2.0 - Computerspiele und Kulturproduktion*. Boizenburg: VWH.
- Vattimo, G. (1997). *Beyond Interpretation. The Meaning of Hermeneutics for Philosophy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wenner, L.A. (1998)(ed.). *MediaSport*. London: Routledge.

Witkowski, E. (2012). On the Digital Playing Field: How We "Do Sport" With Networked Computer Games. *Games and Culture*, 7(5), 349-374. doi:

10.1177/1555412012454222

Wimmer, J. & Schmidt, J.H. (2015). Game Studies und Mediensoziologie. In K. Sachs-Hombach & J.N. Thom (eds.), *Game Studies. Aktuelle Ansätze der Computerspielforschung* (pp. 252-278), Köln: Halem.

White, H. (2008). *Identity and control. A structural theory of social action*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.